

# Deixis and the renaissance art of self construction<sup>1</sup>

Sylvia ADAMSON  
*University of Sheffield*

## ABSTRACT

This paper is offered as a contribution to our understanding of both the history of literary style and the psychology of reading. I begin with a comparison with art history, where the development of the technique of linear perspective provides a stylistic boundary-marker between medieval and renaissance styles. Identifying the 'printed voice effect' as an analogous demarcator in literary history, I explore the technical means by which the effect was created, in a set of case-studies representing the emergent genres of essay and dramatic lyric. My analytical model is adapted from Gombrich's account of 'guided projection,' which explains pictorial illusion as the cooperative creation of the artist (who provides the visual cues) and the spectator (who interprets them). I argue that the literary equivalent to the geometric cues of perspective is to be found in the linguistic system of deixis and claim that renaissance texts show an innovative and experimental awareness of the deictic resources of the English language.

KEYWORDS: deixis, renaissance, historicism, self in literature, language and style

## 1. The printed voice

In the history of art forms, some stylistic innovations seem to demand the title revolutionary, if only because their effects are so striking as to be felt by the non-professional observer. In the western

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to the organisers of 15 SEDERI for inviting me to give the plenary on which this paper is based and to the conference participants for their helpful responses to my presentation. In preparing the written version, I have benefited from the advice of Helen Baron (on Wyatt) and Richard Serjeantson (on Bacon) and from the comments of my Sheffield colleagues (Jane Hodson, Marcus Nevitt, Cathy Shrank and Goran Stanivukovic) and of this volume's anonymous readers. My main thanks are due to several generations of students at the universities of Strathclyde, Cambridge and Manchester; they are the readers whose responses provided the empirical foundation of this paper and the initial audiences on whom its arguments were trialled.

pictorial tradition, the renaissance (re)invention of perspective is revolutionary in just this sense. The power to create the illusion of 'a window on the world' or 'a painted point-of-view,' so painstakingly cultivated by Uccello, Dürer and their contemporaries, still provides the hallmark by which today's art-gallery browsers can distinguish a 'typical renaissance' image from its counterpart in the preceding medieval tradition.<sup>2</sup> In literary history, the closest analogy is the emergence of 'the printed voice' effect.<sup>3</sup> Readers of literature and writers of literary gazetteers may quarrel about dating the boundary between pre- and post-renaissance, but they have generally agreed when it comes to characterising the difference between them. Before the great theory wars of the late twentieth-century, the effect was typically described by some variant of the notion of 'self-expression'. Wyatt, for example, was often selected as the harbinger of the modern lyric voice on the grounds of his "dramatic, colloquial ... introspective character" (Speirs 1961: 56), his "emphatic declaration of personal feeling" (Sampson 1941: 141).<sup>4</sup>

What such formulations share is a loose, intuitive equation between a perceived quality in the language of a text (hence descriptors such as *colloquial* or *emphatic*) and the sensed presence of a personality behind the text, its sponsoring self (hence *introspective* or *personal feeling*). Both sides of this equation, not to mention the inferential link between them, were severely mauled by the literary theorists of the 1980s. As the key concepts of 'author', 'self', 'identity' were problematised and the idea of language as a transparent medium of communication was declared untenable, the naïve notion of 'self-expression' was displaced in favour of 'self-representation' or

---

<sup>2</sup> Such illustrative pairings are common in art histories addressed to non-specialists. See, for example, the townscapes in Edgerton (1976: 8-9) or the dining tables in Gombrich (1982: 21-22).

<sup>3</sup> *The printed voice* is Browning's term (*The Ring and the Book*, 1868-9, Bk 1, l.167). Griffiths (1988) adopted it as the title of his study of the illusionist function of sound effects in nineteenth-century poetry.

<sup>4</sup> *Renaissance* has the inevitable vagueness of all terms used to demarcate historical periods. I take it that, as a stylistic descriptor, the term subsumes a collection of features, each of which may have a rather different historical distribution. In giving primacy to the printed voice effect, I am not claiming that even this occurs always or only in texts of a certain date. It would not unduly disturb my hypothesis, for instance, if Chaucer's poetry displayed the features described in this paper and Spenser's did not. On the contrary, it might account for the fact that to many readers Chaucer appears more 'modern' than Spenser. For helpful discussion of the periodisation problem, see Spearing (1985).

'self-fashioning'. In the revised critical consensus, the new self which readers encounter in the new (or renewed) genres of the renaissance – lyric, drama, essay, autobiography – is as much the precipitate of a new style of writing as the reflection of a new cultural formation.

From the vantage-point of a twenty-year retrospective, what's striking is the relative failure of this theoretical shift to affect analytical practice. Despite well-publicised maxims, such as "self-fashioning is always, though not exclusively, in language" (Greenblatt 1980: 9), New Historicism – like Old Historicism – has had far more to say about "change in the intellectual, social, psychological, and aesthetic structures that govern the generation of identities" (Greenblatt 1980: 1) than about change in language or style. So although the printed voice is now widely acknowledged to be a triumph not of transcription but of illusionism, it is not well understood, and is too seldom discussed, as a representational *technique*, still less as a technique with its own history of development and change.<sup>5</sup>

The balance seems to me to have been better struck in art history where the evolving treatment of perspective is – or ought to be – methodologically instructive for the historiography of literary self-representation.

Pictorial perspective has, at different times, been treated as a mathematical question and a metaphysical one. The standard textbooks used in art schools in the first half of the twentieth century taught it as a system of projective geometry, whose rules guaranteed the accurate transcription of three-dimensional reality on to a two-dimensional surface. In the second half of the century, this view was challenged by one which saw perspective not as an advance in the representation of the real, but rather as a style symbolic of a revolution in the way reality was conceived. To the inventors of linear perspective, it was claimed, "the real was that which could be proved to occupy a given position in space" (Clark 1956: 35), where space had been reconceived as "the quantum continuum of modern philosophical and mathematical theory" (Panofsky 1960: 118-133) and proof had been redefined as optical demonstration. This ideal of

---

<sup>5</sup> Easthope (1983) remains one of the most ambitious attempts to fuse ideological and linguistic approaches to self-representation, though his account is limited by his concentration on iambic pentameter as the mediator of voicing and skewed by his ideological commitment to deconstructing the "bourgeois" illusion of voice, which often hampers his analysis of how it works. A work closer to the spirit and practice of the present paper is Cave (1999).

proof (more colloquially expressed as 'seeing is believing') had the effect of subordinating the quantum continuum to an individual perceiver located in a specific moment of space/time.<sup>6</sup>

It was the achievement of Ernst Gombrich, in works such as *Art and Illusion* (1960) and *The Image and the Eye* (1982), to demonstrate that there is no necessary conflict between the mathematics and the metaphysics of perspective. Key to his argument was the notion of 'guided projection,' a process in which visual cues supplied by the artist are interpreted by the spectator at the prompting of a variety of psychological predispositions, whose origins may be both biological and cultural. On this view, the painted third dimension is the co-operative creation of artist and spectator and the history of its development can be understood as a series of representational challenges, where the experiments and solutions of one generation of artists provide first the opportunities and then the constraints of the next generation.<sup>7</sup>

Gombrich himself likened his activity in relation to art criticism to that of the linguist vis-à-vis literary criticism (Gombrich 1963: 11). It is tempting to take this as a challenge to transfer his enquiry into illusionism from the pictorial to the verbal medium, by making a foray into a 'guided projection' account of the printed voice of renaissance literature. This is what I attempt in this paper by addressing the questions: what are the linguistic cues that prompt readers to 'recognise' a personality or voice in the texts they read? how are these cues deployed and developed by writers of the period's new subjective genres? The nature of renaissance subjectivity itself lies beyond the scope of this discussion. It is *not* my

---

<sup>6</sup> Panofsky's influential essay "Die Perspektive als symbolische Form" was published in *Vertrage der Bibliothek Warburg 1924-5* (Leipzig 1927). Its arguments are more readily available to English readers in Panofsky (1940) and chapter 3 of Panofsky (1960). For a statement of the opposing view, see Pirenne (1952). Forensically, the prioritisation of 'ocular proof' (exemplified in *Othello* 3.iii.359-366) displaced the rhetorical proofs which dominated classical traditions of persuasion.

<sup>7</sup> For a succinct account of the mechanisms of 'guided projection,' see the first and last essays in Gombrich (1963). The origins and consequences of the renaissance idea of art-history as progressive problem-solving are discussed in "The renaissance conception of artistic progress" in Gombrich (1966). For a practical illustration, see Clark's description of the attempts by Claude and Poussin to provoke the illusion of recession from a composition of parallel planes (Clark 1956: 77-80); and for the problems which Claude's solutions created for Constable, see Gombrich (1960: 40-1). The final embarrassments of illusionism are well summarised in Gombrich (1960: 236-46).

aim to engage directly with the ideological and cultural questions of selfhood so ably documented and debated by, for example, Taylor (1989), Hanson (1998), Seigel (2005). Ultimately, I would hope, the two kinds of enquiry touch hands, since linguistic self-construction is the necessary scaffolding on which the dramas of personal identity can be staged.

I begin, in section 2, with a technical interlude, establishing the validity of the analogy between perspective and voice and arguing that it is possible to identify a grammar of voice in the same way that we can identify a geometry of point-of-view. In subsequent sections, I examine specific case-studies of self-construction in renaissance texts, focussing on the genres of essay in section 3 and lyric in sections 4 and 5. My discussion concludes, in section 6, with a brief contrast between renaissance self construction and its deconstruction in modernist texts.

## 2. Deixis and I-witness

Linear perspective can be defined as a method of depicting objects as if viewed from a single fixed spatio-temporal point, their relation to this perceptual centre being the factor that determines their represented size, shape and mutual relations. As so defined, perspective has clear affinities with the linguistic system of deixis, whose primary function is to describe objects in their spatio-temporal relations to a given locutionary centre. In other words, a deictic text is centred on a speaker in the same way as a perspectived painting is centred on a perceiver. If perspective represents an eye-witnessed world, deixis represents an I-witnessed world.

It is important to remember (because easy to forget) that this method of representing the world is by no means inevitable in either the pictorial or the linguistic medium. Objects can be located pictorially without the use of perspective – as in the case of maps – and, similarly, there are ways of describing location in language which avoid or minimise reference to the speaker's own position. Compare, for instance, the two types of locating expression underlined in (1):

- (1a) On the morning of 26th March, 2004, Sylvia Adamson gave a paper at the University of Lisbon. [historical reference]  
 (1b) This morning I gave a paper here. [deictic reference]

In (1a) events are located by what we may call *historical reference*, that is, by anchoring them to the publicly agreed reference-points embodied in calendar and atlas. These are, of course, culturally relative. An English atlas attaches the label *Lisbon* to a place that in Portugal is called *Lisboa*; the Christian calendar dates events from the birth of Christ where the Islamic calendar begins with Mohammed's flight to Medina. Nonetheless, within any given culture, such spatio-temporal anchors have absolute status, in the sense that their reference is transparent and remains constant across users. By contrast, the equivalent spatio-temporal expressions in (1b) are anchored in their speaker and they can only be translated into a framework of historical reference by first establishing the location of the speech-act. When I spoke (1b) at the 15th SEDERI conference, *this morning* referred to 26th March 2004 and *here* to the University of Lisbon. On that occasion, (1a) would have been an acceptable translation. Spoken on other occasions, (1b), unlike (1a), would have quite different temporal and geographical coordinates.

Over the last twenty years, *deixis* has increasingly become part of literary-critical vocabulary and perhaps now needs no preliminary exposition.<sup>8</sup> However, as often happens when a term is transferred across discipline boundaries, its meaning has broadened or metaphorised beyond the narrow construal that will be central to my argument here. For the purposes of this paper, the relevant and distinctive feature of deictic locating terms is that their definitions have to include – directly or indirectly – a reference to the speaker, or, more precisely, to the primary deictic term *I*. It is in this quite technical sense that deixis is 'egocentric' language.<sup>9</sup> The basic meaning of *here*, for example, is 'the place where *I* is' and *now* is 'the time in which *I* is speaking.' In the case of these two terms, the definitional dependence on *I* is so strong that 'I am here now' can never be a lie; it is true by definition in the same way as 'a bachelor is an unmarried man' or 'a triangle has three sides.' And the three

---

<sup>8</sup> The dating here is somewhat anglo-centric. Deixis has been familiar to European literary theorists since the work of Bühler (1934: 79-148). Early adopters in the anglophone world include (for the lyric) Leech (1969: 183-204) and Culler (1975: 164-170), (for drama) Elam (1980) and (for narrative) Banfield (1982).

<sup>9</sup> I am not here concerned with derived or extended senses of individual deictic terms or with the wider phenomenon of empathetic deixis, which I have discussed extensively elsewhere, e.g. Adamson (1994, 1995, 2001b). The view of deixis accepted in this paper is expounded in Lyons (1977: 636-724) and Fillmore (1997); its 'egocentric' basis is challenged, though not, I think, demolished by Jones (1995).

terms together *I-Here-Now* constitute the anchoring-point of the wider deictic field of reference, whose other terms specify location in relation to the spatio-temporal nexus this triad creates.<sup>10</sup> In the core deictic repertoire of English (as in the system of perspective), the locations specified are primarily those of distance, objects and events being categorised as either close to the *I* (by the proximal deictics, such as *here, this, now*) or not close to the *I* (by their distal counterparts *there, that, then*).

Deixis, then, grammaticalises the speaker's locational relation to the objects of his discourse. This means that while sentences like (1b) do not provide sufficient information for readers to locate objects and events in the public reference frame of their historical or geographical setting, they do enable us to reconstruct the spatio-temporal configuration of a speech setting and infer the relative positions of entities in terms of their comparative distance from the speaker. But *enable* is not the right word here. The power of deictic forms lies in the fact that they *force* us to make inferences in order to make sense. The reader is not the passive recipient of information, but its active co-creator. Take, for instance, the following exchange:

- (2) *Gravedigger: Here's a skull now hath lien you i'th'earth three and twenty years ... Whose do you think it was?*  
*Hamlet: Nay, I know not.*  
*Gravedigger: ... This same skull, sir, was Yorick's skull, the King's jester.*  
*Hamlet: This?*  
*Gravedigger: E'en that.* (*Hamlet* 5.i.173-181)<sup>11</sup>

We do not need to see a stage production to know that Yorick's skull passes from one protagonist to the other, though neither mentions this happening. The event is plotted grammatically in the patterning of *here-this-this?-that*.

Drama is arguably a special case, in that there is normally an intervenient director to lift the interpretive burden from the reader and there is an actor to take the part of *I* and embody the anchoring-point for deictic terms. In essay or lyric, the presence of an embodied

---

<sup>10</sup> Bühler (1934) calls this the deictic *origo* and argues powerfully for its psychological salience. If accepted, his arguments provide an explanation for the reading responses I describe in this paper.

<sup>11</sup>All Shakespeare citations follow the text and line numbering of *The Riverside Shakespeare*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974.

*I* is pure illusion, which rests on the writer's ability to provoke the reader into co-operative activity. Deixis is the primary resource. As in a perspective painting where, though the eye is not represented, its position can be inferred from the lines of the picture's construction; so in a deictic text, the definitional dependence of the core terms on *I* means that where they are present, an *I* is both implied and positioned. And in a text that combines deictic reference with historical reference, the reader should be able to infer what position the implied speaker occupies in a public spatio-temporal framework. Imagine the examples in (3) as the opening sentences of texts:

- (3a) Napoleon was defeated in the early years of *this* century.  
 (3b) *Tomorrow* is Tuesday.

In (3a), provided that we remember *Battle of Waterloo: 1815*, the occurrence of *this* is sufficient for us to infer a speaker located in the nineteenth century; in (3b) the combination of the deictic *tomorrow* with the public reference frame of *Tuesday* allows us to infer an *I* whose *Now* is a specific day of the week, Monday. We make these inferences so automatically that they seem less remarkable to us than they ought. And what we ought to find particularly remarkable in the two cases of (3) is that – in contrast to (1b) and (2) – the term *I* itself is entirely absent from the text. The text's 'speaker' is altogether a collaborative construct of writer's cues and reader's inferences, or, in Gombrich's terms, a classic case of 'guided projection'.<sup>12</sup>

In pursuing the literary consequences of this process, I am not, of course, claiming that deixis is a renaissance invention. On the contrary, it is a pervasive, probably universal, design feature of natural languages. What does seem to be the case, however, is that texts of the Early Modern period show an innovative and experimental awareness of the deictic resources of English. As the following case-studies suggest, the new voice which readers detect in renaissance lyric and essay correlates with a new emphasis on the terms at the deictic centre (*I-Here-Now*) and particularly on the expressive power of opposing *Here* to *There*, *Now* to *Then*.

---

<sup>12</sup> Within linguistics, the most famous example of deictic exegesis is the analysis of *may we come in?* in Fillmore (1973).

### 3. I am here now

Since Villey (1908), it has been widely accepted that the renaissance essay, as practised by Montaigne and his English imitators, evolved out of the commonplace books and *adagia* of the earlier sixteenth century, in a process characterised as 'the gradual personalisation of an impersonal form' (Gray 1999: 272). How this process manifested itself in the language of the genre has, however, received surprisingly little attention.<sup>13</sup> My first exemplary text is one which may allow us to apprehend the essayistic *I* in the very act of self construction. It provides, at any rate, an interesting test-case for the application of Gombrich's guided projection hypothesis to the printed voice effect.

- (4) *I might say much of the commodities that death can sell a man but briefly, Death is a friend of ours, and he that is [not] ready to entertain him, is not at home[:] whilst I am, my Ambition is not to fore-flow the Tyde, I have but so to make my interest of it, as I may account for it, I would wish nothing but what might better my dayes, nor desire any greater place then the front of good opinion, I make not love to the continuance of dayes, but to the goodnesse of them; nor wish to dye, but referre my self to my houre, which the great Dispenser of all things hath appointed me; yet as I am fraile, and suffered for the first fault, were it given me to chuse, I should not be earnest to see the evening of my age, that extremity of it self being a disease, and a meer return into infancie: So that if perpetuity of life might be given me, I should think what the Greek Poet said, *Such an Age is a mortall evill*. And since I must needs be dead, I require it may not be done before mine enemies, that I be not stript before I be cold, but before my friends; *the night was even now; but that name is lost, it is not now late, but early[:]* mine eyes begin to discharge their watch, and compound with this fleshly weaknesse for a time of perpetuall rest, and I shall presently be as happy for a few houres, as I had dyed the first houre I was borne.<sup>14</sup>*

<sup>13</sup> I refer to the development of the essay in English; Montaigne himself has been better served. See, for example, Cave (1999: 111-127), which traces the links between 'l'emergence du "moi" comme substantif et comme "sujet" dans tous les sens du mot' (Cave 1999: 109).

<sup>14</sup> This passage forms the conclusion to *An Essay on Death*, first published in 1648 in *The Remaines of the Right Honorable Francis Lord Verulam*. The essay was not included in Rawley's (1657) edition of Bacon's writings, which led Bacon's Victorian editor, Spedding, to doubt its authenticity, though he did print it in an appendix to his edition of the Essays (see *The Works of Francis Bacon*, ed. J. Spedding, R. Ellis & D. Heath, 7 vols, 1857-74, vol. VI: 600-604). Its authorship, as far as I know, remains undetermined.

This passage provokes a marked division of opinion among readers, some responding to it as a 'printed voice' text, others as a piece of impersonal didacticism in the *ars moriendi* tradition. Almost all readers, however, note a qualitative difference in the finale (here italicised), and those who initially class the text as 'impersonal' often recognise an onset of subjectivity at this point, some reporting a double-take, or difficulty in construal, when what they have taken to be an 'everyman' or 'representative I' turns suddenly into the writer of this very essay, finishing his work and going to bed.

While modern reactions offer no infallible guide to renaissance responses – we read (4) now through the thick lens of all that has since been written in more explicitly autobiographical or confessional genres – readers' consensus on the *shift* in tone in the passage is at least suggestive, particularly as it turns out to correlate with a shift in linguistic structure. The item *I* is pretty evenly distributed through the text. What changes is the grammatical framework in which it occurs. In the finale it is supported by a range of deictic forms that were previously absent or underplayed. Tense is perhaps particularly important. In the first section, the basic tense is the propositional present, the non-deictic tense used for the statement of timeless general truths, such as *death is a friend* or *age is a mortal evil*, and the present of personal time seems to be assimilated to this, recording habitual actions or states of mind and hence giving the 'everyman' quality to such declarations as: *my ambition is ...* or *I make not love ...* In the last two sentences, however, the present tense becomes unmistakably deictic, being put into explicit opposition to a past and a future: *it was night; it is early; I shall be at rest*. And the time contrasts set up by the tenses are repeated and reinforced in the deictic temporal adverbs: *even now ... now ... presently*. History, instead of being contemporaneous, is represented as evolving, moving towards and away from a particular point in its course, that point being the *I* in the moment of utterance. The only instance of a spatial deictic in the passage also occurs in the finale, in *this fleshly weakness*. Semantically echoing the earlier *I am frail*, this phrase attracts a rather different interpretation. Whereas *I am frail* is read as

---

The text printed here follows the 1648 version, with the addition of the concluding italics and two clarificatory punctuation marks of the form [;]. The first *not* of the passage does not appear in the original text (1648:12) but is included in the volume's *errata* (1648:103).

a statement of doctrine, *this fleshly weakness* tends to be read as a comment on the writer's physical condition, a declaration of age, sickness or tiredness, as if the deictic *this* invokes a gesture towards the writer's own body in a way that *as I am frail* does not.

On the one hand, then, (4) seems to provide evidence that the occurrence of *I* on its own may not be a sufficient cue to trigger in all readers the recognition of a self behind the page. At the same time, it suggests that the more potent cues lie in the localisation of *I* in a *Here* and *Now*. Apparently our willingness to acknowledge the presence of self has something to do with our being able to place an *I* in time and – perhaps more importantly – in space. Responses to this passage correlate quite suggestively with observations made by Schegloff in his analyses of the opening moves in telephone conversations, where he found a systematic difference in distribution between the formulae 'my name is X' and 'this is X.' The first formula is typically used as self-introduction by a previously unknown caller, while the formula containing the spatial deictic is used only when the act of self-identification is "intended to solicit recognition" (Schegloff 1972: 109, 1979: 47).<sup>15</sup>

There seems also to be some correlation here with the cognitive bases of perspective. Ames's experiments on visual perception – so often cited by Gombrich – showed that it is almost invariably a 'thereness-thatness' experience in which perceivers translate intrinsically ambiguous visual cues into three-dimensional constructions (Ittelson 1952: 21). Wherever the data permits, we recognise, guess at or project objects in space. Readers' responses to texts like (4) point to an equivalent experience in reading, let's call it a 'hereness-nowness' experience, in which we recognise or project the presence of a speaker whenever a text supplies sufficient cues to allow us to place an *I* in a *Here* and *Now*.

Cornwallis, experimenting with the essayistic *I* in (5) below, is careful to provide such locational cues. As the opening move in *Of Alehouses*, he establishes his *I* in richly specific terms, providing

---

<sup>15</sup> The spatial basis of identity goes beyond language. Work in social psychology suggests that what distinguishes a person from an object is the possession of what may be called a territorial envelope. The degree to which we recognise personhood in ourselves or others is intimately bound up with our ability to claim or grant occupancy and control of a certain physical space. The size of this space is culturally variable, but in all cultures the invasion or removal of the customary 'personal envelope' is used or interpreted as a denial of full civic existence. See Sommer (1969: 26-38).

readers both with deictic coordinates of the location (*now, here, this*) and with the means to translate them into historical reference (*night, alehouse, ink & paper*). Inverting the strategy of (4), he then modulates from the progressive present of immediate experience (*I am now trying*) into the generalised present of moral adage (*how men bely themselues*).

- (5) I Write *this* in an Alehouse, into which I am driuen by night, which would not giue me leaue to finde out an honester harbour. I am without any copany but Inke, & Paper, & them I use in stead of talking to my selfe: my Hoste hath already giuen me his knowledge, but I am little bettered, I am *now* trying whether my selfe be his better in discretion. The first note *here* is to see how honestly euery place speakes, & how ill euery man liues: not a Poste, not a painted cloth in the house, but cryes out, *Feare God*, and yet the Parson of the Town scarce keeps this Instruction. It is a straunge thing how men bely themselues: euery one speaks well, and means naughtily. They cry out if man with man breake his word, & yet no Body keepes promise with vertue.<sup>16</sup>

In (4) and (5) we see the emergence of the renaissance essay as a printed voice genre. Both texts show the tug of the genre's origins in commonplace books and compilations of *sententiae*: in (4), by the *I*'s alignment with historical precedent (*I should think what the Greek poet said ...*), in (5), by the moral allegorisation of what originally appeared a random concrete location. Both texts may seem (to us reading now) disconcerting in the way they manage the transition between impersonal and personal modes. But both – and this is the point of importance to the present enquiry – bear eloquent witness to the power of the grammatical configuration *I-Here-Now* to effect the transition by cuing our 'recognition' of a situated self.

#### 4. Where is here?

Deictic reference has certain problematic qualities, arising from the fact that deictic terms are, by their nature, relative and opaque in reference. Their relativity follows from their egocentricity. Because they are definitionally dependent on *I*, their referential meaning varies according to the identity occupying the *I*-role, which in turn may vary with successive speech acts. This causes no difficulty in spoken communication, where we are used to the turn-taking of

---

<sup>16</sup> Apart from my italicised deictics, the text follows that of the 1600 first edition of *Essayes*. By Sir William Corne-waleys the younger, Knight. *Of Alehouses* is no. 22 in this collection.

conversation between visible participants. It is the condition of writing that turns relativity into opacity. *Wish you were here*, for instance, can be written on postcards from all over the world and only the picture on the front of each will enable the recipient to give the *here* a geographical attachment. A sentence that is purely deictic, such as *come here soon*, may be said to express relationship without reference; it is specific in the set of spatio-temporal relations it proposes but opaque concerning the entities and identities which occupy the relational points. Hence the potential problems of construal. Compare the deictic exchange from *Hamlet* in (2) with another famous deictic utterance in the same play, Polonius's *Take this from this, if this be otherwise* (*Hamlet* 2.ii.156). In context, the third *this* in the sequence refers fairly obviously to 'the current state of affairs' (or Polonius's diagnosis of them), but what does he mean by *take this from this*? Like (2), it encodes a stage direction: the actor is clearly invited to point at two entities. But what entities? Whereas in (2) the demonstratives were textually associated with a specified prop (the skull), the implied stage direction for Polonius is purely deictic, allowing a variety of possible realisations (Elam 2001: 181).

In this example, the information deficit seems less a deliberate ambiguity on Shakespeare's part than an oversight, the result of thinking as a dramatist, with the actor's body and gestures solidly present to his mind's eye. The actor will, in any case, resolve the question in performance, so there will be no ambiguity for the audience. The case is very different for non-dramatic texts. In drama, as in oral literature, the *Here* and *Now* are automatically shared by a text's speaker and audience. In literature written for reading, *Here* and *Now* are notably *not* shared; like *There* and *Then*, they have to be established through the words of the text. This is exactly the task that Cornwallis conscientiously undertakes in (5). Not so Wyatt in an earlier experiment with deixis, the rondeau printed as (6) below. This poem employs a traditional form (the riddle) and takes a traditional topic (it entertains the possibility of literally losing one's heart to a lover). What is new – as far as I know – is the extent to which both form and topic are made to hang on the opposition between the deictic locating terms *there* and *here* (introduced as the first rhyme words) and on their qualities of relativity and opacity.

- (6) Helpe me to seke for I lost it *ther*  
 and if that ye have founde it ye that be *here*  
 and seke to convaye it secretly  
 handell it softe & trete it tenderly  
 or els it will plain and then appere  
 but rather restore it mannerly  
 syns that I do aske it thus honestly  
 for to lese it it sitteth me to neere  
     Helpe me to seke  
  
 Alas and is there no remedy  
 but have I thus lost it wilfully  
 I wis it was a thing all to dere  
 to be bestowed and wist not where  
 it was myn hert I pray you hertely  
     Helpe me to seke.<sup>17</sup>

The first line sets up the riddle – what is *it*? The dénouement solves the mystery by supplying a referent (*it was myn hert*) and in doing so turns the previously neutral ‘help me to seek’ into a plea for reciprocity. This is reinforced by wordplay: the final *hertely* – already foregrounded by its echo of *hert* – could be attached either to the preceding *pray* (pray heartily) or to the following *helpe* (heartily help) and by extension either to *I* or to *you*, an ambiguity which acts as a figure for the mutual ownership of ‘my heart’ while teasing us about the degree of seriousness with which its ‘loss’ is to be regarded. But if readers are to solve the riddle before being given the answer, they need to posit referents for the *there* and *here* of the opening two lines. One plausible interpretation is that they represent something like the Latin *istic* and *hic* – *there/istic* is ‘where you are’ and *here/hic* is ‘where I am,’ so that the riddle hinges on the paradox of a speaker who categorises ‘you’ as distinct and distant ‘there’ yet simultaneously as an occupant of his own ‘here’ (which could be construed as either ‘in this room’ or ‘in my heart’). At the end of the poem, this paradox is transferred to the *You*, who is invited to seek something which is actually inside herself, her own heart, which by the logic of the paradox, is also his. The identity of *there* and *here* thus matches the mutuality of *hertely*: opening and closing wordplay coincide, both attacking the notion that the lovers exist as separable beings who occupy separate places.

---

<sup>17</sup> BL Egerton 2711 fol.15r (Helen Baron’s transcription).

Deictically, the most interesting feature of this mysterious little poem is that its status as riddle *depends* on the referents for both *there* and *here* being withheld, a withholding which is in turn dependent on the medium of writing, since a gesture would dissolve the mystery immediately and a gesture (of hand or eye) would be the automatic accompaniment to the speaking of *there* and *here*.<sup>18</sup> Once the message is written and the gesture is removed behind the page, deictic forms become dangerously – or interestingly – opaque. So in (6), apart from the interpretation I have proposed, there is also the possibility that *there* refers to some place outside the domain currently occupied by *I* and *you* (Latin *illic* as opposed to both *hic* and *istic*), but known to both of them (for instance, ‘there in the garden where we plighted our troth’). Equally, there’s the possibility that *you* refers not to a singular addressee but to a general audience and that the scenario of the poem is one in which the speaker is appealing for public pressure to be brought to bear on his defecting lover.<sup>19</sup> I am not here concerned to argue for one reading over another. My point is rather that, as in the case of Polonius’s speech, provided that the spatial relationships dictated by the deictic oppositions are preserved, the reader (like the actor) is free to construct any possible world with which they are consistent.

Wyatt’s experiments with deixis raise the same questions as his experiments with metre. As an anonymous *TLS* reviewer once put it: “the mystery of Wyatt is simply whether he knew what he was doing or whether he did not” (Muir 1963: xlvi). In the metrical case, early criticism thought not, effectively endorsing Tottel’s decision to regularise Wyatt’s practice when transferring his poems from manuscript to print in *Songes and Sonettes* of 1557; more recent criticism, following Stevens (1979), has provided more generous explanations, centring on Wyatt’s conscious negotiation between outgoing (accentual) and incoming (syllabo-tonic) systems of stress. As far as I know, no equivalent exploration has been undertaken of his deictic practice and the effect on it of his position at the watershed between oral and literate genres or manuscript and print cultures. For the moment, then, it remains an open question whether

---

<sup>18</sup> Describing experiments to test children’s acquisition of deictic terms, Tanz notes the considerable difficulties of suppressing the experimenter’s instinctive gestures by hand or eye movements while producing deictic messages. (Tanz 1980: 84)

<sup>19</sup> Both are possible in Wyatt’s usage, where *you/ye* can have either singular or plural reference while a single addressee can be either *you* or *thou* (the distributional rationale would repay study, but none, to my knowledge, has yet been attempted).

in (6) he is the exploiter or the victim of the hiddenness of printed *Here*. But the fact that (6) occurs only in the Egerton manuscript and, unlike poems appearing alongside it, was not copied into other collections may suggest that for many sixteenth-century readers the pleasures of this text were outweighed by its difficulties.

### 5. Putting *You* in the picture

Shifting genre from essay to lyric has required a revision of the verbal image of self from which I began. The configuration *I-Here-Now* seemed sufficient to cue the printed voice effect in (4) and (5), but in the period's dramatic lyrics a fourth term is typically added. A *You* is posited as sharing the *I*'s spatio-temporal location. In this, the language of lyric resembles, arguably borrows from, the language of drama itself. As Elam (1980: 139) points out "drama consists first and foremost precisely in this, an I addressing a you here and now"; and in case that seems a truism, he reminds us of Honzl's claim that the deictic configuration *I-You-Here-Now* is not a universal but *became* important as a compositional device for Greek dramatists and was a crucial innovation in the development of Greek tragedy, away from recitation/narrative towards dialogue/action (Honzl 1976: 118-27).<sup>20</sup> The equivalent innovation for the renaissance dramatic lyric was to bring *You* onstage as someone other than the text's primary reader/audience. As a transitional text, (6), as we have seen, is ambiguous (or uncertain) in this respect.

*You* has always been a somewhat problematic item for the traditional spatio-temporal account of deixis, since it is not clear where it belongs on the proximal-distal axis. The neatest solution would be to align *You* with *There* and *Then* as some expositors have done (for example, Traugott & Pratt 1980: 275), but this is not wholly satisfactory and others have classed it instead as a proximal deictic (for example, Green 1992: 126). Some languages appear to encode a tripartite division of space – as with Latin *hic, istic, illic* – in which 'where *You* is' forms a separate centre of reference, distinct both from *Here* ('where *I* is') and *There* ('where *I* is not'). In English, though, *You* remains spatially ambiguous, an ambiguity most

---

<sup>20</sup> In the terms I have been using here, the configuration *I-You-Here-Now* of drama displaced the *They-There-Then* of traditional narrative. Adamson (2001b) charts the development of narrative styles in terms of analogous shifts in deictic configuration, from (for example) the *I-Was-Now* of seventeenth-century conversion narrative to the *He/She-Was-Now* of nineteenth-century novel.

obviously manifested in the regulation of the deictic verb *come*. Typically *come*, like *hither*, describes movement towards 'the place where *I* is'; but it can also be used of movement towards 'the place where *You* is,' even when this involves movement *away* from *I*. Hence (7a) is a normal sequence, while (7b) is only dubiously acceptable:

- (7a) I'll send him tomorrow. He'll come to see you at ten.  
 (7b) ?I'll send him tomorrow. He'll go to see you at ten.

But it may not be necessary to assign *You* a place in the proximal-distal plan. Arguably, the *I-You* relationship is only incidentally spatial; primarily it is dialogical. *You* relates to *I*'s role as locutionary agent rather than spatio-temporal point. In the dramatic lyric, therefore, *You* and the *You*-centered forms are particularly important in establishing *I* as an inhabitant of *social* space. By the *You*-centred forms, I mean primarily imperatives and interrogatives, both of which prompt us to infer an *I-You* dialogue, even when the presence of an *I* or a *You* has not been explicitly stated. The power of these forms in creating the printed voice effect is particularly evident in the poetry of Donne, which, for many readers, epitomises renaissance self-representation.

It has long been a critical commonplace to characterise and praise Donne's poems in terms of their 'conversational tone' and 'dramatic openings.' Commentators trying to explain these effects in terms of the language of the poetry traditionally attributed them to the presence of colloquialisms (such as *for Gods sake* or *busy old fool*) and the use of violent vocabulary (such as *batter my heart* or *spit in my face*). But while it is true that Donne's language does manifest these features, their presence does not adequately account for the effects described, since the same illusion of voice can be achieved by diction that is neither colloquial, as in 'is she not passing fair?' nor markedly violent, as in 'do have some of this banana!' or 'may we come in?' What these examples have in common with each other and with a Donne poem is their deployment of deictic forms. And Leech's suggestion (1969: 191-193) that deixis is the crucially functional feature in the famous Donne effects is supported by a distributional study of his language; for whereas violent and colloquial vocabulary can and does occur at any point in a poem, the deictic elements are more unevenly distributed, often with a marked concentration in the opening lines or stanza. It is, perhaps above all,

Donne's practice of opening with an interrogative or imperative form coupled with a supporting spatial deictic that has given generations of readers so immediate and strong an impression of peeping into or eavesdropping on "definite situations in individual lives" (Redpath 1967: xxxiii). *The Flea* is typical:

- (8) Marke but this flea, and marke in this,  
 How little that which thou deny'st me is;  
 It suck'd me first, and now sucks thee,  
 And in this flea, our two bloods mingled bee;  
 Thou know'st that this cannot be said  
 A sinne, nor shame nor losse of maidenhead,  
 Yet this enjoys before it wooe,  
 And pamper'd swells with one blood made of two,  
 And this, alas, is more then wee would doe.  
 Oh stay, three lives in one flea spare,  
 Where wee almost, yea more then maryed are.  
 This flea is you and I, and this  
 Our mariage bed, and mariage temple is;  
 Though parents grudge, and you, w'are met,  
 And cloysterd in these living walls of Jet.  
 Though use make you apt to kill mee,  
 Let not to that, selfe murder added bee,  
 And sacrilege, three sinnes in killing three.  
 Cruell and sodaine, hast thou since  
 Purpled thy naile, in blood of innocence?  
 Wherein could this flea guilty bee,  
 Except in that drop which it suckt from thee?  
 Yet thou triumph'st, and saist that thou  
 Find'st not thy selfe, nor mee the weaker now;  
 'Tis true, then learne how false, feares bee;  
 Just so much honor, when thou yeeldst to mee,  
 Will wast, as this flea's death tooke life from thee.<sup>21</sup>

This poem begins with a heavy concentration of deictics, especially in the first line, where there are two deictic forms – imperative *mark!* and demonstrative *this* – and both are repeated. Both are also dual in function, acting first to establish by inference the existence of the *I*, even before its formal entrance as *me* in line 2, and second to relate that *I* to a particular dialogical and spatial context: the imperative prompts us to infer the presence of an

---

<sup>21</sup> Text from Donne, *Poems*, 1633: 230-231.

addressee while the demonstrative introduces a particle of the physical environment. In fact, the conjunction of the imperative with a proximal demonstrative (*this flea* rather than *that flea*) goes a long way towards establishing the physical contiguity of all three protagonists. The imperative in addition sets the tone of the implied dialogue as that of a power relation in which the speaker is, or would be, dominant.

*Mark but this flea* should also be contrasted with *mark but this poem*. That is to say, as soon as an addressee is acknowledged to exist, we are made aware that it is someone other than us, the readers. By contrast, Ben Jonson's opening *Have you seene but a bright Lillie grow?* seems to address its readers directly, inviting us to become a participant in the poem's speech act.<sup>22</sup> This is a question that any reader can, after all, answer, whereas Donne's imperative is one that no reader can obey. The *You* of Jonson's poem remains outside the text, Donne's *You* is firmly located in that hidden *Here* which the text prompts us to co-create.

*The Flea* is a well-known and much discussed poem.<sup>23</sup> My present aim is not to offer yet another exegesis but simply to highlight the conscious experimentalism in its use of deictic terms. Like many of his contemporaries, Donne not only exploits the illusionist force of deictics, but simultaneously shows his awareness of the properties of his tools. In (8) the ambiguities of temporal *now*, spatial *this* and dialogical *you* are all pressed into service.

The simplest case is *now*. It occurs in both first and last stanzas, but of course with different translations into chronological time (in stanza one, the flea *now sucks thee*, by stanza three it is dead). In this respect, the poem imitates drama, where a *now* in Act 1 almost inevitably refers to a distinct phase of time and action from a *now* in Act 5. One of Donne's finest technical achievements is to convey the transition between disparate *Nows* without the aid of either a visible embodied action or a direct narrative. Instead, the action is posited as taking place between the stanzas and the reader is cued to reconstruct the plot from the sequence of stanza-initial imperative or interrogative forms: *oh stay, three lives in one flea spare* (i.e. the lover responds to the argument of stanza 1 by trying to kill

---

<sup>22</sup> Often printed as the final stanza of *Her Triumph*, Jonson's *Have you seen...* appears in some manuscripts as a separate poem, and in one as the first stanza of another poem. For details, see Herford & Simpson (1947: 134-5).

<sup>23</sup> For another linguistically-based discussion, see Bradford (1993: 40-45).

the flea, but is restrained); *hast thou since/ purpled thy nail?* (infer: she has killed it anyway).

Fish (1972) has drawn attention to Donne's tendency to play off against each other two distinct senses of *this*: the gestural/physical demonstrative (as in Polonius's 'take *this* from *this*') and the – historically secondary – abstract/textual anaphor (as in 'I've heard *this* before'). In *The Flea*, the oscillation between the two is recruited as part of the argument. *This* occurs ten times in the poem, six times in the first stanza alone. Three of these six occurrences point unequivocally to the posited empirical reality: *this flea* (l.1), *this flea* (l.4) *this [flea] enjoyes* (l.7); two (l.5, l.9) are readily analysed as textual pointers, each recapitulating in summary form the statement of the preceding line; one – the last word of the first line – is arguably ambiguous: does it mean 'mark in the argument that follows'? or 'mark in the generalisation that the flea represents'? Or is it simply an elliptical repetition of *this flea*? The reader has to pause over this question (if only because it affects the intonation pattern with which the phrase *mark in this* is read) and the uncertainty, once admitted, permeates the whole stanza. In the ensuing plethora of *thises*, concrete and abstract referents are easily confused, until finally there seems to be no instance of *this* that could not be replaced with *this flea*. The flea can't be 'called a sin,' what 'we would do' (if we dared) is less than a flea. Whatever reading is decided upon for each instance – and readers display a wide variety of decisions and indecisions –, the slight check while the decision is made itself plays into the speaker's overall polemical strategy, to replace the large fearsome abstractions invoked by the lover – *sin, shame, honor* – with a concrete particular, whose small size renders her fears ridiculous. After the first stanza, the issue is apparently decided: the four remaining instances of *this* are unambiguously physical.

The second person pronoun, as I have said, is spatially ambiguous in that *You* may be located either *Here* or *There*. In (8), this optionality is central to the speaker's enterprise, which is to persuade the addressee to move from her modest distance into a sexually available proximity. The huge proliferation of *this* in the poem is in itself part of the suasive rhetoric, since its effect is constantly to associate the *You* with the spatial position of the *I*. But Donne plays with the proximal-distal ambiguity of *You* in another way, too, by distinguishing between the *thou* of stanzas 1 and 3 and the *you* of stanza 2. At the period when the poem was written, *thou* and *you* as singular address forms functioned, at least residually, as

markers of a proximal-distal opposition in social space, but the rationale of such an alternation here is not immediately obvious (unless we infer a more estranged and reproachful tone in stanza 2).<sup>24</sup> It is possible, however, that another kind of distinction is in play: the *thou* stanzas are directly focussed on the speech situation and its development (these are the stanzas in which *now* also occurs, registering the passage of time during the speech event). By contrast, the middle stanza focusses more on the background to the present situation; its concern is with habitual rather than current events and with the factors that have kept the lovers thus far apart (*parents grudge; use make you apt to kill me*). What this pattern suggests is that Donne may be groping for a distinction, not formally encoded in English, between what may be called the vocative-*You* and the referential-*You*, reserving *thou* for the addressee in the role of dialogical partner and using *you* as a simple identifying label (equivalent to a name). If this surmise is correct, then the alternation of *thou* and *you* in this poem is a rhetorical strategy that matches the attempt to replace abstract *this* with physical *this*; that is, the conversion of the distal or merely referential *you* into an intimate *thou* furthers the enterprise of inducing a physical intimacy in defiance of the lover's reluctance. Her recognition of their paradoxical oneness in *this* flea will be accompanied and confirmed by her acceptance of the role of the speaker's *thou*. The poem ends (proleptically?) on the *me/thee* rhyme that has been available but avoided in previous stanzas.

## 6. Conclusion

What we find in these renaissance experiments in self construction is an exploitation of the illusionist capacities of the deictic third dimension coupled with an exploration of its concomitant problems of ambiguity and opacity of reference. The general aim seems to be to represent a localised *I* (neither panchronic nor panoramic) and an *I* whose *Here* and *Now* are distinct from and hidden from the *Here* and *Now* of its readers. On the whole, the hiddenness of *Here* is accepted as a challenge. The reader is invited to undertake an act of reconstruction and is given sufficient cues to recognise/project a speaker in a spatio-temporal speech setting which can be mapped on to a coherent possible world. The most radical of my texts in this

---

<sup>24</sup> There is a substantial scholarly literature on pronouns of address. The topic is covered briefly by Adamson (2001a: 226-231), extensively by Wales (1996: 50-84).

respect is the earliest, Wyatt's rondeau (6), which has something in common with his contemporaries' experiments in anamorphic perspective, where the depicted object is visually unconstructable until you know (and adopt) the point of view from which it was constructed.<sup>25</sup> In (8), it may seem that the fixed point of I-witness is violated, in that the poem's two instances of *now* have divergent time references, but they are not mutually exclusive and the overall effect is to situate the implied dialogue within an implied narrative. Similarly, in the seventeenth-century genre of conversion-narrative, which I have not discussed here because I have dealt with it extensively elsewhere, Bunyan and others take the seemingly paradoxical deictic configuration *I-Was-Now* and naturalise it as a verbal image of memory, a cue for readers to project a self-remembering-self (Adamson 1994, 2001b). This is not to say that more tricky cases can't be found. Donne's *The Paradox* and Herbert's *The Bag*, for instance, both take advantage of the condition of textuality – particularly the fact that readers can't see who is saying "I" – to create unresolvable conundrums about their speaker's identity. But as Donne's title indicates, these are creative deviations from an accepted norm, which, as in renaissance experiments in pictorial perspective, centres on the task of testing or honing the instruments of illusionism.

In modernist writing, by contrast, the enterprise of illusionism itself comes under attack. Hence it is the obstacles to the reconstruction of a coherent self that are emphasised, in same way as modernist painting obstructs the reconstruction of a fixed point perspective. Deictic opacity becomes a metaphor for a more general sense of epistemological confusion or, in more extreme cases, the coherence of the deictic centre is put into question. The modern lyric voice is heard in the kind of writing that continually provokes readers into the attempt to identify a precise localised viewpoint, but denies them the information necessary for success. The *I* that is 'here now' is displaced by an *I* that may be, as Eliot puts it in *Four Quartets*, "here/ or there or elsewhere." It is this deconstructed self that has attracted most interest among those writing on deixis in

---

<sup>25</sup> The most famous example is Holbein's *The Ambassadors*; see also the anamorphic portrait of Edward VI by an unknown artist (National Portrait Gallery). Shakespeare defines anamorphism in *Richard II*, 2.ii.18-20 as: "perspectives, which rightly gaz'd upon/ Show nothing but confusion; ey'd awry/ Distinguish form."

literature.<sup>26</sup> What I have attempted to show in this paper is that the renaissance art of self construction is no less remarkable, although, as in the case of illusionist painting, its technical achievements have been veiled from us by its very success.

#### References

- Adamson, S. 1994. "From Empathetic Deixis to Empathetic Narrative: Stylisation and (De-)subjectivisation as Processes of Language Change." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92.1: 55-88. [reprinted, with minor changes, in *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation*. Eds. S. Wright and D. Stein, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 195-224.]
- Adamson, S. 1995. "Empathetic Narrative – a Literary and Linguistic Problem." Eds. W. Ayres-Bennett and P. O'Donovan. *Syntax and the Literary System*. Cambridge: Cambridge French Colloquia. 17-42.
- Adamson, S. 1998. "The Literary Language." Ed. S. Romaine. *The Cambridge History of the English Language, 4, 1776-the present day*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 589-692.
- Adamson, S. 1999. "The Literary Language." Ed. R. Lass. *The Cambridge History of the English Language, 3, 1476-1776*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 539-653.
- Adamson, S. 2001a. "Understanding Shakespeare's Grammar: Studies in Small Words." Eds. Adamson et al. 210-236.
- Adamson, S. 2001b. "The Rise and Fall of Empathetic Narrative: A Historical Perspective on Perspective." Eds. W. van Peer and S. Chatman. *New Perspectives on Narrative Perspective*. New York: SUNY Press. 83-99.
- Adamson, S., L. Hunter, L. Magnusson, A. Thompson and K. Wales eds. 2001. *Reading Shakespeare's Dramatic Language: A Guide*. London: Arden Shakespeare.
- Banfield, A. 1982. *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bradford, R. 1993. *A Linguistic History of English Poetry*. London: Routledge.
- Bühler, K. 1934. *Sprachtheorie*. Jena: Fischer.
- Cave, T. 1999. *Pré-histoires I: textes troublés au seuil de la modernité*. Geneva: Droz.
- Clark, K. 1956 (1949). *Landscape into Art*. London: Harmondsworth.
- Culler, J. 1975. *Structuralist Poetics*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Easthope, A. 1983. *Poetry as Discourse*. London: Methuen.
- Edgerton, S.Y. 1976. *The Renaissance Rediscovery of Linear Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Elam, K. 1980. *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. London: Methuen.
- Elam, K. 2001. "Language and the Body." Eds. Adamson et al. 173-187.

---

<sup>26</sup> For my own account of the post-romantic phases of self-representation, see Adamson (1998: 661-679).

- Fillmore, C.J. 1973. "May we come in?" *Semiotica* 9: 98-115.
- Fillmore, C.J. 1997 (1971). *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Fish, S. 1972. *Self-consuming Artefacts: The Experience of Seventeenth-century Literature*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gombrich, E.H. 1960. *Art and Illusion*. London: Phaidon Press.
- Gombrich, E.H. 1963. *Meditations on a Hobby Horse*. London: Phaidon Press.
- Gombrich, E.H. 1966. *Norm and Form*. London: Phaidon Press.
- Gombrich, E.H. 1982. *The Image and the Eye*. Oxford: Phaidon Press.
- Gray, F. 1999. "The Essay as Criticism." Ed. Norton. 271-277.
- Green, K. 1992. "Deixis and the Poetic Persona." *Language and Literature* 1/2: 121-134
- Green, K. ed. 1995. *New Essays in Deixis: Discourse, Narrative, Literature*. Amsterdam-Atlanta GA: Rodopi
- Greenblatt, S. 1980. *Renaissance Self-fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Greene, R. 1999. "The Lyric." Ed. Norton. 216-228.
- Griffiths, E. 1988. *The Printed Voice of Victorian Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hanson, E. 1998. *Discovering the Subject in Renaissance England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Herford, C.H. and E. Simpson eds. 1947. *The Works of Ben Jonson, 8: The Poems & The Prose Works*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Honzl, J. 1976 (1943). "The Hierarchy of Dramatic Devices." Ed. L. Matejka and I.R. Titunik. *Semiotics of Art: Prague School Contributions*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. 118-127.
- Ittelson, W.H. 1952. *The Ames Demonstrations in Perception*. Ithaca: Princeton University Press.
- Jones, P. 1995. "Philosophical and Theoretical Issues in the Study of Deixis: A Critique of the Standard Account." Ed. Green. 27-48.
- Leech, G.N. 1969. *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muir, K. ed. 1963 [1949]. *Collected Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Norton, G.P. ed. 1999. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, 3: The Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Panofsky, E. 1940. *The Codex Huygens and Leonardo da Vinci's Art Theory* (Studies of the Warburg Institute, XIII). London.
- Panofsky, E. 1960. *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksells.
- Pirenne, M.H. 1952. "The Scientific Basis for Leonardo's Theory of Perspective." *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 111/10: 169-185.
- Redpath, T. ed. 1967 (1956). *The Songs and Sonets of John Donne*. London: Methuen and Co.

- Sampson, G. 1941. *The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schegloff, E.A. 1972. "Notes on a Conversational Practice: Formulating Place." Ed. P. Giglioli. *Language and Social Context*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 95-135.
- Schegloff, E.A. 1979. "Identification and Recognition in Telephone Conversation Openings." Ed. G. Psathas. *Everyday Language*. New York: Irvington. 23-78.
- Seigel, J. 2005. *The Idea of the Self: Thought and Experience in Western Europe since the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sommer, R. 1969. *Personal Space: The Behavioural Basis of Design*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Spearing, A.C. 1985. *Medieval to Renaissance in English Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Speirs, J. 1961 (1954). "A Survey of Medieval Verse." Ed. B. Ford. *A Guide to English Literature, 1: The Age of Chaucer*. London: London: Cassell. 7-57.
- Stevens, J. 1979. *Music and Poetry in the Early Tudor Court*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tanz, C. 1980. *Studies in the Acquisition of Deictic Terms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, C. 1989. *Sources of the Self: The Making of Modern Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott, E.C. and M.L. Pratt. 1980. *Linguistics for Students of Literature*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Villey, P. 1908. *Les Sources et L'Évolution des 'Essais' de Montaigne*. Paris: Hachette.
- Wales, K. 1996. *Personal Pronouns in Present-day English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---

*Author's address:*

School of English · University of Sheffield · Sir William Empson House · Shearwood Road · Sheffield S10 2TD  
s.adamson@sheffield.ac.uk

## Helen of Troy: representing absolute beauty in language

Laurie MAGUIRE  
*University of Oxford*

### ABSTRACT

Helen of Troy is famous for two things: her abduction from Sparta to Troy by the Trojan prince, Paris, and her beauty. In this article I consider the interest taken in these two topics by Renaissance writers. 1) 'Rape' was a term which was being redefined in the 1590s when Helen's story received several innovative retellings and reinterpretations; I argue that changes in rape law gave this old mythological story of abduction a newly urgent topicality. 2) As the most beautiful woman in the world Helen of Troy is an absolute – the paradigm, the standard of beauty. Representing her in language is therefore difficult, if not impossible, since language is, by definition, plural and relative. The Renaissance were aware of this conflict. I consider the responses of narrative and dramatic representation to the challenge which Helen's beauty presented.

KEYWORDS: rape, beauty, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Dr Faustus*, Helen of Troy

Beauty, says the eponymous protagonist in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, is the 'mother to the Muses' (5.1.144), a statement borne out by every anthology of English verse. This apparently uncontroversial observation proves problematic, however, as we see in *Tamburlaine*'s anaphoric conditional conclusion. 'If all the pens that ever poets held', inspired by beauty; 'if all the quintessence' poets try to turn into poetry; if these resulted in just one poem about beauty – yet, *Tamburlaine* concludes ruefully, beauty would remain something 'which into words no virtue can digest' (5.1.173). Poetry cannot represent beauty; beauty cannot be contained in language.

In this essay I want to consider the difficulty literature (both narrative and dramatic) has in representing the beauty of Helen of Troy.

### 1. Representing beauty

Helen of Troy enters Laurence Sterne's novel *Tristram Shandy* by association: the Widow Wadman is a sexually predatory female character who is associated with Helen of Troy from early in the novel (Telotte 1989: 121). When he comes to describe the beautiful widow, Sterne gives us a blank page, and enjoins the reader:

Call for pen and ink – here's paper ready to your hand. – Sit down, Sir, paint her to your own mind – as like your mistress as you can – as unlike your wife as your conscience will let you – (Sterne 1760, VI, 450-51)

Then, after the blank page, he rhapsodises: 'Was ever anything in Nature so sweet! – so exquisite.'

Sterne is not just behaving in typically Shandean, meta-textual fashion; he is continuing a tradition that begins with Homer, a refusal to describe Helen of Troy. What Homer gives us are impressions and reactions. In Book 3 of *The Iliad* the seven old men, elders of the people, sit by the Skaian gates, opining that Helen should be returned to Greece. Their complaints are softened however when they see her: 'Surely there is no blame on Trojans and strong-greaved Achaians if for long time they suffer hardship for a woman like this' (Homer 1951: 104).

This tradition of presenting beautiful women in terms of their effect on others is surprisingly constant in literature. In Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* Hero affects not just men – who think on her and straightway die – but gods (Apollo sees her hair and offers her his throne as a dowry, and Cupid becomes blind by looking in her face) and the world of nature: her breath is so beautiful that bees mistake it for honey, the winds delight in playing upon her hands because they can't keep away from her beauty, and Nature herself weeps because Hero has bankrupted her of beauty: the reason half the world is black is because Hero received their allotted fairness. (Leander, by contrast, is presented in terms of his physical beauty: his neck surpassed 'The white of Pelops' shoulder. I could tell ye / How smooth his breast was and how white his belly'.<sup>1</sup>) In Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* Philargus suspects his wife of infidelity, and repeatedly threatens her with death: by drowning, by burning, by

---

<sup>1</sup> On the association of Hero with her clothes, and others' reactions to her, see Donno (1987); for a continuation of the tradition of representing Helen by reaction, see Walcott *Omeros* (1990).

being dragged naked through thorn bushes. But when he catches sight of her breast ('a most heavenly breast') he stands stock-still in admiration and offers his wife a two-day reprieve to confess (Wroth 1995, Book 1, 18). Aristophanes gives a similar example of male reaction to beauty in *Lysistrata*. After the fall of Troy Menelaus intends to kill Helen. But 'one glimpse' of her breasts' was enough to make him change his mind (Aristophanes 1985: 185). Hecuba anticipates this reaction in *The Trojan Women*. She tries to dissuade Menelaus from returning to Sparta in the same ship as Helen because she knows his thoughts of vengeance will evaporate when he gazes on Helen's beauty.

Marked changes in mortals' reactions and attitudes are the signs in Homer of another kind of beauty: divinity. Characters know when a god has been with them (or someone else) because of the change in them: 'He felt the change and was overcome with awe for he realised a god had been with him'; 'It is obvious that the gods are teaching you this bold and haughty way of speaking'; (*Odyssey* Book I). What is true of humans and gods is true of other sites of beauty too: effect is more illustrative than description. Sidney's *Arcadia* tells us: 'we can better consider the sun's beauty by marking how he gilds these waters and mountains' (63).<sup>2</sup> Displacement or reaction is more reliable than representation because it does not disappoint.

A sixteenth-century chronicler anticipated Sterne in using blank space to stand in for the unrepresentable. In the manuscript *Vita Henrici VII* from his *Historia Regis Henrici Septimi* (c.1500-1502) Bernard Andreas confesses himself unable to represent the epic battle of Bosworth, and gives us one-and-a-half blank pages instead: 'inalbo relinquo' (32). Andreas was blind, possibly from infancy, and often draws attention to his inability to describe fully events which he had not seen; but nowhere else does he offer a paragraph of apology ('Auctoris excusatio') and leave blank pages. A parallel episode of non-representability in art history occurs with the following complaint about artists: 'not able to make their pictures beautiful, they make them rich – as Apelles said to one of his students who had made a picture of Helen adorned with much gold' (Williams 203). Virginia Woolf followed this tradition of non-representation in *Orlando* when she presented the wittiest man of the early 1700s, Alexander Pope.

---

<sup>2</sup> This tradition is Platonic in origin: beauty is the reflected splendour of the divine countenance (see Rogers 1988: 67, citing Ficino's commentary on Plato's *Symposium*).

... the little gentleman said.

He said next,

He said finally.

Here, it cannot be denied, was true wit, true wisdom, true profundity. The company was thrown into complete disarray. One such saying was bad enough; but three, one after another, on the same evening! No society could survive it.

'Mr Pope', said old Lady R, ... You are pleased to be witty.

(Woolf 1970: 142)

As with extremes of beauty in literature, so with wit or epic: they defy representation in narrative.

Faced with extremes, literature's recurrent tactic is the blank space of non-representation. Andreas, Sterne and Woolf offer this literally but many texts approach it by calling attention to absence. In *Historia Destructionis Troiae* (1287) Guido delle Colonne says 'it would be useless effort to explain her appearance in particular details since she surpassed ... the beauty of all other women' (Meek 86). The author of the *Laud Troy* book (c.1400) also gives up on narrating Polyxena's beauty: 'There is no man that is on lyue/ Hir fairnesse that might discryue' (lines 12,007-08, Wülfing 1902: 354). What is consistent in descriptions of Helen of Troy is lack of description, absence of specifics. Homer describes Helen as having 'the face of immortal goddesses'; she wears 'shimmering garments'; she has glistening or shining hair. In Virgil she wears silver robes and has hyacinthine curls. That is as detailed as we get, and the lack of specificity makes sense: if Helen is indisputably the most beautiful woman in the world, as soon as you provide details you make her beauty disputable.

In Shakespeare, characters, in traditional literary fashion, abandon the attempt to describe exceptional beauty. Cassio says Desdemona is 'a maid/ That paragons description and wild fame;/ One that excels the quirks of blazoning pens,/ And in th'essential vesture of creation/ Does tire the ingener' (2.1.61-5). In *Antony and Cleopatra* Enobarbus is able to describe everything around Cleopatra, and influenced by her, in sumptuous and erotic detail. The winds which fan her are lovesick; the water on which she floats is amorous; but for the fact that nature abhors a vacuum the air would have gone to gaze on Cleopatra. But Enobarbus is unable to describe Cleopatra's actual person: 'For her own person,/ It beggared all description' (2.2.197-8). Shakespeare is being ingenuous, of course.

For Homer, as for Sterne, not to describe is not to represent. But drama cannot *not* represent. Drama is representation. And what cannot be described –Desdemona, Cleopatra, Helen – still has to be represented.

Of the several plays that feature a Helen character, I want to mention four that have a documentable stage tradition: Euripides' *The Trojan Women*, Marlowe's *Dr Faustus*, Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*, and Jean Giraudoux's *The Trojan War Will Not Take Place* (written in 1935 but not produced in London or New York until 1955 when it appeared under the title *Tiger at the Gates*). Kenneth Tynan reviewed the first London production of *Tiger at the Gates* in 1955: Diane Cilento [Helen of Troy] was 'fetchingly got up in what I can best describe as a Freudian slip' (1970: 156). Helen's sexuality was also to the fore in a production of *The Trojan Women* at the National Theatre in 1995, directed by Annie Castledine; in this modern-dress production Helen was a Marilyn Monroe look-alike who made her first entrance descending a ladder from the Trojan battlements where the stage's hot air system recreated the famous New York subway-grating pose.

Three RSC productions of *Troilus and Cressida* provide striking images. Lindsay Duncan's Helen of Troy, in 1985, with her alabaster skin and regal deportment, looked every inch a serene princess, in contrast to the anguished vulnerability of Juliet Stevenson's more impulsively kinetic Cressida; in 1968, by contrast, Helen and Cressida were visually indistinguishable blondes, an important casting decision which underlined the play's debate about value as subjective and relative. In 1990 Sally Dexter's voluptuous Helen entered borne aloft on an enormous cushion, wrapped in shining gold fabric, reminding us of her reification as a valuable 'prize'.

Reviews of twentieth-century productions of *Dr Faustus* rarely mention Helen of Troy, probably because productions infrequently attempt verisimilitude. Helen of Troy is recognizably a devil in disguise, like the whore-wife of Act 1, and often the devil who represented the wife at the beginning represents Helen of Troy at the end. At the other extreme is the classical beauty of Jennifer Coverdale (1946): she merits a photograph in the Shakespeare Centre archives (Stratford on Avon) but still no mention in reviews.

The sole Helen to attract attention was the 24-year-old Maggie Wright in 1968, but she was singled out, not for her acting, or for her part in Faustus' damnation, but for her costume: she didn't wear one. Stratford's first naked actress had a long blonde ponytail, a

tiara, and a Max Factor fake tan. Not only was this Helen mentioned in all the reviews but she was a front-page news item in most national and local papers. The director, Clifford Williams, explained that nudity 'was the best way to portray an image of physical beauty' (quoted in anonymous review in *Reading Evening Post* 28 June 1968).<sup>4</sup> If language is the dress of thought, a naked Helen is a Helen who can't be described.<sup>5</sup>

## 2. Abducting Helen

Narratives of Helen of Troy talk about 'the rape of Helen,' but what does rape mean in the early modern period? *1 Tamburlaine* illustrates the difficulties which that question poses. Zenocrate, engaged to the Prince of Arabia, is kidnapped by Tamburlaine, who unambiguously seeks her to 'grace his bed' (1.2.36). Agydas later refers to Zenocrate's 'offensive rape by Tamburlaine' (3.2.6). Mary Beth Rose writes that Tamburlaine wins Zenocrate 'by kidnapping and raping her, a little noticed fact'. Her two verbs make it clear that she is using rape in the sense of sexual violation not abduction (which she distinguishes as 'kidnapping'). She underlines her point by repeating it immediately in a footnote: 'I have not yet encountered any discussion of the fact that Tamburlaine 'wins' Zenocrate by raping her' (Rose 1988: 106). But Agydas's use of the noun 'rape' is a variant of 'rapine' with the same meaning as in 1.2 where Zenocrate begs the marauding Tamburlaine 'not to enrich thy followers/ By lawless rapine from silly maid' (1.2.10). Both nouns come from the Latin *rapere*, to seize. It is inconvenient for us, although no doubt convenient for the early modern legal system, that rape could mean both abduction and sexual violation. At the end of the play Tamburlaine assures the on-stage audience that he has not violated Zenocrate's virginity: 'for all blot of foul in chastity,/ I record heaven, her heavenly self is clear' (5.1.486-7). By this stage, in fact, Zenocrate has fallen in love with her captor and the two prepare to wed. The action is still legally rape however, a category in which female consent (or lack of it) is irrelevant, for the crime is not against the woman's body but against the owner of the woman's body – her father or her fiancé, and his lack of agreement defines an act of

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Marston's 'The Metamorphosis of Pigmalion's Image,' lines 23-4: 'her nakedness, each beauteous shape contains./ All beautie in her nakednes remains.'

<sup>5</sup> On the European equation of nakedness with 'absence or deficiency of language' see Neill (2000: 411-12).

abduction or sexual violation as rape. (If this is what Rose has in mind, she does not make it clear.)

*Tamburlaine* distinguishes between rape (as sexual violation) and abduction, but other early modern texts, literary and legal, philosophical and theological, are as likely to conflate the terms as they are to clarify them; and this semantic obfuscation is paralleled conceptually by the overlapping stages in the spectrum from force to desire. Sir Philip Sidney's *Old Arcadia* initially seems clear: 'although he ravisht her not from herself, yet he ravished her from him that owed her, which was her father' (406). The first verb apparently refers to Pamela's body as an entity to be violated, the second to Pamela's legal status as a property to be stolen. Elsewhere, however, as Jocelyn Catty observes, the *Old Arcadia* offers five senses of ravishment 'which it distinguishes and conflates' (Catty 1999: 42): rape, attempted rape, illicit consensual sex, the violent effect of love, and emotional rapture. Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* is similarly complicated. Lust lives on 'ravin and on rape.' The nouns seem to designate separate not synonymous activities with the former denoting abduction, the latter sexual violence. But as in Sidney, the clarity is short-lived: the 'rape' of Hellenore by Paridell is defined as abduction or seduction (III. x. Argument.1; Catty 1999: 76). The first few pages of Heywood's 'Oenone and Paris' offer little specificity (see stanzas 4, 12, 16). Legal texts are no more consistent. T.E.'s *Laws Resolution of Women's Rights* (1632), a work frequently dependent on medieval legal authority, makes 'little if any distinction ... between seduction and rape; coercion operates within both' (Baines 1998: 76).

Christian ethics, dating back to Augustine, introduced a division between consent of the mind and consent of the body (the former being a sin) but this mind/body division was complicated by Galenic theory which held that a woman could not conceive unless she experienced orgasm; any rape resulting in pregnancy was ipso facto not a rape. In the *Old Arcadia* Cecropia argues 'Do you think Theseus should ever have gotten Antiope with sighing and crossing his arms? He ravished her ... But having ravished her, he got a child of her – and I say no more, but that, they say, is not gotten without consent of both sides' (Sidney 1987: 402).

The concept of consent was further problematic. If a woman yielded to threats or force, she technically consented. Busyrane's tapestry in *The Faerie Queene* 'depicts the rapes of women by gods in a way that blurs the issue of consent' (Catty 1999: 81). Angelo in *Measure for Measure* wants Isabella's agreement to her own violation.

The series of obstacles – doors, bolts – which obligingly ‘yield’ to Tarquin in Shakespeare’s *Rape of Lucrece* as he makes his symbolic journey from outside to inside, from Ardea to Rome, from guest bedroom to Lucrece’s chamber, not only enact rape but raise the troublingly ambiguous question of Lucrece’s consent (Fineman 1991: 165-221). This was an issue which had long occupied commentators. If Lucrece was innocent, why did she commit suicide? Hence the frequent conclusion that she enjoyed Tarquin’s violence. So morally ambiguous was Lucrece’s story that, like Helen’s, it became a topic for formal disputation (Donaldson 1982: 40).

Consent was thus a blurred issue in early modern England. With ambiguities and confusions of language and ideology it is little wonder that some writers were driven to qualify their terms in ways that seem to us tautological. Barbara Baines surveys legal texts across four centuries and explains that ‘when unwilling (involuntary) carnal pleasure is defined by such phrases as “consent of the body” or “the will of the body,” then the phrase “consent of the mind” becomes necessary to represent what the word “consent” alone should signify. “Consent of the mind” is, however, as redundant as “forcible rape” or “rape with force”’ (Baines 1998: 91).

Consent is a key concept in most texts about Helen as we see in four Shakespearean texts: *1 and 2 Henry 4*, *Henry 5* and *Midsummer Night’s Dream*. The issue of consent is raised obliquely in relation to Helen of Troy in *Henry 4* and *Henry 5*. Nell was a common (and not pejorative) abbreviation for Helen, and so Nell Quickly clearly merits inclusion in any discussion of Helen of Troy. She is fought over by two suitors, Nym and Pistol; like Helen, she engages in needlework, living (euphemistically) by the prick of her needle;<sup>6</sup> when she and Doll Tearsheet face arrest we are told, in an ambiguity of personal pronoun which could apply to either woman, ‘there hath been a man or two kill’d about her’ (*2 Henry 4* 5.4.6). In fact, in an apt textual crux, Nell the wife is conflated with the whore. ‘News have I that my Doll is dead’ says Pistol in *Henry 5* 5.1.81, presumably intending his lawful loving wife but giving her the name of the prostitute who accompanies her.<sup>7</sup> Of particular interest then is the Hostess’s unusual collocation in *Henry 5* 2.1 when Nym and Pistol,

<sup>6</sup> On Helen and weaving, see Blundell (1985); Bergren (1979). On weaving generally see Cunningham ‘Yarn’ and ‘Having a Clue’ (forthcoming).

<sup>7</sup> The Riverside editor speculates that in revising the play Shakespeare transferred to Pistol business and lines originally given to Falstaff, but failed to alter Falstaff’s Doll to Pistol’s Nell (‘Note on the text’ 972).

her rival suitors draw: 'O welliday, Lady, if he be not hewn now, we shall see willful adultery and murther committed' (2.1.36-8). The Riverside gloss suggests that 'the Hostess here perpetrates a double blunder, intending *assaultery*, her own version of *assault and battery*' (2.1.37n). This gloss is based on the assumption that 'wilful adultery' (=consenting adultery) is both a malapropism and a tautology. The first it may be, but the second is only valid in contemporary terms where we take for granted that the *OED* definition of adultery – 'violation of the marriage bed' – refers to voluntary violation ('the voluntary sexual intercourse of a married person with one of the opposite sex'; *OED* adultery 1). Involuntary violation goes by another name: rape. But in early modern times, the question of consent is irrelevant legally, if not emotionally. In T.E.'s *Laws Resolution of Women's Rights* T.E. devotes a section to adultery with and without consent, yet classifies both as rape (390; Catty 1999: 13). Although T.E.'s text is seventeenth-century, much of its legal authority derives from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries, and there is no sense that his definition here is novel.

Like rape and abduction, the concepts of rape and adultery were inextricably intertwined in the early modern period: what the law has joined together critics cannot put asunder. But early modern women, like Nell Quickly, can. For women the two categories – wilful and unwilful adultery – are inevitably distinct. Mistress Quickly, in the linguistically feminized space of the tavern, re-appropriates for herself the Adamic power of naming. Chris Cannon sees the legal problem of raptus/rape/abduction as one of renaming: 'the crucial distinction between an act and the names that might be given it' (82). We see this most obviously in a statute change of 1597 which separated abduction from rape. Rape was no longer a crime of property, a crime against male owners, but a crime against the female body. This indirectly introduced a concept (and a word) which has become key in rape law and debate ever since: consent.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> The issue of consent had been raised earlier: in a statute of 1555; in Sir William Staunford's *Exposition* (1567); in William Lambard's *Eirenarcha* (1588), 257; and it continued to occupy Michael Dalton in *The Country Justice* (1618) and T. E. in *The Law's Resolution of Women's Rights* (1632). For good discussions of literature in relation to the law on this topic – and the enduring imprecision, and the apparent tautology and contradiction, of terminology – see Baines; Walker; Garrett; Catty; Belsey; Porter 217; Brownmiller; Wynne-Davies. After the statute change of 1597, public thought and practice did not change overnight, however: historians document a gradual shift and

Shakespeare's work in the 1590s shows a recurrent interest in consent, and it is hard not to see this as a topical concern. In *Midsummer Night's Dream*, for instance, he is interested less in the formal conclusion of marriage (as he later is in *Two Noble Kinsmen*) than in the ambiguous nature of consent which precedes it. The sundered Fairy King and Queen are of most interest in this respect: marital reunion is conditional on female submission ('give me that boy, and I will go with thee', demands Oberon at 2.1.143). The condition is obtained by magic (a metaphor, as Jean Roberts points out, for male power; Roberts 1987-8: 63<sup>9</sup>) and accompanied by unnecessary humiliation. Oberon relates the (to him) positive outcome of a meeting with Titania:

When I had at my pleasure *taunted* her,  
And she in mild terms begged my patience,  
I then did ask of her her changeling child;  
Which straight she gave me. (4.1.57-60; my emphasis)

The nature of Hippolyta's consent is similarly compromised. Elizabeth Fowler's statement about Chaucer's Amazon queen is applicable to Shakespeare's: 'if we wonder what Ypolita thinks of her marriage, knowing what she said under the pressure of Theseus's sword would hardly satisfy us' (Fowler 1998: 60). The issue of consent is also to the fore in Hermia's matrimonial independence. Egeus's anger is caused less by his daughter's choice of husband than by her attempt to deny him authority:

They would have stol'n away, they would, Demetrius,  
Thereby to have defeated you and me:  
You of your wife, and me of my consent,  
Of my consent that she should be your wife. (4.1.156-59)

Even in the romantic world of reciprocal love we are offered the sophisticated riddles of Lysander's attempts to get into Hermia's bed: 'One turf shall serve as pillow for us both,/ One heart, one bed, two bosoms, and one troth' (2.2.41-2). Hermia twice has to ask Lysander to 'lie further off' (44, 57). Contemporary productions have long

---

Nazife Bashir goes so far as to say that the 'same medieval laws applied for the period 1558-1700' (1983: 41).

<sup>9</sup> Jocelyn Catty points out that in the *Faerie Queene*, for both Acrasia and Busyrane, 'enchantment is a substitute for physical force' (1991: 82).

since ceased to play this as prissiness on Hermia's part, seeing it instead as part of the atmosphere of threat which characterizes the wood. Hermia's attempts to evade pre-marital sex are the thin end of a wedge which leads to Helen of Troy's raptus.<sup>10</sup> The minatory tone becomes most overt in Demetrius's threats to the rejected Helena: he progresses from leaving her to the 'mercy of wild beasts' (2.1.228) to becoming a beast himself: 'I shall do thee mischief in the wood' (2.1.237).<sup>11</sup>

The play's grounding in legal terminology seems relevant here. Athens is the home of law and the play is full of legal allusions. Demetrius asks his rival to 'yield/ Thy crazed title to my certain right' (91-2); Hermia 'plead[s]' her 'case' (61-3); Lysander defends his entitlement to 'prosecute my right' (105); Egeus claims ownership of his daughter 'and all my right of her/ I do estate unto Demetrius' (97-8).<sup>12</sup> In the wood law and love are continually associated: Puck describes the mortal wooing as 'pleading for a lover's fee' (3.2.113); Lysander challenges Demetrius 'to try whose right,/ Of thine or mine, is most in Helena' (3.2.336-7). The mechanicals are concerned lest their dramatic representation fall foul of the Athenian law: 'that were enough to hang us all' (1.2.76-7). The lists which typify characters' speeches throughout *Midsummer Night's Dream* function as if evidence in a court of law. Egeus takes eight lines to itemise Lysander's incriminating 'love tokens' (1.1.28-35). Titania takes thirty-six to list environmental damage (2.1.82-117). Even Peter Quince piles up three persuasive descriptive phrases to convince Bottom to play Pyramus: 'for Pyramus is a sweet faced man; a proper man as one shall see in a summer's day; a most lovely gentlemanlike man' (1.2.85-8). Quince offers a verbal contract to his actors, adopting a pseudo-legalese series of synonyms: 'Here are your parts, and I am to entreat you, request you, and desire you to con them by tomorrow night' (1.2.99-101). Convince, we remember, comes from *vincere*, to conquer (in fact, a sixteenth-century meaning of the verb was to 'overcome, conquer, vanquish; *fig.* to overpower');

<sup>10</sup> This theme was developed gratuitously in Robert Le Page's production at the National Theatre in 1992 where Puck raped the First Fairy in act 2 scene 1.

<sup>11</sup> In a logic not untypical of cultural history, Helen is being punished sexually for the crime of sex (she risks her virginity pursuing Demetrius to the wood). See C. S. Lewis, 'After Ten Years' (1966) and Catty (1999) 84-6 on rape as a punishment for 'erring females' in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*.

<sup>12</sup> Edward Rocklin (1990) describes an acting exercise in which students focused their interpretation of 1.1 on one significant prop: a volume of *The Laws of Athens* (156-7).

OED convince 1.1), and the play's sexual and linguistic conquests are linked.

The concept of consent has long been a key issue in the Helen of Troy myth, where the crucial question from antiquity was: did Helen go willingly or was she abducted? In the 1590s questions about abduction and rape, wilful and unwilful adultery, coercion and desire were in the air. Marion Wynne-Davies notes that the very fact of new rape legislation in 1597 'after a century's inactivity reveals a peak of interest in, and concern about, sexual assault' (Wynne-Davies 1991: 131). It was a highly appropriate time to reexamine the myth of Helen.

### 3. Beauty and language

It is fitting that the Elizabethan poet who in his life most tested the notion of limit should dramatise the Helen of Troy story in a narrative about boundaries: *Dr Faustus*. For Marlowe Helen becomes a story about the limits of language.

Two related episodes in *Doctor Faustus* and *Tamburlaine* cement the link between Helen of Troy and language. The first is the unexpected moment at the end of *1 Tamburlaine* when Tamburlaine, a physical character if ever there was one, pauses during the battle for Damascus to deliver a lengthy metaphysical meditation on beauty. Contrast this with the physical reaction of Faustus, a metaphysical scholar, to beauty: he asks Mephistopheles to give him 'unto my paramour/ That heavenly Helen which I saw of late' (5.1.84-5). There is nothing untoward about theologians (or academics) desiring sex (Berowne defends his divagation from study as empirically educative: women's eyes are 'the books, the academes'; *LLL* 4.3.299), and if the aim of study is, as the King of Navarre asserts, 'that to know which else we should not know' (1.1.56), then sex is the original forbidden knowledge (an equation made later in *Love's Labour's Lost* in Berowne's image of women's eyes as 'Promethean fire'; 4.3.300). Faustus's desire for Helen is perhaps just a reification of his traffic with the forbidden:

*Faustus* I gave them [Lucifer and Mephistopheles] my soul for my cunning.

*All* God forbid!

*Faustus* God forbade it indeed. (5.2.36-9)

But Faustus's reaction to beauty is noticeably uncerebral. If we put Faustus's reaction next to Tamburlaine's, we see a common denominator: not the forbidden but the unattainable.

Tamburlaine begins with the specific beauty of Zenocrate ('ah, fair Zenocrate, divine Zenocrate! / Fair is too foul an epithet for thee'), contemplates the relation between beauty and creative artistry ('Beauty, mother to the Muses'), then equates beauty with suffering, the suffering of the writer as he realizes that beauty cannot be digested into words (5.1.160 ff). Alexander Leggatt points out that Tamburlaine's frustrations with beauty parallel his frustrations with world conquest: the inability to conquer it with a pen (Leggatt 1973: 29). Faustus's difficulty is similarly one of limits, whether of the university quadrivium ('Is to dispute well logic's chiefest end? / ... / Then read no more, thou hast attained that [B-text: the] end') or of political power: 'Emperors and kings / Are but obeyed in their several provinces, / ... / But his dominion that exceeds in this [magic] / Stretcheth as far doth the mind of man' (1.1.59-62).<sup>13</sup> Faustus wants 'the whole extent,' 'all that is possible.' These are the *OED* definitions of 'all', an adjective recurrent in Faustus's vocabulary:

All things that move between the quiet poles  
Shall be at my command (1.1.58-9)  
Resolve me of all ambiguities (1.1.82)  
[S]earch all corners of the new found world (1.1.86)  
[T]ell the secrets of all foreign kings (1.1.89)  
I'll have them wall all Germany with brass (1.1.90)  
[R]eign sole king of all our provinces (1.1.96)<sup>14</sup>

Collapsing limits was, in many respects, a humanist project: the bringing of the past into the present, the resurrecting the classics through translation. Faustus is a humanist scholar but he is, in all

---

<sup>13</sup> Damnation, then, as defined by Mephistopheles, would seem to have attractions: 'Hell hath no limits' (2.1.124). Hell in short is a metaphysicians' (or at least a Faustian) paradise.

<sup>14</sup> By the end of the play, however, in an unsurprising theophobic volte face, Faustus will be begging for the re-imposition of limits:

Oh God, / ... / Impose some end to my incessant pain.  
Let Faustus live in Hell a thousand years,  
A hundred thousand, and at last be saved.  
No end is limited to damned souls (5.2.98, 101-04).

respects, a bad humanist scholar (Bevington and Rasmussen 1973: 17). He translates Helen of Troy into the present not for the purpose of study but for sex.

Faustus rejects theology for necromancy. The rejection is not just spiritual but linguistic, for in a post-Adamic world, where language and meaning have lost their one-to-one correspondence, necromancy enables the magician to regain Adamic power: '*ipse nunc...* / I see there's virtue in my heavenly words. ... / Such is the force of magic and my spells' (1.3.22-3, 28, 32). Magic's power to do what language cannot do, to 'abolish the gap between sign and referent' (Forsyth 1987: 13) is dramatically exemplified in a seventeenth-century story of the extra devil who appeared on stage at a performance of *Faustus* (Bevington and Rasmussen 1973: 50). The play ceased to be a representation, becoming itself a spell.

It is not magic that is dangerous, it is language, and Helen is a metaphor for language. 'Be silent then, for danger is in words' (5.1.25), Faustus warns the scholars just before he brings in Helen of Troy. The geminary structure of the scene, in which everything to do with Helen is doubled (she appears twice, between two cupids [in the B text], and is herself a double, a devil impersonating Helen; Forsyth 1987: 12) illustrates the danger Marlowe has in mind: the duplicity of language. Marlowe exploits the *eidolon* tradition<sup>15</sup> and does so in a way which emphasizes Helen's role as an emblem for a sign system in which you do not get what you seek but a substitute for it. Faustus's encounter with Helen replays his first encounter with women in the play (he asks for a wife and is given (and rejects) 'a hot whore') and indeed all his encounters in the play – with intellectual questions, with travel, in which he never gets what he asked for. The Young Vic production of the play in 2002, starring Jude Law as Faustus, underlined this point by staging Helen as an optical illusion, created by lights and mirrors.

This returns us to the topic with which I began – the problem of representing beauty – which links to the second topic: the rape of Helen. The common denominator is language. Poetic language, like rape, is about violent coupling.<sup>16</sup> Metaphoric language asserts that two different things are actually the same and brings them together

<sup>15</sup> In the sixth century BCE the Greek-Sicilian Stesichorus inaugurated a variant tradition in which Helen did not accompany Paris to Troy; instead the gods sent an *eidolon* – a phantom or image of her – and Helen spent the war in Egypt.

<sup>16</sup> For the material in this and the following three paragraphs I am indebted to my research student and colleague, Ben Morgan.

in a momentary, violent union. To compare two like things would result in tautology or linguistic redundancy, a problem illustrated by Spenser (a poet fascinated by beauty, language, unity and doubleness) in Book 1 of the *Faerie Queene* when he compares Morpheus, the god of sleep, to someone who is asleep: 'as one then in a dreame' (I.1.42, line 7). But Morpheus cannot be *like* someone who is asleep because he *is* the god of sleep. Morpheus is therefore the standard of 'asleepness'; he is the absolute of dormancy. As such he is beyond language, which relies on the relative, on their being two positions, on a momentary fix between two separate things (whether in poetic metaphor or in structuralist theory). Like Spenser's Morpheus, Milton's God is beyond language: God simply *is*, he is transparent, and so Milton's God speaks without metaphor (which may be theologically and philosophically responsible but is poetically disastrous, as generations of readers of *Paradise Lost* have registered). And like Morpheus or God, Helen too is beyond language and for the same reason: as the paradigm of beauty she is absolute, an absolute, the absolute.

The absolute is a term (and a concept) beloved by Thomas Heywood. When Edward IV sees and falls in love with Jane Shore he says 'I never did behold/ A woman euerie way so absolute' (*1 Edward 4*, D4r). In *A Challenge for Beauty* (Q 1636), the vain and arrogant Queen Isabella believes that for beauty she is a *non pareille*. The honest courtier Lord Bonavida disputes this on the grounds that nature does not deal in absolutes:

Nature hath yeelded none so absolute,  
To whom she made no fellow. First for beautie,  
If *Greece* afforded a fayre *Hellen*, *Troy*  
Her paralleled with a *Polyxena*. (B1v)<sup>17</sup>

Lord Bonavida's speech reveals Heywood's medieval reading here in which Helen is only the most beautiful woman in *Greece*, *Polyxena*

---

<sup>17</sup> Lord Bonavida unwisely concludes:

Madam though I confesse you rare, ...  
Yet not so choice a piece, but the wide world  
May yeeld you a competitor. (B1v)

Queen Isabella issues the challenge for beauty of the play's title, and Lord Bonavida finds a more beautiful woman in England. The same thing happens in Peele's much earlier *Arraignement of Paris* where Juno and Pallas Athena appeal to Jove for a retrial and Venus (and Helen) lose the restaged beauty contest because Paris had not yet seen Queen Elizabeth.

is the most beautiful woman in Troy.<sup>18</sup> It is this parallel which Chaucer has in mind when he says that Criseyde is more beautiful than either Helen or Polyxena, the two paradigms of Western and Asian beauty (*Troilus and Criseyde*, Book 1, lines 454-55). (And his comparison subtly foreshadows Troilus's destiny: the men who love these women are doomed.)

Narrative often persuades readers to accept the omission of descriptions by inviting them to think of the consequences of inclusion. This is a favourite tactic of Lydgate's. His pen would split if he should describe woe:

For alle her sorwes 3if I shulde telle  
In this story, and her wo discribe,  
Mi penne shuld of verray routhe rive (Book 4, lines 6374-76)

And if he said more we would be moved: 'Me liste no more of hir wo endite ... / Which wolde meve to compassioun' (Book 4, lines 3710, 3714). The implication in both these examples is that the poet could describe but has decided not to. More often, however, the problem is inability – not just the poet's but the inability of language itself to perform the task which is being requested of it. Faced with the beauty of Helen, Lydgate says

And certeynly, 3if I schal reherse  
Hir schap, hir forme, and feturis by & by  
As Gwydo doth by ordre ceryously, ...  
From hed to foot, clearly to devise,  
I han non englysche that ther-to may suffyse;  
It wil not be, oure tonge is not lyke. (Book 2, lines 3674-6, 3678-9)

In oher words: 'I can't describe all her features like Guido does; English is not up to it.' Lydgate implies that the problem is with the English language (Latin can manage it). In fact, Latin can't: Guido may have an extended description but his details tell us little more about Helen than does Lydgate. The problem lies not with a particular language; the problem lies with language generally. Extremes of any kind are one, absolute, fixed; language is plural and relative.

---

<sup>18</sup> Some medieval versions (the anonymous *Seege at Troy*, Caxton's *Recuyell*, the *Laud Troy Book*) offer the alternative tradition – the tradition which was to become the dominant one – that Helen is the most beautiful woman in the world.

Lucian had introduced the problem of absolute beauty in the second century AD: 'Now we looking not simply for beauty but for the great beauty ... ; we are in search of a definite thing, the supreme beauty, which must necessarily be *one*' (*Hermotimus* in Fowler and Fowler (1905), II, 67). Absolute beauty is singular – 'one' – but language is not: language is plural. To talk about Helen, the absolute of beauty, one has to force her into a relative position (as Morgan points out, personal communication). Mythological and literary narrative has numerous ways of doing this. It can double her (the *eidolon* of Greek tradition, the calque of Shakespeare's *Cressida*<sup>19</sup>). It can sexualize her and abduct her, thereby forcing her body into a system of physical relations, moving her from the absolute to the real. Throughout the Middle Ages, the many versions of the Troy story present Helen's abduction as a kind of narrative foreplay: it is always outwith the main body of the text. The *Laud Troy* book makes this explicit: over 3000 lines into the book, having described Helen's abduction, the poet says 'Herkenes now, both grete and smale! For now begynnes al this tale' (3293-4). The tale *begins*? What does he think he has been doing for 3000 lines? But he realises that only with abduction can Helen be narrated.

So, literature can double her or abduct her. Or it can damage her: this, I think, is what lies behind the otherwise inexplicable Renaissance innovation of making Helen physically flawed by giving her a scar on her chin. In *Euphues* (1578) Lyly includes this detail in a list of items whose beauty is enhanced by imperfection:

the sweetest rose hath his prickle, the finest velvet his brack, the fairest flour his bran ... And true it is ... that in all perfect shapes, a blemish bringeth rather a liking every way to the eyes than a loathing any way to the mind. Venus had her mole in her cheek, which made her more amiable, Helen her scar on her chin which Paris called *cos amoris*, the whetstone of love, Aristippus his wart, Lycurgus his wenne. (Lyly 2003, 3).<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Almost all commentators on Chaucer's *Criseyde* and Shakespeare's *Cressida* agree that *Criseyde*'s/*Cressida*'s situation is an action replay of Helen's, *mutatis mutandis*.

<sup>20</sup> Lyly's detail is not an error: when he revised his text, he kept this paragraph intact. This might be a detail he made up: there are also no known references to Aristippus's wart or Lycurgus's wen, which seem therefore to be Lyly's invention. It is significant that all Renaissance references to Helen's scar postdate *Euphues* and are either direct quotes from *Euphues* or paraphrases which make it clear that the source is *Euphues*.

No classical authority mentions Helen as scarred, nor is there any need to: the *eidolon* tradition serves the same purpose, providing something against which to measure Helen. Marring her beauty in this way forces it into a relative position, one which can then be iterated. (And this, perhaps, is why drama has less trouble in representing Helen: drama is already a form of doubling, as we are aware of the actor representing the character.)

Helen's story, according to Morgan, is a story of containment and disruption, of movement from outside to inside, of invasion (like the story of rape). This is visible at every stage of the Trojan war narrative. It begins with Paris expelled only to return. Hecuba had dreamed that she would give birth to a firebrand which would destroy Troy; when Paris was born he was abandoned on a hillside. Rescued and raised by shepherds, he is later identified and welcomed back into the Trojan royal family. The Spartan Helen is captured, brought from Greece to Troy. In defense of her, the Greeks enter the Trojan horse; the Trojan horse enters Troy. This movement from outside to inside is recapitulated repeatedly in the narrative, which can be read as a parable of containment and excess, of controlled space and disruption of that space.

At the centre of that narrative is Helen who, as an absolute of beauty, is linguistically disruptive: she halts the narrative. This is true of all literature's indescribably beautiful females, from the divinely lit Britomart to the ruttishly luscious Cleopatra. Faced with the absolute, the narrative pauses and indulges in rapt reaction. The fabric of the play/poem/plot comes momentarily apart at the seams because to be an absolute is to be outside time – to be loose, free, apart, separate. 'Loose', 'free', 'apart', 'separate' are all meanings of absolute, which derives from the Latin verb *absolvere*, to loosen. The prefix is odd, however: since *solvere* on its own means to loosen, the 'ab' in *absolvere* functions as an intensifier, emphasising the irreversibility of the separation (and giving rise to the OED meaning [11.2] of *absolute* as 'complete, entire'). *Absolvere*, Morgan reminds me, is emphatic about the completeness of the action it denotes, an irreversibility which can be viewed as a refusal to belong to a sequence of actions. *Absolvere* is premised on the possibility of an action which can conclude sequence altogether and begin time afresh. ('Absolution' has the same root; the absolution ensures that the sinner is entirely apart from his/her previous actions and from the past narrative sequence in which they occurred.) As an absolute, Helen is separate: outside time, space, corporeality. Her story is

about attempts to contain her, to relativize her, to bring her into language.

Franz Rosenzweig writes that 'with the proper name, the rigid wall of objectness has been breached. That which has a name of its own can no longer be a thing ... It is incapable of utter absorption into the category for there can be no category for it to belong to; it is its own category' (quoted in Natanson 533). As the absolute of beauty Helen becomes her own category. Helen's story thus reflects the problem of figurative language itself. Language is always in a Parisian state of libido, for more or less the same reason: it is reaching out for an absolute. Metaphoric language, like Paris, is in love with the absolute; and the product of this coupling is a thrilling violence. Nowadays we call this violence the pleasure of the text.

#### References

- Andreas, B. 1858 (1501-02). *Historia Regis Henrici Septimi*. Ed. J. Gairdner. London: Longman et al.
- Aristophanes. *Lysistrata*. Trans. A.H. Somerstein. 1985. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Baines, B.J. 1998. "Effacing Rape in Early Modern Representation." *ELH* 65: 69-98.
- Bashar, N. 1983. "Rape in England between 1550 and 1700." In The London Feminist History Group, *The Sexual Dynamics of History: Men's Power, Women's Resistance*. London: Pluto Press. 28-42.
- Belsey, C. 2001. "Tarquin Dispossessed: Expropriation and Consent in *The Rape of Lucrece*." *SQ* 52: 315-335.
- Bergren, A. 1979. "Helen's Web: Time and Tableau in the *Iliad*." *Helios* 7: 19-34.
- Blundell, S. 1985. *Women in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brownmiller, S. 1975. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Cannon, C. 2001. "Chaucer and Rape: Rape's Uncertainties." Ed. E. Robertson. *Representing Rape in Medieval and Early Modern Literature*. New York: Palgrave. 67-92.
- Catty, J. 1999. *Writing Rape, Writing Women in Early Modern England: Unbridled Speech*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Cunningham, V. 2003. "Yarn." Ed. J. Wolfroys. *Glossalalia: An Alphabet of Critical Keywords*. New York: Routledge.
- Cunningham, V. Forthcoming. "Having a Clue." *Symbolism: An International Annual of Critical Aesthetics* 5.
- Dalton, M. 1619. *The Country Justice*. London.

- delle Colonne, G. 1974 (1287). In *Historia Destructionis Troiae* (1287). Trans. M.E. Meek. Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University Press.
- Donaldson, I. 1982. *The Rapes of Lucretia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Donno, E.S. 1987. "The Epyllion." Ed. Ch. Ricks. *English Poetry and Prose 1540-1674*. London: Sphere Books. 57-72.
- Fineman, J. 1991. *The Subjectivity Effect in Western Literary Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Forsyth, N. 1987. "Heavenly Helen." *Etudes de Lettres* Oct-Dec: 11-22.
- Fowler, E. 1998. "The Afterlife of the Civil Dead: Conquest in the Knight's Tale." Ed. E. Fowler. *Critical Essays on Geoffrey Chaucer*. G.K. Hall: New York. 59-81.
- Fowler H.W. and F.G. Fowler 1905. *The Works of Lucian of Samosata*. Volume II. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Garrett, C.E. 2004. "Sexual Consent and the Art of Love in the Early Modern English Lyric." *SEL* 44: 37-58.
- Heywood, T. 1963. "Oenone and Paris." Ed. E.S. Donno. *Elizabethan Minor Epics*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 127-154.
- Homer. *The Iliad*. 1951. Trans. R. Lattimore. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lambard, W. 1588. *Eirenarcha*. London.
- The Laud Troy Book* 1902. Ed J.E. Wülfing. EETS. London: Kegan Paul.
- Leggatt, A. 1973. "Tamburlaine's Sufferings." *YES* 3: 28-38.
- Lewis, C.S. 1966. "After Ten Years." Ed. W. Hooper. *Of Other Worlds: Essays and Stories*. London: Geoffrey Bles. 127-145.
- Lucian. See Fowler and Fowler.
- Lydgate, J. 1906-08 (1412-20). *Lydgate's Troy Book 1412-20*. Ed. H. Bergen. Early English Text Society. London: Kegan Paul, 19-6. Part 2, 1908.
- Lyly, J. 2003 (1587). *Euphues*. Ed. L. Scragg. *Selected Prose and Dramatic Work*. New York: Routledge. 1-66.
- Marlowe, C. 1993 (1604 and 1616). *Doctor Faustus, A- and B- texts*. Eds. D. Bevington and E. Rasmussen. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Marlowe, C. *Complete Plays and Poems*. 1976. Eds. E.D. Pendry and J.C. Maxwell. London: J.M. Dent.
- Marston, J. 1963. "The Metamorphosis of Pigmalion's Image." Ed. E.S. Donno. *Elizabethan Minor Epics*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 244-252.
- Natanson, M. 1979. "Phenomenology, Anonymity and Alienation." *NLH* 10: 533-546.
- Neill, M. 2000. *Putting History to the Question: Power, Politics, and Society in English Renaissance Drama*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Porter, R. 1986. "Rape – Does It Have a Historical Meaning?" Eds. S. Tomaselli and R. Porter. *Rape*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 216-236.

- Roberts, J.A. 1987-8. "Shades of the Triple Hecate in Shakespeare." *Proceedings of the PMR Conference: Annual Publication of the Patristic, Medieval and Renaissance Conference. Villanova, PA* 12-13: 47-66.
- Rocklin, E.L. 1990. "'An Incarnational Art': Teaching Shakespeare." *SQ* 41: 147-59.
- Rogers, M. 1988. "The Decorum of Women's Beauty: Trissino, Firenzuola, Luigini and the Representation of Women in Sixteenth-century Painting." *Renaissance Studies* 2: 47-89.
- Rose, M.B. 1988. *The Expense of Spirit: Love and Sexuality in English Renaissance Drama*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Shakespeare, W. 1986. *Complete Works*. Gen. eds. S. Wells and G. Taylor. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Shakespeare, W. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 1997. Gen ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sidney, Sir P. 1987. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*. Ed. M. Evans. Penguin: Harmondsworth.
- Stauford, W. 1567. *Exposition*. London.
- Sterne, L. 1760-67. *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy*. London.
- T.E. 1632. *The Law's Resolution of Women's Rights*. London.
- Telotte, L.E. 1989. "'Fire, Water, Women, Wind': *Tristram Shandy* in the Classroom." Ed. M. New. *Approaches to Teaching Sterne's 'Tristram Shandy'*. New York: MLA. 118-122.
- Tynan, K. 1975. *A View of the English Stage*. London: Methuen.
- Walcott, D. 1990. *Omeros*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Walker, G. 1988. "Reading Rape and Sexual Violence in Early Modern England." *Gender and History* 10: 1-25.
- Williams, R. 1998. "The Notion of Beauty in Francesco Bocchi's Bellezze della città di Firenze, II." Eds. F. Ames-Lewis and M. Rogers. *Concepts of Beauty in Renaissance Art*. Alderhot, UK: Ashgate. 199-206.
- Woolf, V. 1970 (1928). *Orlando*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Wroth, Lady M. 1995. *The First Part of the Countess of Montgomery's Urania*. Ed. J.A. Roberts. Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies.
- Wülfing, E. See *The Laud Troy Book*.
- Wynne-Davies, M. 1991. "'The Swallowing Womb': Consumed and Consuming Women in *Titus Andronicus*." Ed. V. Wayne. *The Matter of Difference*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. 129-152.

---

*Author's address:*  
Magdalen College · Oxford OX1 4AU  
laurie.maguire@magd.ox.ac.uk

**“Boscovos tromuldo boscovos”:  
a case study in the translation of William Shakespeare’s  
*All’s Well that Ends Well*\***

Laura MONRÓS GASPÀR  
*University of València*

ABSTRACT

The presence of an artificial language in *All’s Well that Ends Well* 4.1 and 4.3, being an extraordinary instance in William Shakespeare’s literary production, is a key device both for the humor of the play and for the depiction of one of its most memorable characters, Parolles. The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to present a translation that aims to transmit the linguistic interaction established between the characters of the drum-plot and the audience to a modern Spanish-speaking context. In order to do so, first, I will examine the approaches of Luis Astrana and José María Valverde in their translations. Then, I will analyse the most representative examples of rhetorical iteration in this language that are relevant for the orality of the play, so as to describe the adaptations considered in the final copy of the forthcoming translation by the *Instituto Shakespeare*.

KEYWORDS: parolles, drum-plot, language, translation, rhetorics

**1. Preliminaries. Parolles and the drum-plot**

In Peter Brook’s outstanding work, *The Empty Space* (1968), the author states, referring to Shakespearean drama that “A word does not start as a word – it is an end product which begins as an impulse, stimulated by attitude and behavior which dictates the need for expression. This process occurs inside the dramatist; it is repeated inside the actor” (15). It is universally acknowledged that the success of any play relies not only on the creation and transmission of such a word, but also on the ability of the artistic director to convey that creative impulse to its audience. When it comes to deal with

---

\* The research carried out for this paper is funded by ‘Dirección de Investigación del Ministerio de Educación’ through the research project BFF 2003-03720.

translations,<sup>1</sup> the responsibility of rendering such an impulse also falls on the figure of the translator, who acquires a particular relevance as a liaison between the cultures of the source and the target language. The complexity of that task increases when the original text is written in an artificial language.

In *All's Well that Ends Well* 4.1, Parolles is tantalized by Bertram, the Count of Rossillion, and a group of soldiers of his own regiment in his attempt to retrieve the drum he has lost at the battle against the army of Siena. In an ambush prepared to reveal the cowardly nature of the character, the soldiers pretend to be members of a foreign enemy army and improvise an artificial language which Parolles cannot recognize. The plot of the scene, known as the drum-plot, will continue in 4.3 where Parolles, blindfolded, betrays the Florentines answering to every question posed by this pretended army. In the end, the plot is revealed and Parolles is left alone on stage where he recites the verses of the soliloquy that best depicts his nature (4.3.333-343).<sup>2</sup>

The two scenes parody the usual king topos where the ruler as judge learns the truth about a plot or a character by hiding his identity. The main parodical element of this plot lies on the moral reputation of the persons in the role of the judge, which also deepens into a large factor in the background of *All's Well that Ends Well*: honour. The truth that Bertram and his army are going to learn through the answers of the fool will bring to light the dishonourable features that portray their actions. An added issue along the lines of the discredit of their honour lies in the structure of the play in which the drum-plot is embedded. The second sub-plot developed in act four is Bertram's seduction of Diana, which finds its climax in 4.2, between the scenes of the unmasking of Parolles. As the lineation of the character shows, Bertram is a capricious and insolent lad who believes in honour by birth and not by actions or virtue, that is the reason why he rejects Helena in 2.3.13-19 and plans to seduce Diana in 4.2. Little we know regarding his subordinates in the army, but Parolles' descriptions along 4.3 provide revealing hints about their nature: "the troops are all scattered and the commanders very poor rogues" (4.3.134-135). It is also noticeable the parallelism established

<sup>1</sup> As this study is based on an invented language and its transmission to an audience different from its original one, I will not make a distinction here between the terms 'adaptation', 'version', and 'translation'.

<sup>2</sup> All references to the play are from W. Shakespeare 1993. *All's Well that Ends Well*. Ed. Susan Snyder. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

between the treachery comments of these soldiers in 4.3.1-81 and Parolles' revelations at the ambush, which give little credit to their reprobation of the fool. On the other hand, Parolles is depicted both by Lafew and Helena as a cad and pretentious servant whose flamboyant garments and language match the disposition of his character; a chatty soldier that will not hesitate to betray his master in a situation of danger. Neither Parolles nor Bertram or his lords are schooled at the end of the play, however, Parolles' soliloquy in 4.3.333-343 gives voice to the most sincere and honourable statements of the two scenes:

Yet am I thankful. If my heart were great,  
 'Twould burst at this. Captain I'll be no more,  
 But I will eat and drink and sleep as soft  
 As captain shall. Simply the thing I am  
 Shall make me live. Who knows himself a braggart,  
 Let him fear this, for it will come to pass  
 That every braggart shall be found an ass.  
 Rust sword, cool blushes, and Parolles live  
 Safest in shame; being fooled, by foolery thrive.  
 There's place and means for every man alive.  
 I'll after them.

Even though Parolles is sometimes regarded as a coward and shabby flatterer, he wins the approval of the audience in this final soliloquy, where he openly admits to prefer dishonour to death for the sake of an old drum. As stated in Fraser's introduction to his edition of the play (1989: 14), the limits between good and evil furnished by Prudentius' *Psychomachia* are blurred on the depiction of the characters of *All's Well that Ends Well*, and the case of Parolles is particularly significant on this matter. In 4.1 and 4.3, the humanity and, one could even say candour of the fool, together with the compassion and sympathy that he inspires as the victim of a troop of soldiers in thirst of action, increases the audience's favour towards the character.

The artificial language of the drum-plot plays an important role in the creation of that scenario, where the spectators are aware of the treachery of the fool but also pity his misfortunes. Nonsensical though it may seem, it is structured through a number of rhetorical devices that, as I will demonstrate below, are essential for the description of the setting of the ambush and also heighten the comical effect of the scenes. An added key element for the humorous

development of this “choughs’ language” (4.1.19-20) embedded on the parody of the masked king/judge lies in Parolles’ belief that he, the character named after words, is going to die “for want of language” (4.1.71). Except for the First French Lord and the Interpreter,<sup>3</sup> it stands to reason that all the characters involved in the scenes, including the spectators of the play, are unfamiliar with those invented words. However, some of them echo a number of lexical items that herald the soldier’s interpreting and can be recognized, at the same time, by the theatregoers. This fact increases the audience’s empathy towards the fool and also arouses its interest and participation in the conflict.

In view of the importance of the reception of this invented language in a performance of *All’s Well that Ends Well*, the purpose of this paper is to present a translation that aims to transmit the linguistic interaction developed between the characters of the drumplot and its audience to a modern Spanish-speaking context. In this sense, special emphasis will be placed on reproducing the illocutive force of the rhetorical patterns that lie in the structures of this language. The next section of the paper is devoted to an overview of the Spanish translations of *All’s Well That Ends Well* 4.1, 4.3, focusing on the approaches of Luis Astrana and José María Valverde. Then, I will examine the most representative examples of the figures of speech underlying the structure of this language, in order to describe the criteria that ground the final copy of the forthcoming translation by the *Instituto Shakespeare*.

## 2. Spanish Translations of *All’s Well that Ends Well*: Luis Astrana Marín and José María Valverde

The first Spanish translation of *AWW* dates back to the late nineteenth century. In 1872,<sup>4</sup> Francisco Nacente published *Bien está lo que bien acaba* on the first volume of his collection of William Shakespeare’s plays, *Los grandes dramas de Shakespeare en España*. The next translation in chronological order is Rafael Martínez Lafuente’s *Bien está lo que bien acaba* that, under the same title as Nacente, was to come out in 1915. The first Spanish version of the play whose direct source was the Shakespearean English text itself was Luis Astrana’s

<sup>3</sup> There are considerable variations of the speech-prefix designations in the Folio text of *AWW* regarding these two characters. I use here the emendations of the *Instituto Shakespeare* of the forthcoming edition of the play, First French Lord and Interpreter.

<sup>4</sup> For a detailed account of the history of the Nacente collection see Portillo and Salvador (1997).

*A buen fin no hay mal principio*, published in *Obras Completas de William Shakespeare* (1929). In general, the translations of Luis Astrana, being the first complete works of the dramatist in Spanish, became a landmark for Shakespearean studies in Spain along the twentieth century. Forty years later, in 1968, another version of the whole literary production of William Shakespeare was published: José María Valverde's *Teatro Completo* (1968), which included in its second volume *Bien está lo que bien acaba*.<sup>5</sup>

Regarding the forthcoming translation of the Instituto Shakespeare, *Bien está lo que bien acaba*, the criteria underlying the text are accurately explained and summarized in Conejero (1991). As far as the translation of the invented language of 4.1 and 4.3 is concerned, the need to retain the phonosyntactic resemblances between some of the words of this language and the translations of the Interpreter take priority over other principles. Thus, taking into account that both in Nacente and Martínez Lafuente the domestic remainder (Venuti 2002) of a French version might have had an influence on their final copies,<sup>6</sup> the following description of the translating background of the drum-plot of *All's Well That Ends Well* will only consider the versions of Astrana and Valverde.

Despite the known divergences between the translating criteria that lie in the texts of these two scholars, their linguistic choices in the translation of the invented language of 4.1 and 4.3 differ very little one from the other. In general, the most striking feature of their approach is that both translators decide not to intervene in the transmission of these artificial words. As it might be learnt from the excerpts of the play shown in figs. 1 and 2, only two variations are included in their texts: for the Folio "O pray, pray, pray! *Manka reuania dulce*" 4.1.79-80, Astrana reads "¡Oh! ¡Reza, reza, reza. *Mank revania dulce!*" and in 4.3.120 both scholars coincide in their adaptation of the Folio '*Portotartarossa*' into '*Porto tartarosa*'. Little we know about the reasons underlying these interventions; however, as I will demonstrate below, whether they were motivated or not, it is clear that they do not respond to an intentional attempt to

---

<sup>5</sup> For a detailed account of Shakespeare's translations and performances in Spain see González Fernández de Sevilla (1993) and Campillo (2005).

<sup>6</sup> "Translating creates effects that vary to some extent the semantic and formal dimensions of a foreign text. I shall call these effects the domestic 'remainder' in a translation because they exceed the communication of a univocal meaning and reflect the linguistic and cultural conditions of the receptors. (cf. Lecercle, 1990)" (Venuti 2002: 7-8).

bring the linguistic patterns of the invented language to a Spanish audience.

First, should we consider 'mank' a typographical error, no substantial modifications would be recorded in Astrana's translation of the invented language of 4.1. In my opinion, though such a translation would result in a text more consistent with the Folio, it would also imply a considerable loss of the puns created between some of the artificial words of the Interpreter that sound as the cue-lines of his own translations. On the other hand, if 'mank' was a conscious lexical reduction of 'Manka', it would be the sole variation from the original source introduced in Astrana's version. In that case, the whole translation of this artificial language in 4.1 would be inconsistent with itself for it will assume that only this word, and not the others, was due to be modified. A similar approach is followed by the two translators regarding 4.3.120. If the adaptation of '*Portotartarossa*' (4.3.120) into '*Porto tartarosa*' represents an attempt to bring the morphosyntax of the invented language closer to the patterns of the audience's mother tongue, the question arising such a translation is: why these words and not the others?

*A buen fin no hay mal principio*  
Luis Astrana Marín

**4.1**

SEÑOR 1º:

*Throca movousus, cargo, cargo, cargo.*

TODOS:

*Cargo, cargo, cargo, villianda par corbo, cargo ...*

SOLDADO 1º:

*Boskos thromuldo boskos.*

PAROLLES:

Veo que sois del regimiento de Musko, y voy a morir por no saber vuestro idioma. Si hay aquí un alemán, un danés, un holandés un italiano o un francés, que me hable. Le haré revelaciones que perderán a los florentinos.

SOLDADO 1º:

*Boskos vauvado.* Te entiendo y puedo hablar tu lengua. *Kerelybonto.* Señor, medita tu religión; diecisiete puñales amenazan tu pecho ...

SOLDADO 1º: ¡Oh! ¡Reza, reza, reza. *Mank*

*Bien está todo lo que bien acaba*  
José María Valverde

**4.1**

NOBLE SEGUNDO [E]:

*Throca movousus, cargo, cargo, cargo.*

TODOS:

*Cargo, cargo, cargo, villianda par corbo, cargo ...*

INTÉRPRETE [SOLDADO PRIMERO]:

*Boskos thromuldo boskos.*

PAROLLES: Sé que sois del regimiento de los Muscos y perderé la vida por faltarme idioma. Si hay aquí un alemán o danés o flamenco o italiano o francés, que hable conmigo, y yo le revelaré algo que deshará a los florentinos.

INTÉRPRETE:

*Boskos vauvado,* yo te entiendo y sé hablar tu lengua. *Kerelybonto,* señor, encomiéndate a tú fe pues tienes siete puñales al pecho ...

INTÉRPRETE: Ah reza, reza, reza:

*revania dulce!*

SEÑOR 1º: *Oscorbidulchos volivorco.*

SOLDADO 1º: El general consiente en perdonarte por ahora; y, con los ojos vendados como estás, te conducirá a fin de interrogarte. Si, por fortuna, puedes hacernos revelaciones de importancia, tienes probabilidades de salvar la vida ...

SOLDADO 1º: *Acordo linta.* Vamos, se te concede una tregua.

*AWW.* 4.1. Astrana (1929) and Valverde (1968)

*manka revania dulce*

NOBLE SEGUNDO [E]: *Oscorbidulchos volivorco.*

INTÉRPRETE: Al general le parece bien dejarte por ahora vivo y, con los ojos vendados como estás, te llevará allá para saber más cosas de ti. A lo mejor le puedes informar de algo que te salve la vida ...

INTÉRPRETE: *Acordo linta.* Vamos allá, se te concede un respiro.

*A buen fin no hay mal principio*

Luis Astrana Marín

**4.3.122-132**

SEÑOR 1º: ¡Acércate gallina ciega! *Porto tartarrossa.*

SOLDADO 1º: Pide el tormento. ¿Qué revelaciones queréis hacer para que no se os aplique?

PAROLLES: Confesaré cuanto sepa, sin violencias. Si me reducís a masa nada podré decir.

SOLDADO 1º: *Bosko chimurcho*

SEÑOR 1º: *Boblibindo chicurmurco.*

SOLDADO 1º: Sois un general piadoso.

Nuestro general os ordena que respondáis a las preguntas que voy a haceros según este escrito.

PAROLLES: Y con suma verdad, como espero vivir.

*AWW.* 4.3. Astrana (1929) and Valverde (1968)

*Bien está todo lo que bien acaba*

José María Valverde

**4.3.122-132**

NOBLE PRIMERO [G]: Llega la gallina ciega. *Porto tartarrossa.*

INTÉRPRETE: Manda el tormento. ¿Qué vais a decir sin eso?

PAROLLES: Confesaré lo que sé sin violencia. Aunque me hagáis picadillo como a una empanada no puedo decir más.

INTÉRPRETE: *Bosko chimurcho*

NOBLE PRIMERO [G]:

*Boblibindo chicurmurco.*

INTÉRPRETE: Sois misericordioso ...

general. Nuestro general manda que respondáis a lo que os voy a preguntar siguiendo una lista.

PAROLLES: Y responderé con verdad, como... espero vivir.

Regarding the rest of the lines of the plot, a single instance is enough to illustrate the methods followed by the two scholars. Consider 4.1.69-74:

*Inter. Boskos thromuldo boskos.*

*Par.* I know you are the *Muskos* Regiment,  
And I shall loose my life for want of language.  
If there be here German or Dane, Low Dutch,  
Italian, or French, let him speake to me,  
Ile discouer that, which shal vndo the Florentine.

It is clear that the phonological and orthographical similarities between 'Boskos' and 'Muskos', together with the contrast between Parolles' gift of speech and the misunderstanding of the words of the soldiers are the two comical devices of these lines. Any Spanish audience exposed to either Astrana's or Valverde's translations would be able to recognise the phonological parallels between the two words in their proposals, 'regimiento del Musko' and 'los Muscos.' In both cases, however, some significant information regarding the original 'Muskos' is missing. As a variation of musk, the OED incorporates the Latin form in ablative 'musco' which, as a compound (e.g.: in musk-animal, musk-colour or musk-trade) refers to something "flavoured or scented with musk."<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, the proximity of 'Muskos' to another lexical item, 'muscovite', and the pragmatic context in which the word is being used, brings into discussion some other networks of possible meanings underlying the choice of 'Muskos'. Whether in one direction or the other, few will dispute that none of these connotations are considered in either Astrana's or Valverde's translations. Moreover, as far as the readers of the text are concerned, although in this context the spellings <c> and <k> refer to the same phonetic transcription, /k/, its representation with different signs, as it happens in Valverde, also implies a certain disequivalence that deepens into the misreception of the puns between 'boskos' and 'Muskos'.

A collation of Astrana's and Valverde's contribution to the translation of the invented language of *AWW* 4.1 and 4.3 goes to show that, in general, little regard was given in their texts to the transmission and adaptation of the rhetorical patterns of this language to Spanish theatregoers. The two scholars sense a possible modification in 'Portotartarossa' (4.3.120), but only Valverde – being to a certain extent more concerned than Astrana with this topic – records a second attempt in 4.1.70 with his translation of 'Muskos' into 'de los Muscos.' Hence, notwithstanding the unquestionable acknowledgment that the work of the two translators deserve with regard to the transmission of the play in Spain, a thorough analysis of the rhetoric underlying the episode reveals a number of forceful devices that were not measured in their texts and are essential for the reception of the play by a Spanish audience.

---

<sup>7</sup> OED, s.v. Musk *sb*<sup>4</sup>

### 3. A 'not-so-invented' language

Despite the major interest that different aspects of Shakespeare's language have raised among the critics, the invented words of *All's Well that Ends Well* have never been a recurrent topic in this field of research. Following Patricia Parker's (1996) assessment of the play, one can get a rough idea of the general disregard of the scholarly work towards this language:<sup>8</sup>

The scene of the ambush in Act IV – and its deflation of Parolles, the play's 'manifold linguist' (IV.iii.236) – depends once again on a foregrounding of language, or 'parolles'. The 'choughs' language: "gabble enough and good enough" (IV.i.19-20) that the ambushers conspire to speak is parodically both empty sound or nonsensical 'nothings' and the prattle of the 'chough' or chatterer Parolles. (202)

Contrary to Parker's appreciation, the plot hatched to unmask Parolles in 4.1 and 4.3 and the language employed by the playwright bear much more significance than mere 'prattle' or 'nonsensical things'. William Hazlitt, referring to the character of Parolles and the 'drum-plot' scenes asserts in his well-known book *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays* (1817) that:

The comic part of the play turns on the folly, boasting, and cowardice of Parolles, a parasite and hanger-on of Bertram's, the detection of whose false pretensions to bravery and honour forms a very amusing episode ... The adventure of 'the bringing off of his drum' has become proverbial as a satire on all ridiculous and blustering undertakings which the person never means to perform. (227)

As stated above, some of the most important comical aspects of 4.1 and 4.3 lie both in Paroles and the audience's reception of the dialogue between the First French Lord and the Interpreter. There is little that is novel in emphasizing the way in which the intervention of rhetoric shapes the works of this playwright. However, with regards to the application of those rhetorical studies to a Spanish translation of *AWW* 4.1 and 4.3, there are still some issues that should be reexamined.

---

<sup>8</sup> A similar reading is offered in by Russ McDonald when referring to iv.i.69-72 he states that "Paroles in *All's Well* is brutally mocked with gibberish" (2001: 176).

Writing in 1989, Angel-Luis Pujante expressed some basic principles for the translation of literary texts that are of an utmost significance for a Spanish version of the drum-plot scenes of *AWW*:

si la obra literaria es un conjunto de sistemas que se interrelacionan e interpretan, la traducción debe partir de un análisis previo de la estructura en cuestión en el que se muestre la presencia e interrelación de los elementos estructurales. (135)

Considering Pujante's assertion, the following pages will discuss the visible rhetorical patterns of the soldiers' "choughs' language" (4.1.19-20) that give support to a reconsideration of the importance of this episode for the comic background of the play. Some of these structures, as I shall explain in the next section of the paper, can be transferred to the Spanish linguistic patterns, resulting in a translation more concerned with the playability of *AWW* 4.1 and 4.3 in a Spanish context. In *Traducir el teatro de Shakespeare: Figuras retóricas iterativas en Ricardo III* (2002), John D. Sanderson states that:

Dentro de una nomenclatura retórica exhaustiva y, a veces, con una terminología que se entrecruza con numerosas variantes relacionadas entre sí, los elementos que tienen una mayor relevancia fónica para la representación teatral son las figuras iterativas de dicción precisamente porque su reiteración aporta una cadencia ocasional al texto que contribuye a una mayor percepción formal y semántica del hipotético efecto elocutivo del segmento que las incorpora. Su traslación al texto meta facilitaría la descodificación por parte de un receptor que compensaría la distancia contextual en otros aspectos gracias a su familiarización con estos recursos compartidos por ambos códigos. (79)

Bearing in mind these considerations, I will confine myself to an examination of the rhetorical figures of iteration due to their relevance for the reception of the orality of a dramatic text. The theoretical background underlying the procedures of rhetorical analysis will be supplied here by Richard A. Lanham (1991), José Antonio Mayoral (1994) and John D. Sanderson (2002).

First of all, I would like to draw attention to the clear and constant repetition of certain phonemes that recall the cadence of some of the languages that Parolles mentions at the beginning of the drum-plot – German or Danish, for example. Let's take the instance of the most evident ones: /r/ in 'Throca', 'cargo', 'kerelybonto',

'revania', 'volivorco', 'acordo', 'thromuldo', and 'oskorbidulchos', and /k/, or /o/ in 'kerelybonto' 'cargo', 'boskos', 'acordo', 'corbo', or 'oskorbidulchos'. Whether they were originally motivated or not, it is undeniable true that some certain phonosemantic effect is rendered to the repetition of these phonemes that, on some occasions (e.g.: 4.1.66-67), gives a particular military colouring to the setting of the plot. This use of language in order to shape the scenario of 4.1 and 4.3 should be taken into account in a Spanish translation of the text so as to transmit the pragmatic context in which the plot develops.

Another case of phonemic iteration is 'boskos' and 'oskorbidulchos'. Contrary to Mayoral, Lanham refers to the phenomena of 'homoiptoton'<sup>9</sup> and 'homoioteleuton'<sup>10</sup> separately (1991: 82-83), eliding any allusion to a higher category that would embrace the two figures in a single device. Mayoral, on his part, includes them in what the Spanish terminology labels as 'similicadencia' (1994: 63). Leaving aside the theoretical debate, it is rather utopian to examine whether these two examples correspond to one figure or the other, since they belong to an imaginary language without a rationalized grammar. Such a substantial restriction, however, doesn't prevent us from considering that 'boskos' and 'oskorbidulchos' may generally illustrate a case of 'similicadencia'. Even though the transposition of this figure to a target language entails some significant difficulties, it is important to be acutely aware of its collocation in the text in order to identify the interrelation of this device with other elements of the dialogue.

On the topic of syntactical iterations, a noteworthy example illustrates that what had seemed a series of chaotic answers at first sight is actually a set of well-structured linguistic patterns that highlight some keywords for the transmission of the semantic context of the language. In 4.1.66-67, a conscious use of 'antimetabole'<sup>11</sup> organises the two lines as follows: "FIRST LORD:

---

<sup>9</sup> "In classical rhetoric, the use in a sentence or verse of various words in the same case and with similar case endings. Lacking a real series of inflections, English uses the term loosely, often making it synonymous with Homoioteleuton, often making it mean simply rhyme" (Lanham 1991: 82-83).

<sup>10</sup> "In English, the use of similar endings to words, phrases, or sentences" (Lanham 1991: 83).

<sup>11</sup> "Commutatio; Counterchange; Permutatio – In English, inverting the order of repeated words (ABBA) to sharpen their sense or to contrast the ideas they convey, or both" (Lanham 1991: 14) or "contraposición, no tanto de pares de unidades léxicas

*Throca movousus, cargo, cargo, cargo./ ALL: Cargo, cargo, cargo, villianda par corbo, cargo.*" The illocutive purpose of the repetition of 'cargo' is to surmount the resonances of this word over the rest of the sequence in order to motivate its association with other lexical segments that again evoke a military setting. 'Cargo' shares the same root as 'charge', which is registered in Onions (1985: 42) as having been used by Shakespeare with the meaning of an "order", "a military post or command" or a "position for attack" of a weapon.<sup>12</sup> The importance of the reception of the idea of 'cargo' as the beginning of a military skirmish stems from the common practice of Elizabethan drama of using dialogue in order to evoke in the audience's mind an impression of the setting.

To a remarkable degree, the figures of lexical iteration are the most difficult to detect in the analysis of the artificial language of *AWW* 4.1, 4.3 because of the hypothetical semantic reconstruction that is implicit in their study. However, it should be highlighted that there are some effective interventions of this kind in *AWW* 4.1 and 4.3 that secure emphasis in a number of words that, like 'cargo', evoke sets of parallel meanings that run and grow through the scenes of the drum-plot. For example, both Schmidt (1902) and Onions (1985) refer to the use of the adjective *bosky* in Shakespeare with the meaning of "woody" and "shrubby or wooded," respectively.<sup>13</sup> In the context of this scene, the use of 'epanalepsis'<sup>14</sup> in "Boskos thromuldo boskos" and 'antanaclasis'<sup>15</sup> in "boskos thromuldo boskos" and "boskos vauvado" reinforces the perception of the audience of the lexeme of 'bosky', 'bosk-', underlining again

---

antonimicas en el enunciado ... cuanto del sentido global de las oraciones" (Mayoral 1994: 272).

<sup>12</sup> It is well worth noting at this point Hunter's note on 'Cargo' (4.1.65) in his edition of the play published in *The Arden Shakespeare* (1959, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.): "This word, (taken presumably from the Spanish) is used in an exclamation elsewhere." See Wilkins' *Miseries of Enforced Marriage*, sig. F4: "But *Cargo*, my fiddlestick cannot play" (1959: 99). Hunter's presumption of the origin of the word relates it with 'charge' and its exclamative use in Wilkins justifies its position at the beginning of the line in 4.1.67.

<sup>13</sup> "woody: *my b. acres and my unshrubbed clown*, Tp.IV.81. *you b. hill*, H4A V,1,2 (O. Edd. *Busky*)" (Schmidt 1902: i, 131) and "Shrubby or wooded TMP 4.1.81. *My bosky acres and my unshrub'd clown*." (Onions 1985: 26)

<sup>14</sup> "the repetition at the end of a clause or sentence of the word or phrase with which it began" (Lanham 1994: 124).

<sup>15</sup> "tipo de artificios consistentes en una reiteración, en un espacio discursivo de reducidas dimensiones, de dos o más palabras homonímicas y/o polisémicas, según partamos de la consideración del significante o del significado" (Mayoral 1994: 117).

the setting of the plot – let us remember that is an ambush which takes place at night in a battlefield.<sup>16</sup>

The lords and soldiers involved in the unmasking of Parolles define the language that the Interpreter must invent to that purpose as “linsey-woolsey” (4.1.11), “choughs’ language, gabble enough, good enough” (4.1.19-20); as the Second Lord points out:

When you sally upon him, speak what terrible language you will. Though you understand it not yourselves, no matter; for we must not seem to understand him, unless some one among us, whom we must produce for an interpreter. (4.1.2-6)

However, even in some of the lexicon that best illustrates the strangeness of this language, ‘oscorbidulchos’ (4.1.81) or ‘chicurmurco’ (4.3.126) for instance, rhetoric still reminds both Parolles and the audience that they are facing up with well-structured sentences. Considering ‘chicurmurco’ and ‘oscorbidulchos’ examples of ‘polyptoton’,<sup>17</sup> ‘oscorbidulchos’ would be a compound word of the root forms of corb- plus dulch-, which are the lexemes of ‘dulche’ (4.1.80) and ‘corbo’ (4.1.67). The prefix os- and the suffix -os would have been added to those lexemes so as to form the lexical item ‘oscorbidulchos’. A similar process would affect as well the case of ‘chimurco’ and ‘chicurmurco’.

The examples discussed so far illustrate the thoughtful structures in which this apparent meaningless pattern was invented. Due to the large number of rhetorical patterns that lie in the contrived language of the drum-plot, the implication of the audience in 4.1 and 4.3 becomes an essential issue in the reception of the comical aspects of the scenes. In addition, the proximity of some of the phonological clusters of this artificial language with the Spanish linguistic patterns facilitate a translation concerned with rendering that information to its audience. With this regard, in the next section

---

<sup>16</sup> Another instance of epanalepsis would be “*Cargo, cargo, cargo. Vilianda par corbo cargo.*”

<sup>17</sup> “(po lup TO ton; G. “employment of the same word in various cases”); alt. sp. Polyptiton – Paregmenon; Adnominatio; Traductio (2); Multiclinatum. Repetition of words from the same root but with different endings: ‘Society is no comfort to one not sociable’” (Lanham 1994: 78).

of the paper I will set out the adaptations considered in the translation of the *Instituto Shakespeare*.

### 3. Results and conclusion

As stated above, the aim of this translation of *AWW* 4.1 and 4.3 is to produce a text focused on the performability of the play in a Spanish speaking context. Hence, I will next examine the processes of actualization and adaptation of the structures of this language that were considered in order to elude the constraints that may hinder a positive reception of the plot on the Spanish scene. Particular emphasis will be placed on the transmission of the common structures of both the source and the target languages, and on the elements that underline the pretended foreignness of the soldiers in the ambush so as to compensate the possible adaptations of other more obscure passages.

As far as the sequence "Throca movousus, cargo, cargo, cargo" (4.1.66) is concerned, the only variation adopted in the line is the modification of the spelling of 'throca' into 'troca' in order to bring the phonetic clusters of the lexical items closer to those of the target language. Thus, with the variation of <thr> into <tr>, the group /er/ becomes /tr/. In 4.1.69 'thromuldo' is also adapted into 'tromuldo'. These orthographical modifications are the only ones grounded on a clear phonetic motivation. The other spelling changes included answer the need of unifying the visual representation of the artificial language merging both a sense of foreignness and proximity that evokes the confusion of the fool. As a result, <k> turns into <c> in 'Manka' (4.1.79), 'boskos' (4.1.69/4.1.75) and 'bosko' (4.3.125) and <y> into <i> in 'Kerelybonto' (4.1.76). For the same reason, but this time only to keep the sense of foreignness, <k> in 'Kerelybonto' (4.1.76) and <ch> in 'dulche' (4.1.80) and 'oscorbidulchos' (4.1.81) remain as they appear in the source text.

Regarding 'oscorbidulchos', (4.1.81) the resemblances of the word with 'corbo' (4.1.67) and 'dulche' (4.1.79-80) are incorporated without any modification, since the linguistic coherence that is perceived by composing 'oscorbidulchos' from items already recognisable in the scene should also be transposed to the audience of the target language. This decision would also affect the case of 'chicurco' and 'chicurmurco' (4.3.125-126).

There are a few words like 'remania' (4.1.79), 'par' (4.1.67), 'Portotartarossa' (4.3.129), 'accordo' (4.1.89) and 'linta' (4.1.89) that possess clear Latin echoes both in their orthography and phonology.

Contrary to the exoticism suggested by this lexicon in the original text, they bring both Parolles and the audience too close to the invented words of the Lords in a Spanish context. However, the group of translators working on this version decided to keep the words as in the source text as there are still other linguistic elements that emphasize the strangeness of the dialogue. In order to reproduce the illocutive force of the original lines in which 'Accordo linta' is the semantic cue line for the Interpreter's "you are granted space" (4.1.89), and 'Portotartarossa' heralds the phonetics of 'tortures' (4.3.121), the *Insituto* opted for the following translations: "Acordo linta. / Ven, se te concede licencia" and "¡Portotartarosa!/ INTÉRPRETE.– Dice que de comienzo a la tortura."

Finally, following the same criteria as in 4.1.89 and 4.3.120-122, the last modification that I would like to discuss in this section is the morphological variation of 'boskos' (4.1.69/4.1.75) and 'bosko' (4.3.125) respectively into 'boscovos' and 'boscovo'. In 4.1.71 Parolles states "I know you are the *Muskos'* Regiment/ And I shall loose my life for want of language" in answer to the Interpreter's "*Boskos thromuldo boskos.*" It is evident that the humor of this dialogue lies both in the homophony between 'Muskos' (4.1.69) and 'Boskos' and the fact that Parolles, mastering words, believes that he is going to die tormented by them. In order to transmit these comical aspects to the Spanish audience, the first step was to evaluate the possibilities of the translation of the real language, English, through 'Muskos'. The choices were 'Muscos' and 'Moscovita'. In the end, the final version of the scene opted for "Veo que sois del regimiento moscovita/ y que moriré por no conocer vuestro idioma" and, thus, gave priority to the association of 'Muskos' with "muscovites" with the disappearance of 'musk'.

In his annotated edition of the play, G.K. Hunter illustrates the connection between 'Muskos' and 'muscovites' with the following example: "In *Edward III* a Polonian captain brings troops from 'great Musco, fearfull to the Turke,/ And lofty Poland" (1959: 99). There is still another instance, related to the characters of the plot, that also supported this choice. In *Love's Labours Lost* 4.2, four male suitors, King, Biron, Longaville and Dumaine, present themselves in front of their four ladies disguised as Muscovites. Whether mere coincidence or an intentional reworking of the theme, the analogy between the Dumaine characters and their masquerades dressed up as Muscovites was an added factor in this consideration. In order to compensate the lack of homophony between 'moscovita' and

'boskos' and keep the pun between the two terms, the options were to modify the invented word; the result, 'boscovos'. Although the surrounding lines only motivated this change in 4.1.69, for obvious reasons of consistency 'boscos' in 4.1.75 and 'bosco' in 4.3.125 were also modified into 'boscovos' and 'boscovo'.

All in all, bearing in mind the idea that a play is embedded in the dichotomy of being a written text conceived to be performed orally (Pujante 1989), this proposal aimed to achieve a version of *AWW* 4.1, 4.3 that would fulfil the expectations of a Spanish audience in these two ends of its reception. Although the subject of my research here is the invented language of the drum-plot, this fragment doesn't work in isolation but should be viewed in its context. As a consequence, the variations discussed above also affect some other instances in which decisions founded on the same criteria we required.<sup>18</sup> In the end, the results show a text with certain dramatic gains that opens up new dialogic possibilities between the source and the target languages in a Spanish translation of *AWW*.

*Bien está lo que bien acaba*  
Instituto Shakespeare

**4.1**

[PRIMER] SEÑOR [FRANCÉS].–*Troca movousus, cargo, cargo, cargo.*  
TODOS.–*Cargo, cargo, cargo, villianda par corbo, cargo.*  
PAROLES.–¡Socorro! ¡Auxilio! ¡No me vendéis los ojos!  
INTÉRPRETE.–*Boscovos tromuldo boscovos.*  
PAROLES.–Veo que sois del regimiento moscovita,  
y que moriré por no conocer vuestro idioma.  
Si alguno de entre vosotros es alemán, danés o de Holanda,  
italiano o francés, que me hable.  
Os revelaré los secretos de los florentinos.  
INTÉRPRETE.–*Boscovos vauvado.* Te entiendo, sé hablar tu lengua. *Kerelibonto.*  
Reza tus plegarias, pues hay diecisiete puñales que apuntan a tu corazón.  
PAROLES.–¡Ah!  
INTÉRPRETE.– Sí, eso es, reza, reza. *Manca revania dulce.*

*Bien está lo que bien acaba*  
Instituto Shakespeare

**4.3.122-132**

*Entra PAROLES con el INTÉRPRETE*  
BELTRÁN.–¡Maldito sea! Si lleva los ojos vendados... Nada podrá decir de mí.  
PRIMER CAPITÁN [FRANCÉS].–Silencio, silencio... Que viene el verdugo... ¡*Portotartaros!*  
INTÉRPRETE.–Dice que de comienzo a la tortura. ¿Queréis confesar algo antes?  
PAROLES.–Os diré todo lo que yo sé, no os hará falta emplear el suplicio. Aunque me dejarais arrugado como una pasa, nada más os podría revelar.  
INTÉRPRETE.–*Boscovo chimurcho.*  
[PRIMER] CAPITÁN [FRANCÉS].–*Boblibindo chicurmurco.*  
INTÉRPRETE.–Mi general, sois muy compasivo. El general os ordena que respondáis a las preguntas que figuran en este manuscrito.  
PAROLES.–Os diré la verdad, por mi vida que sí.

<sup>18</sup> E.g: 'Charbon' and 'Poysam' (1.3. 52) into 'Chuletón' and 'Pescadilla'.

[PRIMER] SEÑOR [FRANCES].-  
*Oscorbídulchos volivorco.*  
INTÉRPRETE.-El general está dispuesto a  
no matarte, por ahora.  
Vendados tus ojos como están, te  
llevaremos  
donde podamos interrogarte. Tal vez  
quieras informar  
de algo, lo cual podría salvar tu vida.  
PAROLES.-  
Os revelaré todos los secretos de nuestro  
campo,  
nuestro número y proyectos. Os diré  
cosas  
que os han de asombrar.  
INTÉRPRETE.-  
PAROLES.-Si no lo hago, condenado sea.  
INTÉRPRETE.-  
Ven, se te concede licencia.  
Sale [con Paroles]  
A*WW*. 4.1 and 4.3. 122-132 . Instituto Shakespeare.

### References

- Astrana Marín, L. 1964 (1929). *Obras completas de William Shakespeare*. Madrid: Aguilar.
- Brook, P. 1990 (1968). *The Empty Space*. London: Penguin.
- Campillo, L. 2005. *Estudio de los elementos culturales en las obras de Shakespeare y sus traducciones al español por Macpherson, Astrana y Valverde*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia. <[http://www.tdr.cesca.es/TESIS\\_UM/AVAILABLE/TDR-1128105-101704//LCampilloArnaiz.pdf](http://www.tdr.cesca.es/TESIS_UM/AVAILABLE/TDR-1128105-101704//LCampilloArnaiz.pdf)>
- Conejero, M.A. 1991. *Rhetoric Theatre and Translation*. Valencia: Fundación Shakespeare España.
- González Fernández de Sevilla, J.M. 1993. *Shakespeare en España. Crítica, traducciones y representaciones*. Alicante: Universidad de Alicante.
- Hazlitt, W. 1817. *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*. London: Printed by C.H. Reynell for R. Hunter.
- Lanham, R.A. 1991. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*. California: University of California Press.
- Martínez Lafuente, R. 1915. *Obras Completas de William Shakespeare*. 12 vols. Valencia: Prometeo.
- Mayoral, J.A. 1994. *Figuras retóricas*. Madrid: Síntesis.
- McDonald, R. 2001. *Shakespeare and the Arts of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nacente, F. ed. and trans. 1930 (1872). *Los grandes dramas de Shakespeare*. 2 vols. Barcelona: La Enciclopedia Ilustrada.

- Onions, C.T. 1985. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. 1989 (1933). Eds. Murray, J.A.H; Bradley, H.; Craigie W.A. y Onions, C.T. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Portillo, R. and M. Salvador 1997. "Shakespeare in Spanish Translations: Recent Findings about the Nacente Collection." *SEDER* VIII: 197-201.
- Parker, P. 1996. *Shakespeare from the Margins: Language, Culture, Context*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pujante, A. 1989. "Traducir el teatro isabelino, especialmente Shakespeare." *Cuadernos de Teatro Clásico. Traducir a los clásicos*. Madrid: Compañía Nacional de Teatro Clásico. 4: 133-157.
- Shakespeare, W. 1959. *All's Well that Ends Well*. Ed. G.K. Hunter. London: Methuen & Co.
- Shakespeare, W. 1989 (1985). *All's Well that Ends Well*. Ed. R. Fraser. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shakespeare, W. 1993. *All's Well that Ends Well*. Ed. S. Snyder. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, A. 1902. *Shakespeare Lexicon. A Complete Dictionary of All the English Words, Phrases and Constructions in the Works of the Poet by Alexander Schmidt*. 2 vols. Ed. Gregor Sarrazin. Berlin: Georg Reimer.
- Valverde, J.M. 1968. *Teatro completo II. William Shakespeare*. Barcelona: Planeta.
- Venuti, L. 2002. "Translating Humour. Equivalence, Compensation, Discourse." *Performance Research* 7/2: 6-16.
- 

*Author's address:*

Departament de Filologia Clàssica · Facultat de Filologia · Av. Blasco Ibáñez, 32 ·  
46010 Valencia  
laura.monros@uv.es

**'Here's sport, indeed!':  
interchangeable voices and mass communication  
in Renaissance England**

Aimara da Cunha RESENDE  
*Centro de Estudos Shakespeareanos – Brazil*

ABSTRACT

Renaissance England was a time when "voices" of most varied kinds intermingled, creating diffuse perceptions of ideologies. "High" and "low" cultures merged and/or changed place, as the advent of capitalism brought with it mobility that blurred socially hierarchical boundaries. As seen by Peter Burke, culture moved both ways, migrating either from the country, with its traditional culture, to the city, with its courtly and/or urban pastimes, or vice-versa. Thus court entertainments such as plays and masques, and political spectacles such as pageants and royal progresses – which both reinforced the splendour and power of the monarch and his/her court, and permitted some sort of participation of the crowd, offering the common people opportunity to enjoy more sophisticated cultural expressions – were nurtured by and simultaneously nurtured folklore and rural festivities. In the same way, popular pastimes that resulted from urban assimilations of both court and country entertainments, due to the rise of capital and the new middle class, appropriated and re-enacted such entertainments as part of their ideology. This article deals with such exchange between "high" and "low" cultural expressions, exploring them and discussing how and where they are exchanged as transformations take place, enhancing forms of carnivalized art such as theatre, elite and popular literature, dances and games.

KEYWORDS: Renaissance England, elite culture, popular culture, festivities, cultural exchange

In the country, people dance, drink, listen to music and attend performances. Two or more musicians play their pipes and drums, followed by Morris dancers. Saint George fights the dragon, is killed, and is brought back to life by a doctor. Then comes Robin Hood, the medieval outlaw of noble origin. He meets socially and economically different people like his brave companions, beggars, rich men and

beautiful women. He opposes the rich and protects the poor. Among other pastimes, in the English Renaissance, the Robin Hood plays fill the minds of the simple men, women and children, transforming their hard, monotonous everyday life into a momentary dreamland of impossible experiences come true. In the newly created medieval legend, on May Day, the hero is often accompanied by a burlesque Maid Marion, with her free, obscene behaviour, rude language and erotic gestures. In the calendar festivities, both are relished as much as food and drink. In this world there are mirth and "cakes and ale."

In London, people stand hours on end to see the pageants prepared for the Sovereign, when *tableaux vivants*, singing, and speeches take place in different locations. Pageants offer the "commoners" a chance to enjoy a free day or a festive occasion, and simultaneously introject the acceptance of royal power and supremacy. Lavishly decorated, with many allusions to classical myths, with actors dressed in Greek or Roman robes mixed with contemporary costumes, the pageants were also a kind of dream offered the poor, apprentices, the middle-class and foreigners, so that, in addition to witnessing the display of power and superiority, they might escape the hard reality of their lives, or, in the case of spectators from abroad, take home information about the English monarch's wealth, grandeur and political strength.

Pastimes and displays of power in Elizabethan and Stuart England were nourished by oral and written traditions, moving from the aristocracy's, or "high" culture's literary world, to popular, or "low" oral culture, to turn again to the gentry and nobility often through the theatre, thus forming a fabric of discourses suggesting Peter Burke's (1989) double social movement of culture.

As Mikhail Bakhtin (1984) pointed out, these discourses arise and function under the stress and through the exchanges raised by socio-political constraints as well as individual expectations. The Russian theoretician sees such discourses as subversive devices coming from the lower social strata to be assimilated, later on, by the representations of ideologies of higher social groups, bringing about awareness of the differences between both court and urban elite societies, and the rural and poor inhabitants of the "outer" world.

My belief is that there is not only this movement from "low" to "high" culture, but that there is a never-ending interchange of ideas embodied in individual, regional and/or national ideologies. Culture, in its broader sense, is made of heterogeneity, complexity,

oppositions and overlappings. Its mobility allows for unexpected exchanges, confrontations, assimilations and adaptations.

Within the language of entertainments, displays of power, and economic interests, there is always the confrontation of ideas and ideals, the strengthening of some positions, the displacement of others. In any pseudo-naïve entertainment, there is a muddle of veiled antagonism, necessary alienating relief, and an outburst of energy that, being both liberating and controlled, concretizes subtle changes resulting from the compromising attitudes that arise from the very awareness of contradiction and domination.

Dominant forms of rule bear within themselves the seeds of political dissatisfaction and social disturbances. Such predicament requires an ambivalent attitude of those in power, which reflects their anxiety, generated by the hold that popular representations have on the minds and attitudes of this dominant class. This attitude is expressed in the simultaneous presence of harsh laws based on moral and religious principles, and the temporary permissiveness that gives vent to the uneducated, badly nurtured, overworked commoners' expression of *reduced laughter* (Bakhtin, 1984: 164-165, 178n.). The rulers' apparent contradiction, which is the basis of socio-political control, brings to the fore the role of cultural representations to maintain the equilibrium and mediate between "low" and "high" cultures, thus guaranteeing the continuity of the system.

This explains both Elizabeth I's and James I's seemingly contradictory acceptance of the pastimes of both the closed, "contained" court and the open, "free" rural poor. These two rulers maintained ambiguous attitudes towards festivity, since they knew that on the permanence of traditional rituals and "carnival laughter" depended the stability of the State. Elizabeth seems to have enjoyed such pastimes. James, however, merely put up with them, because he was sure that they were a necessary political articulation, though he could not find pleasure in them.

As a result, under Elizabeth, not only was traditional festivity enjoyed by the people, despite the persecution of Puritans, but also the players had the freedom to perform both at court and at the public theatres as well as in the country. James, though, preferred attending court performances, especially *masques*. Under him, even the ritualistic space of the church, which had been freely used by the rural poor for their communal celebrations, the most frequent being cyclic festivities, becomes an enclosure where only God can be "celebrated". Little by little, this sacred space is separated from the

“common” man, and the people’s entertainments previously linked to religious symbolism, are segregated from it.

When one thinks of English Renaissance culture, two ideas are predominant: the undeniable force of the theatre and the incomparable mutability of Elizabeth I’s image, so theatrical in itself. Innumerable examples can be drawn from the “Virgin Queen’s” behaviour in her relationship with political advisers, courtiers, foreign ambassadors, wooers and the people in general. I will cite here just one example. This is how Francis Peck describes her response to the orator, in 1564, on a visit to Cambridge University:

First he [the orator] praised and commended many and singular virtues set and planted in her majesty, which her highness, not acknowledging of, shaked her head, bit her lips and her fingers, and sometimes broke forth into passion and these words, ‘Non est veritas, et utinam –’ [‘It is not true, would that it were –’].

“[When he praised virginity] she said to the orator, ‘God’s blessing of thine heart: there continue’ .... When he had done, she much commended him, and much marveled that his memory did so serve him, repeating such diverse and sundry matters, saying that she would answer him again in Latin but for fear she should speak false Latin, and then they would laugh at her. (apud Marcus 2000: 87)

At the conclusion of the visit, at St. Mary’s Church, she made her speech ... in Latin!

The preponderance of the theatre, as both a site and the repository of entertainment tends to blur the importance of numerous other cultural expressions. These cannot be overlooked lest the blend that forms the identity of a group loses its character, and the real, expressive traits of communality that impregnate the life experiences and the behaviour of such group tend to be effaced, so that the aspects that form/conform behaviour, tastes, and beliefs lose their distinctive character.

As was shown by Peter Burke (1989), there seems to have been a movement from the “higher tradition” to the “lower tradition,” and back again, a movement that exemplifies Bakhtin’s (1981) theory of the relativity and interchange of discourses. As argued by the latter, there is no single, original discourse, since every speaker, when he/she utters a thought, is somehow aware of the response to come from his/her interlocutor. Besides, every discourse is already loaded with other discourses, and the new idea is merely a

metamorphosed embodiment of previous thoughts and social stances.

Burke shows how “lower” tradition adapts representations from “higher” tradition for its own uses, so as either to reinforce or to subvert the values of the time and milieu of the culture appropriating the adapted text (I here use *text* in its broad sense of a representational device of whatever kind, not only literary). Not only does “lower” culture appropriate “high” culture, but the reverse process is also common.

In the English Renaissance, when both Elizabeth I and James I say that they are on the stage, such statement shows how clearly aware they are of their ambivalent position of “Player Queen/King” and “Queen/King Player,” and of the fact that they are observers of and participants in the incidents of their time, but also observed on the royal stage. Such ambivalence is especially displayed in Elizabeth’s theatrical socio-political manouvres as well as in her transvestite behaviour, speeches, and image. Her transvestism is a direct descendant of the rituals and representations of ambivalence in the traditional culture of her country. The Queen adapts popular representations in an endeavour to blur the boundaries between sovereignty and commonness, and in so doing she attempts to recreate the make-believe aspect of the theatre, when the line between fiction and reality disappears, promoting the image of commonness to a falsely higher status, exactly where it is implicitly absent and insistently denied. Like Robin Hood, or Long Meg, she is socially, politically, and physically transformed.

At the end of the English Renaissance, James I tended to reassert the boundaries between élite and popular culture. He supported the private theatres and, in the case of the court masques, limited the participation of his subjects, restricting them to the nobility. Elizabeth, on the other hand, in her public appearances, extensively borrowed from popular culture and, in so doing, transformed the challenges and dangers she was faced with, chiefly for being a single woman. She veiled her vulnerability under her apparent androgyny, incarnating burlesque representations of gender relations and socio-political roles. In her theatricality, the Virgin Queen, Cynthia, Hippolyta, Astrea, Diana, of élite culture, shares features with Robin Hood and Long Meg familiar to her less literate subjects. Like the latter, she is presented as the protector of the poor and punisher of the dishonest rich; she moves among the people and respectfully listens to them, as is attested by her progresses and

contemporary reports of the deep attention she paid to speeches in her honour as well as to petitions from city mayors and, sometimes, praise or requests coming from a common man or woman.

Robin Hood, an outlaw, at first, then a hero “born great,” a medieval subversive aristocrat who left his noble environment to fight for an ideal, moves from the lower to the higher level of society and back again. His mutations take place alongside the representations of ascending capitalist ideologies. From medieval ballads, he moves through popular entertainment, especially Mummer’s, appears in Masques and plays – it was then that the anti-Catholic Anthony Munday gave him a name and the title of Earl, in his *The Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington* and *The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington* (both entered in the Stationers’ Register in 1600) – and is firmly grounded in the Renaissance chapbooks. As Margaret Spufford says,

Robin Hood was yet another hero with a very respectable medieval pedigree, that runs at least back to the fourteenth century, although there is lively disagreement about whether he originated as a hero for peasant audiences then or for a gentle audience which disliked the forest laws and shrieval administration of the thirteenth century. By the end of the fifteenth century he had become a hero of some Mummer’s Plays, and in the sixteenth century presided widely in England as King of May. (1981: 231)

That Robin Hood ends up as a chapbook hero deserves attention. Chapbooks, typical popular literature, are also essentially a commercial product. While they acquired an outstanding position among other books aimed at more educated people, they were written with the less literate but economically ascending “middling sort” in mind. Their printers and distributors aimed at such a public, which is why the heroes and heroines embodied values and responded to aspirations characteristic of that group. The representation of chapbook heroes and heroines bears the signs of the evolving mercantilism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Although arising from chivalric ideals, with the passing of time and the advent of possibilities for social ascendancy, these popular figures were transmuted so as to incorporate the dreams of the lower members of the realm. The chapbooks, which were an important means of alienating the less fortunate, dealing with the misfortunes of the poor, and the unreal possibility of reprieve by someone brought in almost miraculously among them, helped to efface the

awareness of socio-economic differences while simultaneously bringing profits to those creating and distributing them.

The chapbook novels of Thomas Deloney, that appeared between 1597 and 1600, are a telling example of the interplay between élite and popular cultures in Renaissance England. Probably read by the aristocracy, the gentry and the commoners alike, these stories highlight city life and stress the ever increasing power of trade. But the most evident proof of the interplay of cultures is to be found in the heroine Long Meg. The chapbook *Long Meg of Westminster*, first printed in 1582, tells the adventures of a strong-minded lower class girl who makes use of several devices typical of popular heroes, including transvestism, secret nocturnal walks, succesful struggles against dishonest and/or immoral men, to reach the ideals of the social class she belongs to.

The similarities between Long Meg and the androgynous representation of Elizabeth I are undeniable. Both are shown as protectors of the poor, play male roles when necessary, are unarguably stronger than men. And both are essentially seen as women. Though Long Meg gets married and becomes a submissive wife, while the Queen does not, both act according to the ideals they champion. Long Meg is obedient to her husband; Elizabeth is apparently submissive to her country and her people, to whom she more than once declares she is married. When the occasion so requires, she displays the male traits proper to a ruler and calls herself "Prince" to reassert before her advisors and other subjects that *she* is the only Master. But as a ruler, she knows quite well that her supremacy rests on the acceptance of her sovereignty by her subjects. Based on this awareness, therefore, she also plays the role of the submissive wife. An example of this display is found in an exchange between her and Sir John Harington's wife, as was reported by him, in *Nugae Antiquae*:

The Queene did once ask my wife in merrie sorte, "how she kept my goode wyll and love, which I did always mayntaine to be trulie goode towards her and my children?" My Mall, in wise and discrete manner, tolde her Highnesse, "she had confidence in her husbandes understandinge and courage, well founded on her own steadfastness not to offend and thwart, but to cherishe and obey; hereby did she persuade her husbande of her own affectione, and in so doinge did commande his" – "Go to, go to, mistresse, saithe the Queene, you are wisely bente I finde: after such sorte do I keepe the good wyll of all my husbandes, my good people." (apud Marcus 1988:59).

Maid Marian is another interesting folkloric type whose flamboyant sexuality is often intermingled with elite culture. She is supposed to have first appeared as Robin Hood's sweet companion in Adam de la Halle's French version of the legend, *Jeu de Robin et Marion*. According to J.C. Holt, "Maid Marian became Robin's partner in the May Games between 1450 and 1500" (quoted by Tom Hayes, 1992:60). If she is originated in *Jeu de Robin et Marion*, she, too, is transmuted over time and place to become the vulgar, riotous character of the May Festivals. According to François Laroque (1993: 125),

Maid Marian had thus become the embodiment of, in some cases, effrontery and vice, in others of extreme vulgarity. The Puritans denounced her as 'the Whore of Babylon' while others, like Lady Bornwell in Shirley's *The Lady of Pleasure* (1637), suffered from vapours at the very mention of her name.

It is worth noting, though, with Peter Stallybrass (1985), that this transmuted Maid Marion became a chaste maid when introduced into the literature of elite culture, which would avoid sophisticated ladies' vapours at the mere sound of her name. The fact that Maid Marion can be transmuted, not only as a transvestite, but also from a vicious "whore" to a chaste maid and back again, once more highlights the uninterrupted movement of culture backward and forward between high and low traditions. The "Other", be it embodied in the lower class, seen from above, or the higher society, seen from below, is always an object of simultaneous fear and desire.

Besides folklore stock types in the Calendar festivals and in chapbooks, other figures from popular culture appear here and there in the articulate discourses of the English Renaissance. For one, ballads and pamphlets help toward the continuation of idealized relationships and imposed faith. The half literate readers of ballads and pamphlets turned them into *the* mass media of the time, as can be seen in the enormous output and wide readership of these broadsheets. The use made of pamphlets by supporters of the monarchy as well as by religious representatives whether Puritan or Catholic, to manipulate the people, was notable and doubtless worked as propaganda and marketing. Through satire, and both mercantile and "innocent" appeals, chapbook propaganda had great

success in the selling of either pleasantly erotic stories or guides to reach Heaven. As one advertisement of *Small Godly Books*, published in a list of chapbooks printed in the sixteen-fifties shows, faith and thrift are intertwined: "Read them over carefully, and practice them constantly, and rest assured thou wilt find comfort in them to thy own Soul, and are but twopence a piece" (apud Spufford 1981: 198).

The cheap price of chapbooks, be they *Small Pleasant Books*, *Small Godly Books*, ballads or pamphlets, guaranteed their large scale diffusion among the members of the lower social strata. The *Small Pleasant Books* catered for young men and women, creating an erotic atmosphere for idealized love. They told love stories, often adapted from chivalric romances, and originated interestingly vulgar and grotesque types, such as Mother Bunch, the ale wife, an enormous woman, who

spent most of her time in telling of tales, and when she laughed, she was heard from Algate, to the Monuments in Westminster, and all Southwark stood in amazement, the Lyons in the tower, and the Bulls and Beares of Parish-Garden roar'd (with the terror of her laughter) lowder than the great roaring Megge ... She danced a Galliard on Tower hill, and London shook as it had been an Earthquake (apud Spufford 1981:53)

Mother Bunch, as the Epistle to the Reader says, is the mother to "our great greasie Tapsters, and fat swelling Ale wives, whose faces are blown as bigge as the froth of their bottle Ale, and their complexion imitating the outside of a Cooks greasie dripping-pan, and you could hardly go round about her in a Summer after-noon." The type represented in Mother Bunch moves, for example, from popular literature into Jonson's Ursula, of *Bartholomew Fair*. This is how Ursula is seen by Justice Overdo, on the one side, and the horse courser Knockem, on the other:

Jus. [Aside] This is the very womb and bed of enormity! Gross, as herself! This must all down for enormity, all, every whit on't. (2, 2, 95-7)

Kno. Thou art such another mad merry Urs still! Troth I do make conscience of vexing thee, now i' the dog-days, this hot weather, for fear of foundering thee i' the body; and melting down a pillar of the Fair. [...] I'll ha' this belly o'thine taken up, and thy grass scoured, wench; (2, 3, 46-51)

Ambivalence charges Justice Overdo's expression *enormity* – used by him in the sense of great social wrong – with the suggestion of Ursula's ponderous size, an idea that is reinforced by his comparison: *gross as herself*. In Knocker's speech, too, the Rabelaisian traits of fat and grease, especially related to the belly, are openly asserted: she may be *foundered in the body* – once again, the play on the verb *founder*, meaning *foundering* [in the body of a horse with a surfeit], and *foundring* [melting down]; if she is *foundred*, Knockem sardonically asserts, a pillar of the Fair may be melted – the pillar made of her belly and the grease all over her, that Knockem threatens to rub off.

Mother Bunch, one of the original popular female characters of Misrule, like Gargantua, embodies in her exuberance the lower bodily life of carnivalized Renaissance, and is reproduced in the dramatic literature of the period in the wonderfully grotesque lower class women, whose lack of education, liberal behaviour and vulgar language highlight the veiled side of feminine reality, since from them and their response to life one can deduce how idealized the “coy mistresses” of elite Renaissance poetry are. In broadsheets, women, after all, had desires.

Such types did certainly exist prior to the sixteenth century. But it is in the Renaissance, with the upsurge of capital, and consequent class mobility, that these characters inhabit the threshold between elite and popular entertainment. Renaissance texts of whatever kind where such figures appear are typical crossroads in the construction and reconstruction of cultural discourses. Like a tennis ball, these dialogical “products” rocket from one point to another, to simultaneously introduce or reinforce ideas and destabilize them. This can be seen, for instance, in the juxtaposition of Mother Bunch and Juliet's nurse, in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*. The similar imagery found in the way they address young girls points to feminine yearnings and doubts, in general, as well as the constraints forced on maids (and maidenheads) by social imperatives. Here is Mother Bunch's advice to young girls, interspersed with guidance on how to discover who will be their future husband, and avoid sexual problems: “those that languish in single sheets till fifteen. I will tell how you shall know and see the persons that shall ease you of the simple thing, so much talked of, called a *Maidenhead*, by him that must be your husband” (apud Spufford 1981: 63). She tells what a girl should do, on St. Agnes Eve and Midsummer Eve, to dream of her future husband, but advises

her to be careful, in case the dream simulates reality too closely: "if he offered to salute thee, do not deny him, but show as much favour to him as thou can; but if he offer to be uncivil to thee, make sure to hold thy Leggs together" (apud Spufford 1981: 62). Or, when she tells a dream she had, on St. Agnes Eve, of her third husband to be, who

was of the Gentle-Craft and he came to me with his Awl in his hand, and would need prick me, aye, and did prick me, but did it not hurt me, for when I awakened out of my dream I was never the worse, but I thought the time very long until he came again, and so will all Maidens do, who have a desire to be married. (apud Spufford 1981: 63)

In act 1, scene 3, of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, when Lady Capulet tells Juliet of Paris's proposal, and ends up saying: "So shall you share all he doth possess, /By having him, making yourself no less," the nurse replies: "No less, nay bigger. Women grow by men." Her erotic innuendos are heard again, in act 2, scene 5, when, back to Juliet, after having told Romeo to meet the girl at Friar Lawrence's cell, and in answer to Juliet's anxious questions, she tells her:

Hie you to church. I must another way  
To fetch a ladder by the which your love  
Must climb a bird's nest soon when it is dark.  
I am the drudge, and toil in your delight,  
But you shall bear the burden soon tonight. (2.5: 72-76)

In the social environment of the English Renaissance, where marital relations are expected to conform to a hierarchy that places man above woman, requiring that she be obedient to her "lord", another popular, often riotous demonstration of attachment to such precept is the riding, or skimmington. *Skimmingtons* (the French *charivaris*) were demonstrations that included large groups, basically of people from the lower social strata, but often supported by members of the gentry and nobility, in which those considered offenders had their houses invaded and/or their sleep disturbed. Large parties would parade the streets, playing pipes and drums, beating pans, ladles and skittles – hence another name for them, *rough music*, due to the noise of the parade. They danced, shouted and performed scenes related to the offensive act, addressing the offenders with bawdy and violent language, and carrying effigies

and symbols representative of the world-upside-down. Skimmingtons would often start as merry-making and end up as violent attacks.

The original causes of these demonstrations were deeds or behaviour considered offensive to society, especially the beating of husbands by their wives, the disturbance created by scolding women, female adultery, racial and ethnic prejudices. On a deeper psychological and social level, though, they were rituals of inversion and destabilization of the socio-political establishment, especially because of their close relationship with one sort of officially promoted parades: the "carting" of bawds, prostitutes, slanderers, and criminals, who were objects of debasement through verbal and physical attacks by the onlookers. The ducking stool, used at the end of some skimmingtons, was an extension of the punishment, once again mostly of women seen as witches, adulteresses, or scolds. An essential feature of skimmingtons was the *riding*, when the ridiculed person, especially the docile husband, or the neighbour who had failed to come to his help during the beating, was forced to go along the streets sitting astride a horse or donkey with his face to the tail which served as the bridle, and followed by a band of riotous men, women and children. Sometimes both husband and wife rode the horse, sitting back to back. Horns were probably the most prominent feature in such symbolism. This ritual served as open ridicule of unobserved social rules, but it simultaneously suggested, in its inversions, transvestism, and the enactment of the impermanence of hierarchical boundaries, the thin thread upholding authority. As Martin Ingram (1984: 96-97) says,

Central to the symbolism of charivaris were notions of hierarchy, inversion, reversal, rule and misrule, order and disorder – the world upside down. The most straightforward explanation of charivaris is that they stigmatized as ridiculous inversions of the "natural" hierarchy. This was clearly true at one level. Yet it is arguable that at a deeper level of psychology these customs reflected a sense of the precariousness or artificiality of that hierarchy; and that the laughter of charivaris bore witness to ambiguities and unresolvable conflicts in the ideal and actual social stratum.

The "unruly woman" and the cuckold of the skimmingtons are transposed to the theatre, often subtly inserted in the plays through suggestions of the symbolism they offer in their oral tradition. The dialogical use of cuckoldry and feminine dominance in

Renaissance texts, especially plays, is easily found. François Laroque deals with Shakespeare's subtlety in echoing the licentiousness and vulgar language of popular expressions, and shows how Iago pictures Othello as a cuckold. Laroque (1993: 287) observes how the representation of the skimmington is transported to the beginning of the play:

The first important festive tradition echoed in *Othello* is that of waking someone up or of creating some public disturbance to protest against a marriage of which the local community disapproved, namely the tradition of charivari, better known in England under the names of 'rough music,' 'Skimmington riding' or 'riding the stang.' Iago probably has this popular custom at the back of his mind when he says to Roderigo at the beginning of the play:

Rouse him, make after him, poison his delight,  
Reclaim him in the streets, incense her kinsmen. (1, 1, 67-69)

Iago's language, as he informs Brabantio of Desdemona's elopement, is charged with the vulgar expressions of the skimmington. An example of such argot is found in his telling Brabantio, in the same scene (1,1,110-12): "you'll have your daughter covered with a barbary horse, you'll have your nephews neigh to you; you'll have coursers for cousins, and gennets for germans."

The cuckold will appear insistently in other plays. Once again, Jonson, in *Volpone*, creates Corvino, the husband who uses his wife to catch the miser's wealth. Hoping to become Volpone's heir, Corvino decides to take Celia, his wife, to lie with the old and supposedly dying miser. As she refuses to comply with his intention, he rails at her, and shows his mind:

Honour? Tut, a breath;  
There's no such thing in nature: a mere term  
Invented to awe fools. What is my gold  
The worse for touching? Clothes, for being looked on?  
Why, this is no more ...  
And for your fame,  
That's such a jig: as if I would go tell it,  
Cry it on the Piazza! Who shall know it?  
But he that cannot speak it; and this fellow,  
Whose lips are i' my pocket: save yourself,  
If you'll proclaim it, you may. I know no other  
Should come to know it. (3, 7, 38-42; 47-52)

The fairs, like the marketplace, were the most outstanding loci for communal expression. They offered chances of entertainment and trade, since all sorts of incidents and exchanges took place in them. It was in the fairs that plays were performed, puppet shows were seen, dances, games, eating and drinking had their turn. It was also in the fairs that men bought and sold cattle, country women offered their vegetables and poultry for sale, city women bargained for them and city gentlemen put on their private shows of fashionable garments to woo their social equals or had a rendez-vous with some prostitute, a meeting arranged by the bawds (like Jonson's Ursula) who might also be selling pigs or other wares. Monstruous or deformed creatures were displayed, peddlers and hawkers brought their ballads, pamphlets, laces, trinkets to the fairs. As Stallybrass and White (1986: 28-29) put it, "the fair, like the marketplace, is neither pure nor outside. The fair is at the crossroads, situated at the intersection of economic and cultural forces, goods and travellers, commodities and commerce."

The Medieval and Renaissance fair is the embodiment of Renaissance dialogism. All sorts of contemporary *texts* were exchanged, parodied, reinforced or subverted in the fairs. They were the crossroads where popular and elite cultures merged, incessantly forming and transforming social, political, and individual values and intentions, generating new discourses, relativizing truths, simultaneously effacing with their multifariousness the boundaries between the existing hierarchical systems. Jonson's dedicatory "Prologue to the King's Majesty", in *Bartholomew Fair*, synthesizes the dialogical character of the fairs, in an encounter of literature, nobles' entertainment and popular pastime, flattery and political manouvres:

Your Majesty is welcome to a Fair;  
 Such place, such men, such language and such ware,  
 You must expect: with these, the zealous noise  
 Of your land's faction, scandalized at toys,  
 As babies, hobby-horses, puppet-plays,  
 And suchlike rage, whereof the petulant ways  
 Yourself have known, and have been vexed long.  
 These for your sport, without particular wrong,  
 Or just complaint of any private man,

(Who of himself, or shall think well or can)  
The maker doth present: and hopes tonight  
To give you for a fairing, true delight.

Renaissance England's various *voices* clash in this text, bringing to light the opposed forces of unilateral zealous puritanism and plurivocal energetic popular expressions; royal entertainment and individual interest (present in the author's intention); promised theatrical performances of the "lower" tradition parodically appropriated in Jonson's "higher" theatre. These *voices* reinstate the system in the very process of relativizing its representations through the dramatization of the essence of the symbolic fair in its *free familiar contact*, and its *world-upside-down*.

Speaking of the market square, the urban reproduction of the rural fair, Stallybrass and White (1986:27) say that "The market square – that epitome of the 'common place' – so definite and comforting in its phenomenological presence at the heart of the community, is only ever an *intersection*, a crossing of ways."

Urban violence and rural festivity, strange and local, high and low, inside and outside meet at this intersection; and probably the best representative of the hybridity of both marketplace and fair is to be found in Tom o'Bedlam. Such a type, duplicating the imitation of real Bedlamites, forms a crossroad where the urban criminal and the rural fake meet and blur the image, so conspicuous all over Renaissance England, where they originated. On the one side, there is the urban Tom o'Bedlam, a criminal permanently haunting the popular imagination. On the other, there is the joyful fake Bedlamite, singing, dancing and asking for alms, who also became part of folk tradition. This jovial Bedlamite is another kind of pseudo-madman, different from the awesome urban type appearing on farms to take food and money from the women when the men were in the fields.

The best known Tom o'Bedlam is one of the most frightening figures of the English underworld, a familiar marginal type originating in the former patients of Bethlehem Hospital, the mental asylum. Thomas Dekker, in his *The Belman of London* (1608), describes in detail the organization and activities of the criminal Tom o'Bedlams. Such men were false types that impersonated the characterization, language and behaviour of the real madmen to rob and steal, scare country women and terrify city dwellers. They usually had a blanket round their waist, were dubbed with tar, and moved around repeating the words "Poor Tom is a'cold."

Such type is highlighted in Shakespeare's *King Lear* through Edgar's transformation. What is noteworthy about Shakespeare's bedlamite is the fact that he, like his model, is built on a lie: Edgar, to escape his father's wrath, puts on his new terrifying role, thus lying to the world. As his reproduction of a false madman is a lie duplicating another lie, the process of the literary creation of the type – and its correspondent idea – is a construction through *mise-en-abîme*, a specular fabric, suggestive of the gay relativity of parodied popular motifs.

To validate his new identity, Edgar/Tom insistently uses the language found in Samuel Harsnett's *Declarations* (1608), a work that aimed to bring to light the fraud practiced by Jesuits, who forced people to behave like lunatics. As madmen were supposed to be possessed of devils, the Jesuits brought these "possessed" people before large audiences, where they conjured up the fiends. In his description of these frauds, Harsnett lists a series of expressions used by the supposed devils as well as their names. As his book was widely known, the parodic use made of its contents by Shakespeare, together with reversed passages and expressions from the Bible, endows Edgar's characterization with traits of folk culture, at the same time parodically relativizing the "true" word, that is, both the Bible and Harsnett's widely read book.

As a foil to Edgar/Tom, there is the insane Lear, who subtly appears as another kind of Tom o'Bedlam, the one often seen in the most striking public/folk site: the fair. This other Tom o'Bedlam, different from his frightening companion, was an exuberant, lively type. In *Bedlam*, Anthony Masters (1977) describes him as a fake Tom who appeared in fairs and markets, gorgeously dressed and wearing a garland of flowers and weeds, sounding a horn, dancing, singing, jesting and asking for alms.

Compare this description to how Cordelia paints Lear:

As mad as the vex'd sea; singing aloud;  
Crown'd with rank fumiter and furrow-weeds,  
With burdocks, hemlock, nettles, cuckoo-flowers,  
Darnell, and all the idle weeds that grow  
In our sustaining corn. (4. 4: 2-6)

The presence, in the play, of this other type of Tom o'Bedlam allows for the passage from the image of the king-to-be to the desacralized image of the past king, now turned into a carnival king,

embodying suggestions of joyful relativity, eccentricity, and the world-upside-down. On the stage, that is, in elite culture, there is the appearance of a type from popular imagery that destabilizes the cultural discourse assimilating it at the same time that it illustrates the movement of cultures, showing how weak or impossible the separation between them is.

As Mary Ellen Lamb (2000:280) says, after Louis Montrose, “collective social structures within early modern England were experienced by the subjects as ‘multiple, heterogeneous and even contradictory’; early modern theater in particular had within itself ‘the capacity to produce heterodoxy’ even within the ‘context of absolutist ideology’”. What better example of theatre produced heterodoxy than the use Shakespeare makes, in *King Lear*, of duplicated lies, contradictory images taken from the popular imaginary – the two opposed Tom o’Bedlams – to simultaneously reinforce and destabilize, on different discursive levels, the dominant ideology?

The type running from Cordelia’s envoys who come to take him to his daughter, in act 4, scene 6, is a tragicomic creation, incorporating the transmutations typical of cultural movements. Like mad Tom, Lear transgresses the norms and engenders new texts that will destabilize the power of both socio-political hierarchy and “high” culture.

Edward O’Donoghue (1914: 135) thus talks of the Tom o’Bedlam of the fairs:

Imagine him – to give the last touch to the picture – carolling with a calculated disregard of simple arithmetic:  
Of thirty years have I twice twenty been engaged,  
And of forty thrice fifteen been caged.  
Oh! The lordly lofts of Bedlam with stubble and dainty:  
Brave bracelets strong,  
And whips ding-dong,  
And wholesome hunger plenty.  
Yet do I sing – any food, any feeding, drink or clothing.  
Come, dame or maid,  
Be not afraid!  
Poor Tom will injure nothing.

In act 4, scene 6, Lear uses similar language, when he talks of his suffering – as Tom of the fairs does, referring to Bedlam Hospital – and then addresses the apothecary:

There's hell, there's darkness,  
There's the sulphurous pit,  
Burning, scalding, stench, consumption; fie, fie, fie! pah! –  
Give me an ounce of civet; good apothecary, sweeten my  
imagination; There's money for thee. (121-123)

In these two passages, even the order of ideas is the same: first comes the request (“Give me an ounce of civet” / “any food, any feeding, drink or clothing”); then both address someone (“good apothecary” / “dame or maid”); and finally there is the outcome (“there's money for thee” / “Poor Tom will injure nothing”).

The playwright, with his duplication of Bedlamites, recreates the environment of the fair and of the underworld of Renaissance England. Interspersed with this duplication, one has the representation of reversed gender hierarchy (so frequent in folkloric figures such as Long Meg and Maid Marion), in the parallel characterization of the “unruly women” (Goneril and Reagan), and the self asserting female (Cordelia); the world-upside-down in family relations, as represented in the Edmund/Gloucester and Cordelia/Lear affairs, highlighting the image of the fool, an enlightened being who occupies the ambiguous position of no sense and mystical vision, as it was perceived at the time. In *King Lear*, Shakespeare produces a portrait of his society that, borrowing from “low” culture, assimilates it to the “higher” culture of the theatre, and ambiguously reinforces/debases the political *status quo*, in the loan of marginal fake madness as embodiment of both past and future sovereignty. Popular culture becomes elite entertainment and elite entertainment speaks through the voices of popular culture.

The exchange of ideas, images, values, symbolism between popular tradition, be it written like what was seen in pamphlets and chapbooks, or oral and performatic, like pageantry, royal progresses and public festivals – and elite entertainments like the private theatre, masques and court dances so often reproduced or referred to in the plays, illustrates the hybrid multiplicity of social, political and artistic discourses characteristic of Renaissance England. As Burke has noted, some of the folk entertainments, like dances, were appropriated by the court and, after the rising “middling sort” have also started assimilating them, discarded and then often reappropriated by the folk. There is no linear movement in the appropriations then taking place. There is rather a blurred mapping

of representations: sometimes overt, sometimes subtle borrowing and lending, the ambiguous speech and conspicuous relativization of the dominant political, religious or artistic hierarchies.

The life and sounds of Renaissance England, through its festivals, skimmingtons, chapbooks and masques, its royal speeches, pageants and progresses, its theatre with the parodic displays of relativized moral, pomp, and circumstance, where the Player Queen/King and the Queen/King Player merge while multiplying the representations of the commoner's world, have been reenacted for centuries, with their ebullient crowning and decrowning of truth and constant erasing and rearrangement of hierarchical boundaries. Such representations offer a spectacle worth Cleopatra's ambiguous exclamation, when dying Antony is being lifted up to her monument, in act 4, scene 15: "Here's sport, indeed!"

#### References

- Bakhtin, M. 1985 (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. C. Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. 1984 (1981). *Rabelais and his World*. Ed. M. Holquist. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Burke, P. 1989. *Cultura popular na Idade Moderna*. Trans. D. Bottman. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Dekker, T. 1608. *The Belman of London; Bringing to Light the Most Notorious Villanies that are Now Practised in the Kingdome*. London: Nathaniel Butter.
- Harsnett, S. 1603. *A Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures, to Withdraw the Hearts of Her Maiesties Subjects from their Allegiance, and from the Truth of Christian Religion Professed in England, under the Pretence of Casting out Devils*. London: James Roberts.
- Hayes, T. 1992. *The Birth of Popular Culture: Ben Jonson, Maid Marion and Robin Hood*. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Duquesne University Press.
- Ingram, M. 1984. "Ridings, Rough Music and the 'Reform of Popular Culture' in Early Modern England." *Past and Present*. 105: 79-113.
- Jonson, B. 1989 (1981, 1988). "Bartholomew Fair." Ed. G.A. Wilkes. *Five Plays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 483-604.
- Jonson, B. 1989 (1981, 1988). "Volpone." Ed. G.A. Wilkes. *Five Plays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 219-348.
- Lamb, M.E. 2000. "Taken by the Fairies: Fairy Practices and the Production of Popular Culture in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 51/3: 277-312.
- Laroque, F. 1993. *Shakespeare's Festive World: Elizabethan Seasonal Entertainment and the Professional Stage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Marcus, L.S. 1988. *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and its Discontents*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Marcus, L.S., J. Mueller and M.B. Rose 2000. *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Masters, A. 1977. *Bedlam*. London: Michael Joseph.
- O'Donoghue, E.G. 1914. *The Story of Bethlehem Hospital; from its Foundation in 1247*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.
- Shakespeare, W. 1974. *King Lear*. Ed. G.B. Evans. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1249-1305.
- Shakespeare, W. 1974. *Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. G.B. Evans. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1055-1099.
- Spufford, M. 1981. *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in Seventeenth-century England*. London: Methuen.
- Stallybrass, P. 1985. "'Drunk with the cup of liberty': Robin Hood, the Carnavalesque, and the Rhetoric of Violence in Early Modern England." *Semiotica* 54/1-2: 113-145.
- Stallybrass, P. and A. White 1986. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. London: Methuen.
- 

*Author's address:*

Rua Guaxupé, 355 · Serra – 30. 220-320 Belo Horizonte · Minas Gerais · Brasil  
aimara@terra.com.br

# Country wives and country girls in eighteenth-century England. A history of theatrical rewriting<sup>1</sup>

Purificación RIBES  
*University of València*

## ABSTRACT

This paper covers a span of fifty years in the reception of Wycherley's masterpiece, his *Country Wife*. This play has been chosen for study because its linguistic and thematic features made it scarcely eligible as a stage piece for the increasingly prudish and good-hearted audiences that attended the playhouse during the second half of the eighteenth century. The challenge that its rewriting posed on playwrights was not small, taking into account that the piece's most outstanding features are its employment of witty language and its cynic approach to the relationship between the sexes. This paper focusses on the different processes of theatrical appropriation undergone by *The Country Wife* in response to the changing demands of audiences. A number of editions attributed to John Lee (1765, 1786) and David Garrick (1766, 1777, 1808, 1819) have been closely read bearing in mind their theatrical nature. Finally, the analysis of metatextual items has proved a valuable tool to check the mutual relationship between text and performance that was characteristic of the period.

KEYWORDS: country wife, eighteenth century, reception

## 1. Introduction

The aim of the present article is to cast light on the complex and fascinating history of the dramatic appropriation of Wycherley's masterpiece, his *Country Wife*, during the second half of the eighteenth century.

The changes in the expectations of audiences,<sup>2</sup> particularly after 1750, are considered as the main factor leading not only to John Lee's hypertextual transformation of Wycherley's *The Country Wife*

---

<sup>1</sup> Research for this contribution has been funded by a grant from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Technology (ref. no. BBF 2003-06096).

<sup>2</sup> In the sense of Hans Robert Jauss's *Erwartungshorizont*, as developed in his *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft* (1970).

in 1765 but also to Garrick's theatrical rewriting of the play as *The Country Girl* in 1766. Attention is paid to the thematic and formal characteristics of their versions that, in the case of Lee, fulfil the requirements of *reform comedy*, whereas in that of Garrick, they fit into the pattern of *romantic comedies*.

An illuminating number of paratextual and metatextual items<sup>3</sup> are taken into consideration in order better to understand not only the reasons that led both to Lee's and Garrick's rewritings of Wycherley's text but also as a means of assessing the kind of reception that their theatrical versions encountered at the playhouse. The specific characteristics of the period with its strong theatrical monopoly account for the added importance that extralinguistic features had both as the source of rewritings and as a means of mentally picturing what their actual performance could have been like.

At this period, more than at any other time in the history of British Drama, playscripts were a mere pre-text for their staging. The reason lay in the limited number of plays that were licensed for performance, so that the same plays, whose characteristics had made them earn the status of canonical, were staged over and over again. This single fact explains why the performance of actors and actresses attracted so much attention on the part of editors, critics and audiences alike, to the extent that their presence could be used to justify a new rewriting of a text, as in the case of Garrick's 1766 version,<sup>4</sup> or to turn a deficient script into a successful theatrical event, as was the case with Mrs. Jordan's outstanding performance of Garrick's leading role in his 1785 revival of the play.

---

<sup>3</sup> In the sense given to the terms by Gérard Genette (1982 and 1987)

<sup>4</sup> Garrick, well aware of the centrality of actors in the theatre of his day, gave as the main reason for his 1766 adaptation of the *Country Wife* the fact that an actress, Miss Reynolds, was available to perform the part of the female protagonist: "The desire of shewing Miss Reynolds to Advantage, was the first motive for attempting an alteration of Wycherley's *Country Wife*." Playbills equally echoed their importance, and, on this particular occasion, the play was advertised by indicating that Garrick himself had "taken many pains in teaching Miss Reynolds, who was approved by the public in his character." This view, however, was not universally shared, as *The London Chronicle* stated in November 11-13, 1766: "*Miss Reynolds does not appear to that advantage in this piece she could in many others.*" And it goes on to assert that she was a "raw and inexperienced actress". The same viewpoint was shared by Thomas Davies (1780: II, 121), who was of the opinion that "*Miss Reynolds, though not deficient in merit, neither in age, person, or look could pretend to be the innocent and simple lass of sixteen.*"

The long lasting theatrical monopoly was also responsible for the high number of acting editions in free circulation during the period<sup>5</sup>. It is this particular circumstance that has made it possible for a good number of editions to reach us, which has allowed a fuller insight into the different processes of theatrical appropriation undergone by *The Country Wife*. A close analysis of significant editions attributed to John Lee (1765, 1786) and David Garrick (1766, 1777, 1808, 1819) has been supplemented with valuable information from a series of playbills which, again, has confirmed our sense of the mutual dependence between text and performance at this period. At the same time it has increased our awareness of the unfixed nature of texts, which were living and changeable objects whose exact nature cannot be determined.<sup>6</sup>

## 2. John Lee's *The Country Wife* (1765)

John Lee's 1765 version of *The Country Wife* was undoubtedly written to meet the new expectations of mid-eighteenth century audiences, that no longer favoured Wycherley's play.<sup>7</sup> As a matter of fact, 12 years had gone by since it was last performed in London, and, although reading editions of the play were still in circulation,<sup>8</sup> its witty and crude dialogue was no longer fashionable on stage. In addition, there was an increasing demand for mixed entertainments that included songs and dances,<sup>9</sup> which involved the shortening of

---

<sup>5</sup> They were so popular that, according to J. Stone Peters (2000:49-50), it was a common practice for mid-century theater goers to take their pocket editions (usually published in 8<sup>vo</sup>) with them to the theatre.

<sup>6</sup> The fact that texts were constantly changed in reply to the demands of audiences makes it difficult to decide what kind of performances could have been derived from a particular script. Stern (2000: 286) goes as far as to say that, during the period under consideration, "An audience might, as a result of actor's revision, never see a play as written at all."

<sup>7</sup> As the *Thespian Dictionary* (1805) points out, the reason why *the Country Wife* was dropped from the stage in 1753 was that "it was then unpalatable to the public taste." Cfr. Gray (1931) for a more detailed analysis of the change of attitude towards stock plays during the 1750s and 1760s.

<sup>8</sup> As a matter of fact, there was a sharp distinction between stage and press censorship at the time, which, according to Kinservik (2001: 42), would find its peak during the years of the Exclusion crisis and the Popish plot, that is to say, between 1678 and 1683.

<sup>9</sup> The demand for a variety of entertainments in the same evening, that was already fashionable at the beginning of the century, was often taken to be a helpful means of attracting audiences towards plays that would have otherwise proven unpopular because of their complexity. Emmett L. Avery (1934: 418) in his seminal study on the increasing importance of this varied type of spectacle, went as far as to suggest that it

plays as a means of avoiding too long theatrical evenings. That is why Lee turned Wycherley's play into a two-act afterpiece, that was staged on the 26<sup>th</sup> of April 1765 preceded by *the Winter's Tale*, and followed, first, by a piece of *dancing*, and, then, by *Tambourine*.

Fortunately, Lee's accommodation to the requirements of his age, which did not tolerate either lengthy plays or eccentric characters, did not prevent his retaining a certain degree of wit in his first rewriting of Wycherley's *The Country Wife*.

He succeeded in reducing its running time without losing the play's clarity of plot. In addition, changes in the course of action were so carefully motivated that the behaviour of characters proved natural.

The audience was therefore offered a play with an amiable tone and a happy ending, that perfectly suited the times. As compared with Wycherley's, it removed the coarsest of the three plots, where Horner, pretending to be impotent, had free access to a number of respectable women, who thus took revenge on their loveless husbands.

As regards the second plot, he basically maintained its romantic quality, that led to the final marriage between Harcourt and Alithea, who broke the engagement her brother Pinchwife had previously arranged with the fop Sparkish.

Even though the argument is basically the same as in Wycherley, Lee improves its structure by taking special care of anticipating changes in the course of action. In his adaptation, Alithea's change of mind regarding the identity of her future husband no longer comes as a surprise to the audience, since they have been allowed to share in her most inner thoughts, as revealed in the monologue that she delivers before breaking her engagement with Sparkish. There Alithea comes to the conclusion that she has no need to marry a fop whom she does not love and who does not care about her. Unlike in Wycherley, Alithea gives Harcourt some hints that allow him to expect a favourable change. Finally, Sparkish is also allowed to guess what his lot is going to be, as he tells Pinchwife when he speaks of his pending *fracas*.

Anticipation is also taken good care of in the other argument that Lee borrows from Wycherley, though, in this case, he introduces

---

could even eclipse the main piece: "Entertainments seemed frequently to dominate the comedy or tragedy with which they were presented."

important changes into it. The more moderate tone of the play does not allow the rake (Dorilant instead of Horner in this case) to awaken Margery to the pleasures of the town as thoroughly as in Wycherley. Even though he approaches her in the theatre, nothing serious happens, since Pinchwife never loses sight of her long enough for anything to occur. In Lee's first version, Margery is not taken to the theatre in male attire, so that she has no chance of disappearing with the rake she meets on her way to the playhouse, and neither is she later delivered to him under somebody else's disguise (Alithea's).

But even though Margery is not allowed to savour town life completely, she still gets to discover the glamour of its gallants, that strongly attract her. Her innocence leads her, as in Wycherley, to reveal her husband what her feelings towards Dorilant (Horner in Wycherley) are. As in Wycherley, Pinchwife is an old, jealous husband, but here he handles both his wife and his sister less roughly, in line with the end of this plot, that Lee modifies to please a good-hearted audience.

Pinchwife, unlike in Wycherley, admits that he is to blame for the unequal nature of his marriage, since it has been his own device to marry a woman his junior by thirty years. He movingly admits: "How could I reasonably expect happiness, when *I was destitute of every requisite that should form it? Similitude of years, tempers, manners;* and in short, all the qualities that can endear a heart, and warm it into love!"<sup>10</sup> But, since it is now too late to change this state of affairs, his sister suggests him to allow his wife a greater degree of freedom,<sup>11</sup> and, especially, to provide her with innocent entertainments that might prevent more dangerous ones. Alithea says:

Would you be happy together? Take my advice? *Release her from her bondage; let her associate with the innocent and sensible of both sexes; and improve that mind, which has hitherto been too un-informed, to*

---

<sup>10</sup> This same view had already been voiced in 1683 (Anonymous, 1683: 48) by "A person of quality of the female sex" who said: "Never let him [an old husband] be disquieted at what his young brisk and dissatisfied wife does, when *he is the only occasion of all she does himself.*" And blames him for inflicting great suffering upon his wife: "If an old Hunks without life or vigour, have such an inclination to leachery, ... let him not go about to *make a young* and better-deserving *Gentlewoman's life miserable* and loathsome to her, where she expects her greater felicity and enjoyment."

<sup>11</sup> This very idea is also stressed in the anonymous (1683: 34) *Fifteen real comforts of matrimony*, where its author says: "Men do not marry to bury their wives alive in a house ... And a man had better be *over-indulgent to his wife in point of liberty*, than be accounted her Jaylor."

defend itself from the attacks of its own passions, or from those of others.

Lee, thus, adapts his plot to the requirements of *reform comedy*, greatly favoured by his audience,<sup>12</sup> and, by taking good care of anticipating changes in the behaviour of its characters, he transforms the play into a coherent whole, where Wycherley's three arguments with different views on love and marriage are brought down to two, that share an optimistic view of human nature. The greater scope that Lee allows to the development of his characters provides a fuller motivation for both plots.

At the same time, Lee's version meets his audience's demand for a convincing moral tone. He succeeds in achieving it through the employment of devices that somewhat differ from those that Garrick would resort to a few months later, since, whereas the development of Lee's characters as shown on stage is the clearest proof of the plausibility of their statements, Garrick's abridged presentation of them makes their behaviour appear sudden and unexpected. An extreme example of this way of dealing with character presentation affects Alithea's change of mind regarding her own marriage, that, unlike in Lee, is not prepared for by means of a suitable monologue. Whereas in Lee Alithea realizes that the match her brother has arranged for her is unsavory and unfair: "Why do I make such a sacrifice to the will, or rather, avarice of a brother? ... where lies the justice ... in giving away my person without my heart?",<sup>13</sup> her change of attitude towards Sparkish comes unexpectedly in Garrick, because, all of a sudden, she breaks up her engagement with Sparkish and replaces her stubborn decision of marrying a fop she does not love with a sneering handling of him. As a matter of fact, Sparkish's report of her reaction widely differs from Alithea's behaviour in Lee's version:

---

<sup>12</sup> Lee's essential quality, as pointed out by Stuart Tave (1960) in regard to the comedies they favoured, was their belief in the tractability of human nature. This gave rise to *Reform Comedy* as an eighteenth century subgenre that replaced *contemptuous* (Wycherley's) with *sympathetic laughter* (Lee's).

<sup>13</sup> A similar concern is expressed by a "Sorrowful and Afflicted Daughter" (Anonymous 1687: 7) in a letter addressed to her Parents "that would have her Matched to one whom she cannot Love": "but if you do resolve that I shall Marry, let it be to one that I can love, or to my Grave, be not over ruled by the thoughts of Avarice."

She walk'd up within pistol-shot of the church, then twirl'd round upon her heel, *call'd me every name* she could think of; and when she had exhausted her imagination, and tired her tongue ... she *sent her footman to buy a monkey* before my face, then *bid me good morrow with a sneer*, and left us with our mouths open in the middle of a hundred people. [my italics]

Lee's depiction of Alithea as a sensible character had made her suitable to voice the moral message of the play, that, unlike Garrick's, openly reflects on the state of marriage. Lee therefore replaces Wycherley's crude satire on marriage<sup>14</sup> with a milder kind of criticism that ends up in a tone of hope, as revealed by Alithea's words to her brother at the end of the play:

---

<sup>14</sup> Barbara Kachur's (2004: 152) conclusion on the type of criticism that Wycherley's *The Country Wife* makes is particularly sound. According to her, "Wycherley was neither championing women's rights nor advocating adultery, but he did, however, examine male-female relationships in marriage through a lens that viewed *husbands as the oppressors ... and the wives as rebels who resist tyranny*." This unequal situation was sometimes verbalized during the period, as Mary Astell acknowledges in her *Essay of Marriage* (1696). Hers is not the attitude of the rebel who openly tries to subvert the prevailing situation but, even though a tone of moderation is characteristic of her statements, she nevertheless lets her voice be clearly heard in her advices to naive ladies who are looking forward to getting married. To start with, she reminds her readers (1696: 2) that "the Laws of God and Nations have given *man the supreme authority in marriage*", which she does not question, though she recommends wives to bear it with resignation, and she warns young ladies (1696: 1) that marriage is seldom the blessed state they often imagine: "Those that are in extraordinary haste for a settlement, (as they call it) do commonly Advance their Expectation of Happiness, much beyond what they have Possessed in a Single Life, and many times *the Imaginary Heaven proves a Hell*." This situation was more than once the outcome of economic interests in matches, particularly during the Restoration, when many families tried to recover part of their estates by this means. As P.F. Vernon (1962: 370-387) has interestingly argued, playwrights showed their disagreement with this situation by means of their plays, and, instead of championing a libertine code of behaviour, they often resisted a marriage of economic convenience, while supporting the ideal of a mutually satisfying relationship that made a happy and lasting marriage possible. Voices could be heard for and against the relevance of economic concerns for future married couples. Whereas Francis Osborne (1655: 57) quite cynically advises his son to look for a good portion in a wife: "As the fertility of the ensuing yeare is guessed at, by the height of the river Nilus, so *by the greatnesse of a wives portion may much of the future conjugal happinesse be calculated*", others (Anon. 1683: 41) consider those grounds to be degradating: "He that *marries a wife for the portions sake, buys a Concubine*, does not marry a wife." In their view (Anon. 1683: 19), "Lawful matrimony ... [can only be] the effect of *choice and mature consideration of the mutual temper and affection of both parties*."

No more let anxious doubts o'er love preside,  
But generous confidence be virtue's guide!  
Those wives are chastest, whom indulgence charms,  
Those husbands happiest, whom no fear alarms.

### 3. Garrick's *The Country Girl* (1766)

Garrick proves less interested in delivering a moral message to his audience than in offering them a play with a happy ending. That is what leads him to give a romantic bias to Margery's plot, that no longer deals with the problems of a married couple, as it had done both in *Wycherley* and in *Lee*. Margery, who is called *Peggy* in Garrick's version,<sup>15</sup> is given a true opportunity of leading a happy life, since she is only engaged to Pinchwife, but has not married him yet. At the same time, the man approaching her (Belville) is no longer a rake (Horner in *Wycherley*; Dorilant in *Lee*) with no intention of starting a lasting relationship with her, but a tender youth who immediately falls in love with Margery and ends up marrying her. Garrick, moreover, underlines the happy ending of the play by having Peggy exclaim: "I'm for always loving like a fool!" This final romantic note no doubt contributed to the play's long popularity on stage, since it suited the tastes of eighteenth and nineteenth century audiences alike.

The play's dénouement, moreover, symbolically epitomized the diminished importance of wit that pervaded both the theatre and daily life, since in Garrick's version a well bred youth (Belville) is ready to share his life with an uncultivated, good looking country wench (Peggy). In addition, the lack of sophistication in both characters allows the playwright to dispense with any kind of verbal wit that might have baffled his audience.

It is good feelings, and, above all, sound morality, that seems to have been in favour among audiences. As a result, absence of wit proved no obstacle to the success of Garrick's (1766) version of *Wycherley*'s most accomplished Comedy of Wit. The reason lay in the fact that the greatest part of the new audience was not highly

---

<sup>15</sup> By choosing this name for the character, Garrick tries to make his audience aware of the relationship his version bears to *Wycherley*'s play. As Hans and Hodges' (1996) entry reads, *Peggy* is an "English variant of *Maggie*, or the obsolete *Meggie*, both pet forms of *Margaret*."

intellectual,<sup>16</sup> but merely squeamish about morals, and was, therefore, ready to favour dull plays over "immoral" ones.<sup>17</sup>

Playwrights were so fully aware of this fact, that they even voiced it in the prefaces to their plays. The editor of Garrick's (1808) edition of *The Country Girl*, for example, gives the "alterer's endeavour to clear one of our most celebrated comedies from immorality and obscenity" as the main reason for his re-writing of "neer half of the play". Aware that it is no longer as comical as it used to be, he justifies its lack of wit on moral grounds. As he acknowledges in the *Prefatory Remarks* (1808:5), the play has been "expunged of those parts of it, which probably were thought the most entertaining in the age when it was written, but which an improved taste delicately rejects."

It is worth noting that his arguments closely resemble those that Collier had used to attack the Restoration stage around the turn of the previous century. According to him (1698: 161), "To make delight the main Business of Comedy is an unreasonable and dangerous Principle. It opens the way to all Licentiousness, and confounds the distinction between Mirth and Madness." Moreover, by privileging delight over instruction, "the Marks of Honour and Infamy are Misapplied, and the idea's of Virtue and Vice Confounded" (1698: 145).

But his view, which did not have an immediate effect on the repertory of theatres,<sup>18</sup> was completely imbedded into the new plays

---

<sup>16</sup> This was evidenced, for example, in their reaction to Jonson's *Volpone*, whose language they found difficult. Cfr. Horace Walpole's (1798, ii: 315) assessment of the play, written sometime between 1775 and 1786, although collected for publication in 1798 as *Thoughts on Comedy*: "*Volpone* is faulty in the moral, and too elevated in the dialogue." Around the same time, Thomas Davies (1783, ii: 98) stressed the high degree of complexity that the play had for average theatergoers, so that, according to him: "*Few, except the learned, can perfectly understand it.*"

<sup>17</sup> As a matter of fact, the number of testimonies in favour of a kind of entertainment that could expose vice and promote virtue was on the increase, as Emmett L. Avery, among others, has underlined (1942: 141-142). The testimony he quotes from the *Public Ledger* (September 25, 1765) is revealing of the moral climate that gave rise to a wave of rewritings of Restoration dramas, which resorted to the concept of 'utility' as an euphemistic term for encouraging such changes. The text reads as follows: "In real utility, I shall not hesitate to give the poets of the present hour a considerable superiority. *Wycherley, Etheridge, and their contemporaries*, were possessed of parts rather brilliant than useful ... hence decency and good sense were continually sacrificed to an ill-timed emanation of vivacity."

<sup>18</sup> Cfr. Calhoun Winton (1974) for a detailed view of the scarce impact that the Collier Controversy had on repertory offerings up to 1710.

and adaptations that audiences were ready to tolerate at the turn of the following century. Mrs. Inchbald's (1808) edition of the play thus remarked that "no kind of wit ought to be received as an excuse for immorality" and she added: "nay, it becomes still more dangerous in proportion as it is more witty." In the same way, Oxberry's (1819) edition of the play unabashedly acknowledged: "there is not perhaps much wit or humour in the dialogue" but he tried to make up for this minor fault by saying that it was "entertaining".

It is true that in Garrick's version we find neither Wycherley's unbeatable instances of witty repartee, nor Lee's more restrained passages of ingenious use of language, but, even though he does not provide his audience with scenes as funny as those offered by Lee, he is careful enough to write some scenes that afford pleasurable moments to his audience.

Garrick does not have as witty a character as Lee's Alitheia, who delights the audience by means of her use of verbal ambiguity. For example, when standing by her groom before a fake priest (Harcourt in disguise), she tells him about the priest he is expecting to marry them: "I now confess that that gentleman may marry one of us, but he shall never marry both," thus hinting to the fact that the "priest" is no other than her beloved.

He neither presents them with a scene as hilarious as that where Lee has Sparkish collect and read the letter that Pinchwife has brought Dorilant from his own wife, and that he despisingly throws away. Unlike in Wycherley, Lee does not have Horner read the letter to himself and discover that Pinchwife has been outwitted by a resourceful wife who has written a love letter instead of a nasty farewell note, but has Sparkish read it aloud to a whole assembly of characters who delight in Pinchwife's deserved humiliation.

This is precisely one of the scenes that Garrick takes dramatic advantage of in order to make his play "entertaining". There are, however, substantial differences as regards theatricality, for Lee's exhilarating scene is toned down to a more restrained kind of humour that avoids Pinchwife's (Moody's) public exposure.<sup>19</sup> In Garrick's version the contents of Peggy's love letter are silently read by Belville, who slyly asks Moody to tell its author that he will obey her in everything. The dramatic irony lies in the fact that Moody

---

<sup>19</sup> This change is in line with the deliberate avoidance of caricature in the play as contrary to the ideal of naturalness in character portrayal: "*there is much whim but no caricature ... the characters are natural and well discriminating.*"

thinks his obedience consists in never seeing her again, whereas the audience is aware that Peggy has asked Belville to marry her.

This dramatic irony is enhanced at the end of the play, when Moody stands before Belville's house in the belief that he is marrying his sister Alithea, whom he has escorted there. Only too late does he realize that it is not his sister, but Peggy in her clothes, that he has brought to Belville's house for marriage.

The action reaches a melodramatic peak when, on the way to Belville's house, Sparkish, heavily drunk, approaches the couple, and, deceived by Peggy's disguise, tries to remove the veil that covers her face. He regrets Moody's lack of honourability in giving his fiancée's hand to somebody else, but Moody is in a hurry to have Belville marry Alithea, so as to make sure that he does not marry Peggy. All his efforts, however, prove to be vain, to Sparkish's delightful discovery. He cannot hide his inner satisfaction when he spots Harcourt coming along with Alithea, and introducing her to them as Mrs. Harcourt. It is no matter that he has lost Alithea, for he did not care much about her. What he finds satisfying, and partly compensates for his loss, is the punishment that Moody receives in kind for his lack of scruples.

He relishes stating Moody's astonishment when he finds out the truth about Belville's marriage. When he knocks at his door in despair, a servant calmly asks him to wait until his orders have been completely obeyed by his master. (Moody had asked him to do as told in Peggy's letter.)

But even though the play includes some funny scenes like this, it always takes good care to keep it within respectable bounds. That is why the play does not end in a riotous note, but allows space for Peggy's brief justification of her behaviour. She points out that Moody's present disappointment is to be preferred before future suffering that would ensue from a loveless match: " 'twas honest to deceive him./ More virtuous sure to cheat him than to grieve him."

Although Lee's (1765) careful and dramatically effective adaptation successfully held the stage for a number of years,<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Starting in April, 1765 and continuing up to November, 1782. It was staged five times in 1765, and then retired from the stage while Garrick's version was performed during 1766 (15 times) and 1767 (3 times). It returned in 1768 (9 performances), when Garrick's adaptation was only performed twice. They continued to be staged simultaneously during 1769 (twice Lee, against four times Garrick) Lee's version then gave way to Garrick from 1771 to 1775 (a total of 7 performances). And the situation was reversed from 1776 to 1782, when only Lee's version was performed, first with

Garrick's 1766 version would be later preferred, probably due to its more romantic tone as well as to the extreme care that he had taken to free the text from any potential term of abuse. Garrick's text was not as comical as that by Lee, but it still retained a part of humour, and even though his characters were not as fully developed and the changes in the course of action were less motivated, the play still retained a simplicity of plot and a double happy ending that fulfilled the audience's expectation of spending an agreeable evening in a variety show, where this play was but a small part of the whole.<sup>21</sup>

#### 4. From Garrick's (1785) *The Country Girl* to Lee's (1786) *The Country Wife*

John Lee's (1786) version of the play shows all the signs of haste, and the reason openly lies in the wish not to let escape a promising theatrical market that the recent revival of Garrick's version a few months earlier (Drury Lane, October 18th, 1785 ) had opened up, after a 12 year absence of the play from the stage.<sup>22</sup>

This version, however, surprisingly contrasts with the effective adaptation John Lee had made of the play in 1765, which could not be equalled by Garrick's (1766) version, in spite of which, there is a rhetorical apology in Lee's text for any misprints or errors that might have unwillingly appeared, due to the haste of preparing an edition

---

notable success (13 performances in the season 1776-77), then less so (only one performance in 1779 and 1782, respectively). It is worth noticing that a new edition of Garrick's adaptation was precisely issued in 1777, that is to say, during Lee's most successful season (1776-1777), in spite of the fact that Garrick's text was then absent from the stage. And it is somewhat surprising to spot a significant mistake in the title page, for, instead of *The Country Girl*, which was the title Garrick had given to his own version, it reads as *The Country Wife*, which corresponds to Lee's title. This printing error can be taken as a mere accident or, maybe, as an intentional means on Garrick's side of not wholly disappearing from the theatrical arena, precisely when the text of his competitor was being acclaimed on the stage.

<sup>21</sup> The playbill of its première in Drury Lane, October, 25, 1766, announced that it was to be followed by *The Lying Varlet*, and, two days later, it shared evening with *The Devil is in Him*.

<sup>22</sup> According to the advertisement in the playbills, the play "had not been acted these 12 years," and they specify December, 16th, as the last date. *The London Stage*, however, records another performance that took place the following year, on March, 7th. Garrick's adaptation enjoyed 21 performances since October 18th, 1785 until December 29th, 1786, to be followed by another eleven stagings in 1787 whereas Lee's adaptation, although it proved equally successful during 1786, with a total 11 performances, took its final leave from the stage the following year, when it was only performed once (Covent Garden, February 17th).

on occasion of a benefit night.<sup>23</sup> Lee's (1786) edition, curiously enough, emends the scarce errors found in the sections of the text taken from his first version,<sup>24</sup> only to leave visible mistakes in the remaining part of the script, where a careless combination is attempted between parts of his adaptation and some scenes from Garrick's version.

Garrick's interest in tightening up the action<sup>25</sup> in reply to the tastes of his audience had led him to bring the characters from both plots together in a number of scenes. An interesting case is the "park scene," that Garrick adapts from Wycherley. In his version, Peggy is allowed to go out, disguised as a boy, so as to go unrecognised. Male characters, as in Wycherley, see through her disguise and approach her accordingly, although they handle her more gently.<sup>26</sup> Peggy, instead of being kissed and moused by all rakes at hand, is given a chaste kiss by a promising youth who falls in love with her. When left on their own, Belville, instead of making love to her, gently asks her to marry him.

---

<sup>23</sup> "The following scenes, being intended for a Representation upon a Benefit Night Only, were compil'd with so much haste and inaccuracy, that several mistakes in the copy were obliged to be rectified. (See the subjoin'd Errata)."

<sup>24</sup> Such as "Ned" for "Frank" or "to-morrow" for "this morning."

<sup>25</sup> Cfr. the prefatory remarks to the 1819 edition of the play, where it is stated that "the incidents are not numerous, but to make amends are *compacted into a whole*." And it adds: "The two parts of the plot are so *well linked together*, and so *intimately connected* that it is not very easy at first to distinguish the double fictions." It looks as though there was an evident interest on the part of the editor to underline the dramatic correctness of the version, that seemed to fit the rules listed by Edmund Burke in *The Reformer* (Nr. 2, February 4, 1748). The third of these rules was precisely "to conduct the Fable so *all the parts seem to depend one on another*, and center in the Conclusion as in a point." This rule, like the ones related to the "propriety" of characters and to the moral aim of the piece, that Avery (1944: 146-147) fittingly highlighted as influential in mid-century drama ("By mid-century Burke's views were those of a greater and often a more influential body of people") seems to have enjoyed a long-lasting life, as the (1819) edition of Garrick's version proves.

<sup>26</sup> It should be remembered, however, that this type of scenes continued to be popular on stage, and Garrick's première in 1785 had benefitted from the performance of a promising actress, who would excel in "breeches parts." Although this was Mrs. Jordan's début in Drury Lane, she was immediately successful. Mrs. Inchbald's (1808) edition of the play offers the whole cast, but carefully informs that she no longer performs that part, since she has left the stage. The truth is that she had been very busy bearing children (four by a young man, up to 1791, and ten more by the Duke of Clarence, later William IV, between 1791 and 1811), what allowed her time to act but intermittently.

The park is also the meeting place of the other couple, whose mutual attraction has already been shown on stage, and whose obstacle – Sparkish – is about to be removed, so that they too may end up in happy marriage.

Lee's hasty borrowing of this part, however, gave rise to incongruous situations, that were only due to a lack of proper revision. That it had not been fully effected is revealed by the fact that some of the names from Garrick's version are still retained: *Belville*, for example is kept in the stage direction (*Belville kisses her*) that should allude, instead, to Dorilant's kissing of Margery.

Dorilant, moreover, that is mistakenly addressed as *Dick*, is funnily urged by Harcourt (Belville's uncle in Garrick's version) to kiss Margery. It goes without saying that such a piece of advice, that was fitting for a bashful and inexperienced youth, is redundant in the case of a notorious libertine, such as Dorilant.

But the lack of revision inadvertently leads to still more ludicrous lines, such as Harcourt's sincere remark on Belville's modesty when he is left alone with Peggy in the park. He tells Moody: "My dear friend is a very modest young man, you may depend upon his prudence." These words can only produce a hilarious effect when applied to Dorilant, who does pose a real danger to his honour.

What in Garrick's play helped tighten up the structure of the piece, by bringing together both plots, in Lee's version only leads to confusion as the result of that lack of revision. Thus, for example, Lee inserts the park scene into his play at a point when Harcourt and Alithea are not still acquainted with each other's feelings. It is therefore puzzling to hear Alithea tell Harcourt that their relationship has come to an end: "I will never see you more. I will get rid of your importunities and give my hand to Sparkish tomorrow morning" when the audience has not even seen it start.

It is surprising that such a careless revision of Wycherley's *The Country Wife* as Lee's (1786) version of the play could hold the stage for 12 nights, while Garrick's adaptation was simultaneously performed. It is only conceivable that the uncountable incongruencies found in the published text were, at least partially, solved in performance, presumably after the first night.<sup>27</sup> It is

---

<sup>27</sup> This possibility would be in line with the evidence that Stern (2000: 269-270) finds for play rehearsal under Garrick, since, according to him, "Against the tales of Garrick's careful rehearsals, are tales of extraordinary negligence," so that, since

therefore likely that the numerous flaws of structure and characterization in this version were only evident after the first performance, and then partially solved, although the fact that its last performance took place the following year (Covent Garden, February, 17th), whereas Garrick's version continued to hold the stage for the remaining of the century and well into the next one, leads us to doubt that it was properly done, especially if we take into account that Garrick's version, though theatrically acceptable, was far from perfect.<sup>28</sup>

Another reason that may account for the play's popularity is, no doubt, the memorable performance of an outstanding actress. This fact had been acknowledged, for example, in 1777, when Mrs. Wilson's notable performance undoubtedly contributed to the successful reception of Lee's first version. On that occasion, *The London Magazine* (46, January 1777) declared her "one of the best actresses that has appeared these twenty years on a London stage." As we know, Mrs. Wilson benefited from a satisfactory playscript, which was not always the case at the time, not at least with Garrick's (1785) version of the play, and, even less with Lee's (1786) careless adaptation.

But the centrality of actresses was so paramount that it could turn a deficient script into a successful theatrical event, as it occurred with Mrs. Jordan's outstanding performance of Garrick's leading role in his (1785) revival of the play. In fact, her unanimously acclaimed performance was enough to attract large numbers of spectators to the theatre for several years, even though many of them were aware of the scarce dramatic merits of the text, as Madame d'Arblay made explicit after attending a performance on the 26 of July, 1788: "Mrs. Jordan played the Country Girl most admirably but the play is ... disagreeable in its whole plot and tendency."<sup>29</sup> Her gaiety, playfulness and vivacity, that were often praised by critics<sup>30</sup> were probably enough to compensate for the play's lack of wit and tediousness.

Lee's (1786) posed an even greater challenge to the performing abilities of Mrs. Brown, who successfully played the leading role

---

"partial rehearsals followed one another; the notion of a complete play as a single unit was seldom paramount before 'final' rehearsals."

<sup>28</sup> As was acknowledged, among others, by Frederick Seeley (1937: 217), who, fittingly, called it "wretched".

<sup>29</sup> Cfr. Barrett (1905: IV, 47).

<sup>30</sup> Cfr. for example, *The World*, April 7, 1788.

during the only season that the play held the stage (1786-1787). Her doubtless merits, however, seem to have been unable to compete with Mrs. Jordan's vivacity while trying to enliven a twice revised adaptation that was as dull as Garrick's and even less coherent than his.

### 5. Conclusion

To conclude, as evidence on the reception of *The Country Wife* during the eighteenth century has amply demonstrated, the mutual dependence between text and performance at that time was not a mere theoretical hypothesis, but a live, working principle, so that no text worthy of praise could prove successful unless staged by capable actors, and vice-versa, even though the outstanding performance of actresses could temporarily save a deficient script.

The paratextual elements taken into account for the analysis of the play's hypertextual transformations have, moreover, increased our awareness of the continuous accommodation of playwrights to their audiences' changing set of expectations, thus casting new light on the close relationship that existed between performance and text.

### References

- Anonymous 1683. *Fifteen Real Comforts of Matrimony Being in Requitall of the Late Fifteen Sham Comforts, with Satirical Reflections on Whoring and the Debauchery of this Age, Written by a Person of Quality of the Female Sex*. London: Benjamin Alsop & Thomas Malthus.
- Anonymous 1687. *The Royal Academy of Complements*. London: E.H.
- Astell, M. 1696. "An Essay of Marriage." *Six Familiar Essays upon Marriage, Crosses in Love, Sickness, Death, Loyalty and Friendship, Written by a Lady*. London: Tho. Bennet. 1-37
- Avery, E.L. 1934. "Dancing and Pantomime on the English Stage, 1700-1737." *Studies in Philology* 31: 417-452.
- Avery, E.L. 1942. "The Country Wife in the Eighteenth Century." *Research Studies of the State College of Washington* 10: 141-172.
- Avery, E.L. 1944. "The Reputation of Wycherley's Comedies as Stage Plays in the Eighteenth Century." *Research Studies of the State College of Washington* 12/3: 131-154.
- Avery, E.L. ed. 1960. *The London Stage 1700-1729. Part 2*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Barrett, Ch. ed. 1905. *Diary and Letters of Madame d'Arblay*. London.
- Collier, J. 1698. *A Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage, together with the Sense of Antiquity upon this Argument*. London: S. Keble.
- Davies, T. 1780 *Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, Esq. Vol. II*. London.

- Davies, T. 1783-4. *Dramatic Miscellanies*. Dublin. 3 vols.
- Fitzgerald, P. 1882. *A New History of the English Stage*. London.
- Garrick, D. 1766. *The Country Girl. A Comedy (Altered from Wycherley)*. London: T. Becket & P.A. de Hondt.
- Garrick, D. 1777. *The Country Wife. A Comedy Altered from Wycherley*. London: C. Bathurst, J. Rivington.
- Garrick, D. 1808. *The Country Girl. A Comedy in Five Acts ... Altered from Wycherley's Country Wife*. Ed. Mrs. Inchbald. London: Longman.
- Garrick, D. 1819. *The Country Girl. A Comedy Altered from Wycherley*. Ed. W. Oxberry. London: W. Simpkin & R. Marshall.
- Genette, G. 1982. *Palimpsestes, la littérature au second degré*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Genette, G. 1987. *Seuils*. Paris: Seuil 'Poétique'.
- Gray, C.H. 1931. *Theatrical Criticism in London to 1795*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hans, P. and F. Hodges 1996. *A Dictionary of First Names*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hogan, C.B. ed. 1968. *The London Stage 1776-1800. Part 5*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Jauss, H.R. 1970. *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation der Literaturwissenschaft*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Kachur, B.A. 2004. *Etherege and Wycherley*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kinservik, M.J. 2001. "Theatrical Regulation during the Restoration Period." Ed. S.J. Owen. *A Companion to Restoration Drama*. Oxford: Blackwell. 36-53.
- Lee, J. 1765. *The Country Wife. An Entertainment in Two Acts Altered from Wycherley*. London: J. Lee.
- Lee J. 1786. *The Country Wife. An Entertainment in Two Acts. Altered from Wycherley*. London: W. Lowndes.
- Osborne, F. 1655. *Advice to a Son*. Oxford: Thomas Robinson.
- Owen, S.J. ed. 2001. *A Companion to Restoration Drama*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Scouten, A.H. ed. 1961. *The London Stage 1729-1747. Part 3*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Scouten, A.H. and R.D. Hume 1980. "Restoration Comedy and its Audiences 1660-1776." *Yearbook of English Studies* 10: 45-69.
- Seeley, F.F. 1937. "The Last Eighteenth Century Performance of Wycherley's *The Country Wife*." *Philological Quarterly* 16: 217-218.
- Stern, T. 2000. *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stone, G.W. Jr. ed. 1962. *The London Stage 1747-1776. Part 4*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Stone Peters, J. 2000. *Theatre and the Book 1480-1880*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Tave, S. 1960. *The Amiable Humorist: A Study in the Comic Theory and Criticism of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Lennep, W. et al. eds. 1965. *The London Stage 1680-1700. Part 1*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Vernon, P.F. 1962. "Marriage of Convenience and the Moral Code of Restoration Comedy." *Essays in Criticism* 12: 370-387.
- Winton, C. 1974. "The London Stage Embattled, 1695-1710." *Tennessee Studies in Literature* 19: 9-19.
- 

*Author's address:*

Facultat de Filologia · Av. Blasco Ibáñez, 32 · 46010 Valencia  
purificacion.ribes@uv.es

# Portuguese in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries

Francisco Javier SÁNCHEZ ESCRIBANO  
*University of Zaragoza*

## ABSTRACT

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries can be considered the great period of translations into English. During these centuries the Classics and works of different subjects were translated from Italian, French and Spanish. But Portuguese was a different matter. There are translations from Portuguese but some Portuguese writers used Spanish instead of their own language. No grammars or dictionaries had been written in English for the teaching of Portuguese. It was not until 1662 that James Howell's first rules for the pronunciation of Portuguese were published, and the French Monsieur De la Molliere's *A Portuguez Grammar* emerged. They were the only examples of books written on the teaching of Portuguese in English we have in the seventeenth century. Only the former will be considered in this article.

KEYWORDS: Portuguese, translations, grammars, dictionaries, sixteenth century, seventeenth century

## 1. Introduction

The Spanish tongue became essential in cultural interchanges between England and Spain, especially after the marriage of Catherine of Aragon and Henry VIII. Different circumstances and elements contributed to the development of these interchanges and to the interest of the English people in our language. As we will see later, different vocabularies, dictionaries and grammars for the learning of Spanish were published in England.

This was not the case with Portuguese. No grammars or dictionaries (with two exceptions) had been published in England for the learning of that language. It was not until 1662 that James Howell's first rules for the pronunciation of Portuguese, followed by a glossary, were published, and the French Monsieur De la Molliere's *A Portuguez Grammar* emerged.

The Anglo-Spanish marriages had a long tradition in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries before the aforementioned alliance of Catherine and Henry VIII. But the Anglo-Portuguese relations are limited to the marriage of Philippa of Lancaster (sister to Henry IV) and John I of Portugal. I wonder if that marriage had any influence on the cultural interchanges between both nations, although it was very important from the political point of view<sup>1</sup> a century later.

A good source of information about the extent to which English people were familiar with Portuguese is Gonçalves Rodrigues. I will follow him in the structure of my article when he says that in his study he considers “três classes de documentos, as traduções, as opiniões dispersas de um ou de outro autor e os primeiros manuais, gramáticas e dicionários para o ensino do português” (Gonçalves 1951: 2).<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Translations

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries England produced a veritable flood of translations of the Classics, and of Italian, French and Spanish literatures. But Portuguese was a minor language as a lot of Portuguese writers preferred to express themselves in other languages, especially Spanish. So translations from Portuguese are comparatively scarce. Allison's (1974) *Catalogue* will be of great help. Gonçalves (1951: 3) points out that “A literatura portuguesa como fonte de deleite estético só virá a ser descoberta com a versão dos *Lusíadas* levada a cabo com grande aparato crítico por William Julius Mickle em 1776”.<sup>3</sup> I wonder if we can admit that Camões'

---

<sup>1</sup> The Jesuit plotters William Allen and especially Robert Persons referred to this marriage when they proposed in different memoranda that Philip II of Spain, after his marriage to his cousin Maria Manuela of Portugal, was the lawful heir to the throne of England. She was daughter of Joan III of Portugal and Catalina, sister of Charles I. And Philip was the son of the latter and Isabel of Portugal, sister of the former. They plotted the murder of Queen Elizabeth I and the invasion of England. They changed their mind about the murder after the disaster of the Spanish Armada in 1588. For more information see how the rights of Philip II to the English crown are treated in *Heghinton's Booke*, in Ruiz (1977: 117-216). See also Howell (1662a).

<sup>2</sup> I would like to thank Prof. Manuel Gomes da Torre, University of Porto, for providing me with copies of this article and of Monsieur. De la Molliere's *A Portuguese Grammar*.

<sup>3</sup> But on p.7 he points out that Luis de Camões' masterpiece was translated by Richard Fanshaw in 1655. In Allison's entry we find the title *The Lusiad, or, Portugals historical poem ... Now newly put into English by Richard Fanshaw Esq.* London, H. Mosley, 1655. And he goes on to say that he “was a well known hispanophile, who lived in Spain for several years, spoke Spanish and Portuguese fluently, and at a later period was

masterpiece was, as Gonçalves says, the only fiction literature translated into English from Portuguese. The other popular works all over Europe were written in Spanish, such as *Amadis de Gaula*, attributed by national tradition to Vasco de Lobeira; Jorge de Montemayor's *Diana*; Francisco de Morais' *Palmerin de Inglaterra* and the anonymous romance of chivalry *Florando de Inglaterra*.<sup>4</sup>

Other Portuguese writers who used Spanish or other languages in their works were:

- The historian and poet Manuel de Faria y Sousa. He wrote in Spanish his *Asia Portuguesa* (translated into English in 1695 by the hispanist Capt. John Stevens) and *Historia del Reyno de Portugal* (also translated into English by the same translator in 1698).
- The lawyer and writer Bartolomé Felippe. His *Tractado del Consejo y de los Consejeros de los Príncipes* was translated into English by John Thorius in 1589.
- The navigator and writer Pedro Fernández de Quirós. His *Relación de un memorial que ha presentado ... sobre la Población y Descubrimiento de la Quarta Parte del Mundo* was translated into English in 1617.
- The Portuguese Rabbi and scholar Manase, ben Joseph, ben Ismael had his *Esperança de Israel* translated into English in 1650.
- The historian, poet and general writer Francisco Manuel de Mello. He wrote both in Spanish and Portuguese. His *Carta de guía de Casados* was translated into English as *The government of a wife; or, wholsom and pleasant advice for married men ... Written in Portuguese, by don Francisco Manuel. There is also added, a letter upon the same subject, written in Spanish by don Antonio de Guevara ...* Translated into English by Capt. John Stevens. London, J. Tonson and R. Knaplock, 1697.
- The Jesuit João Rodríguez Girão wrote his letters from Japan in Latin, and the Dominican José Teixeira wrote in Latin and French.
- Everybody in those times was interested in the Portuguese discoveries and travels and the English were no exception. But we have very few examples and again some of the translations were done from other languages. Most of these works were gathered in the encyclopedic works of voyages by Richard Hakluyt and Samuel Purchas. I will abridge the titles and the translations. I refer the reader to Allison's *Catalogue* for details.

---

English Ambassador in Madrid." "Now newly put into English" points to a previous translation, perhaps lost.

<sup>4</sup> According to Allison "it was written in Spanish probably by a Portuguese author and first published at Lisbon, was translated into French and from French into English by A.M. (Anthony Munday?) in 1588."

- Francisco Alcoforado. He wrote *Relação do descobrimento da ilha da Madeira*. According to Allison, this was translated into French from a manuscript and then into English as *An historical relation of the discovery of the isle of Madeira. Written originally in Portuguez ... thence translated into French, and now made English*. London, W. Cademan, 1675.
- The Jesuit missionary Jerónimo Lobo. He went to Goa, Mozambique, Angola and Brazil. His *Itinerario das suas Viagens*, extracts of which were translated into a number of European languages, becomes in English *A short relation of the river Nile, of its source and current: of its overflowing the Compagnia of AEgypt ... written by an eye-witnesse*. London, J. Martyn, 1669.<sup>5</sup>
- The explorer Duarte Lopes. He dictated his *Relação do Reino do Congo* to Filippo Pigafetta, who translated it into Italian and published it in 1591. It was soon translated into other European languages. The English title is *A report of the kingdom of Congo ... and of the countries that border rounde about the same ... Drawen out of the writings and discourses of Odoardo Lopez a Portingal, by Philipo Pigafetta. Translated out of Italian by Abraham Hartwell*. London, J. Wolfe, 1597.<sup>6</sup>
- The Jesuit missionary Fernão Cardim. There is an MS. of his account of Brasil that was not printed. It was translated into English as *A treatise of Brasil, written by a Portugall which had long lived there*. 1625.
- Feliciano Cieça de Carvalho. Portuguese local governor in northern Brazil, 1597. *A speciall letter written from Feliciano Cieça de Carualso the governor of Paraiua in the most northerne part of Brazil, 1597, to Philip the second king of Spaine ... touching the conquest of Rio Grande*. 1660.<sup>7</sup>
- Elvas: see Hernando de Soto below.
- The sailor Nuno da Silva. He was a pilot with Francis Drake. The account of his voyage was translated into English from an unprinted Portuguese manuscript under the title *The relation of a voyage made by ... Nuno da Silva for the vice-roy of New Spaine ... wherein is set downe the course and actions passed in the voyage of Sir Francis Drake*. 1600.
- The Jesuit Francisco Soares. *A letter ... to his brother Diego Suares dwelling in Lisbon, written from the riuer of Ienero in Brasil in Iune 1596 concerning the exceedingly rich trade ... between that place and Peru, by the way of the river of Plate*. 1600.<sup>8</sup>
- The Spanish conquistador Hernando de Soto (Fidalgo de Elvas, according to Gonçalves). Discoverer of the Mississippi and a great

---

<sup>5</sup> There is another edition in 1673. As we can see, the author's name is not revealed in the book. And Allison points out that the "Portuguese original exists in manuscript but was apparently never printed. The translator was Sir Peter Wyche (1628-99?)."

<sup>6</sup> There is another abbreviated version dating from 1625.

<sup>7</sup> Allison does not give the Portuguese title.

<sup>8</sup> *Idem*. Not published separately. In Hakluyt, R. *The Principal Navigations*. Vol. 3, pp. 706-8.

explorer. One of his followers, an unknown Portuguese, wrote an account of the Florida expedition which was translated into various languages: *Relaçam verdadeira dos trabalhos que ... dom Fernando de Souto e certos fidalgos portuguezes passaram no descobrimento ... da Florida*. In English it has the title *Virginia richly valued, by the description of the maine land of Florida ... out of the foure yeares travel ... of don Ferdinando de Soto ... Written by a Portugall gentleman of Elvas ... and translated out of Portuguese by Richard Hakluyt*. London, F. Kyngston, for M. Lownes, 1609.<sup>9</sup>

- The sailor López Vaz. His *A discourse of the West Indies and South Sea ... vnto the yere 1587*. 1600 (2nd ed. 1625) was translated from a Portuguese manuscript now, apparently, lost.

- The Dominican missionary and historian, Gaspar de Cruz. He visited Goa, Malacca and China. His *Tractado em que se cõtam muito por Esteso as Cousas da China* was translated into English as *A treatise of China and the adioyning regions*, 1625. The translator has not been identified.

- The traveller and writer Fernam Mendes Pinto. Allison finds two translations of his *Peregrinacam* (sic) *de Fernam Mendez Pinto*:

- 1. *Observations of China, Tartaria, and other easterne parts of the world*. 1625. Partly translated and partly summarised from the first part of Mendes Pinto's work. The translator has not been identified.

- 2. *The voyages and adventures, of Fernand Mendez Pinto ... Written originally by himself in the Portugal tongue ... Done into English by H.C. Gent*. London, J. Macock, for H. Cripps and L. Lloyd. 1653. (2nd ed. 1663; 3rd ed. 1692). The dedicatory epistle is signed: "Henry Cogan."

- India is very well represented by the following authors.

- The Portuguese viceroy of India João de Castro. He wrote several "Roteiros" of his travels which remained unpublished. The English version of one of them appeared as *A rutter of don John of Castro of the voyage which the Portugals made from India to Zoez*. 1625.

- The secular priest, poet and prose writer Jacinto Freire de Andrade. His *Vida de Dom João de Castro* (1651) appeared in English as *The life of dom John de Castro, the fourth vice-roy of India. By Jacinto Freire de Andrada, written in Portuguese and by Sr Peter Wyche Kt. translated into English*. London, for H. Herringman, 1664.

- The sea captain Antonio Galvão. His *Tratado ... dos Diversos & Desvayrados Caminhos, por onde nos Tempos Passados a Pimenta & Especearia Veyo da India as Nossas Partes* was rendered into English as *The discoveries of the world, from the first originall vnto the yeere of our Lorde 1555 ... Corrected, quoted, and now published in English by Richard Hakluyt sometime student of Christchurch in Oxford*. Londini, G. Bishop, 1601.

- The historian Fernan Lopes de Castanheda. The first book of his *Historia do Descobrimeto & Conquista da India pelos Portugueses* was translated into

---

<sup>9</sup> There is another issue in 1611, an abridged version in 1625 and another translation of the whole in 1686.

English as *The first booke of the historie of the discoverie and conquest of the East Indias* (sic), *enterprised by the Portingales ...* Translated into English by N.L. Gentleman (Nicholas Lichfield). London, T. East, 1582.

- The viceroy of India Duarte de Meneses. A collection of official documents was published from the MS. in English in *Purchas his Pilgrims* as *Don Duart de Meneses the vice-roy, his tractate of the Portugall Indies, containing the laws, customes, reuenues, expenses, and other matters remarkable therein: here abbreuiated.* 1625.
- The Augustinian Archbishop of Goa Aleixo de Menezes. His *Synodo Diocesano da Igreja e Bispado de Angamale dos Antigos Christãos de S. Thome das Serras de Malabar* was published in 1606 with Antonio de Gouvea's *Jornada do Arcebispo de Goa*, and was translated into English as *A diocesan synod of the church and bishoprick of Angemale, belonging to the ancient Christians of St. Thomas in the serra or mountains of Malabar.* 1694.<sup>10</sup>

Ethiopia is also present in three works:

- The Portuguese priest and traveller Francisco Álvares. He wrote *Verdadera Informaçam das Terras do Preste Ioam* which was translated into English as *The voyage of Sir Francis Aluarez, a Portugall priest, made vnto the court of Prete Ioanni, the great Christian emperour of Ethiopia.* 1625.<sup>11</sup>
- The priest João Bermudes. His *Breue Relaçao da Embaixada q o Patriarcha do Ioão Bermudez trouxe do Emperador da Ethiopia.* Lisbon. 1565, was rendered into English in an abridged edition by an unknown translator as *A brief relation of the embassage which the patriarch don John Bermudez brought from the emperour of Ethiopia.* 1625.
- The Dominican João dos Santos. His *Ethiopia Oriental* was translated into English by an unknown translator as *Collections out of the voyage and historie of friar Joao dos Santos.* 1625.
- Allison also includes Emanuel, Prince of Portugal who became a Carmelite but later apostatised. His work was certainly written in French and translated into English as *A Declaration of the Reasons moveing don Emanuel ... to forsake the Romish Religion,* 1634.

Hispano-Portuguese relations are represented by two authors:

- The pretender to the throne of Portugal Antonio, Prior of Crato. The statement of his claim to the Portuguese throne deserved editions in Latin, French and English, but no copy of a Portuguese original is known. The English version is entitled *The explanation of the true and lawfull right and tytle, of the moste excellent prince, Anthonie the first of that name, king of Portugall, concerning his warres, against Phillip king of Castile*

---

<sup>10</sup> Translated by Geddes.

<sup>11</sup> According to Allison it was translated from the Italian version of Giovanni Ramusio.

... for the recouerie of his kingdome ... Translated into English and conferred with the French and Latine copie. Leyden, C. Plantyn, 1585.

· The general Manuel de Vilhena Sancho, *Count of Vilaflor*. His letter *Relaçam... da Victoria que o Conde de Villaflor ... alançou (sic) das Armas Castelhanas* appeared in English as *A relation of the great success the king of Portugal's army had upon the Spaniards, the 29th of May* (Engl. stile) 1663. London, A. Warren, for W. Garret, 1663.

· And last in this account of translations and translators is the Franciscan writer Marcos da Silva, Bishop of Oporto. His best known work *Chronicas da Ordem dos Frades Menores* was translated into different languages. In English we have three editions:

1. *The chronicle and institution of the order of the seraphical father S. Francis ... Set forth first in the Portugall, next in the Spanish, then in the Italian, lastlie in the French, and now in the English tongue*. S. Omers, Iohn Heigham, 1618.<sup>12</sup>

2. *The rule of our holy mother S. Clare*. (no place) 1621. Extracted from book 8 of the Chronicle of Marcos da Silva in William Cape's translation. Printed at the press of the English Jesuits at S. Omer.

3. *The life of the glorious virgin S. Clare. Togeather with the conuersion, and life of S. Agnes her sister. And of another S. Agnes, daughter to the king of Bohemia. Also the rule of S. Clare. And the life of S. Catharine of Bologna*. Translated into English. (no place) 1622.

### 3. Dictionaries and grammars: the case of James Howell

We have to wait until the seventeenth century to see Portuguese included in polyglot dictionaries and the appearance of the rules for its pronunciation and a glossary by James Howell and Monsieur De la Molliere's *A Portugez Grammar* (1662). Despite the lateness of this general interest in Portuguese, the new Portuguese terminology acquired in the new discoveries was introduced into other European languages.

In 1530 appeared the first edition of the *Vocabulare* by Noel de Berlaimont or Barlement, now lost. There are some copies of the second edition of 1536. Both were bilingual. It is from the edition of 1551 that the *Vocabulare* began to appear in four languages: French, Flemish, Latin and Spanish. In 1576 the printer Henry Heyndrick added English and German. There is another edition in 1584 where German is substituted by Latin. It is in two editions of 1639 that Portuguese appeared in this *Vocabulare*. One of them is the first

---

<sup>12</sup> See entry in Allison: The translation was made from the French version of D. Santeul and Jean Blancone. According to the Approbation, the translator was a layman, William Cape.

edition published in England by the anonymous E.G. for Michael Sparke:<sup>13</sup>

New / Dialogves or Colloquies, / and, / A little Dictionary of Eight Languages / Latin, French, Low-Dvtch, High-Dvtch, Spanishe, Italien, English, Portugvall. / ... / Now perfected and made fit for Travellers, young / Merchants and Sea-Men, especially those that desire to attaine the use of these Tongues. / London / Printed by E.G. for Michael Sparke junior, and are to be sold niere / the Exchange and in Popeshead Palace. 1639.

In 1617 John Minsheu had had his monumental *Guide into the Tongues in eleven languages* published, Portuguese being one of them. It was re-edited several times in the seventeenth century with changes: in those of 1625, 1626 and 1627 British (or Welsh), Portuguese and *The Spanish-English Dictionary* were excluded.

"O mestre de linguas", as Gonçalves (1951: 9-10) considers John Minsheu,

na sua gramática castelhana de 1599, tende já a dar autonomias ao português declarando que ele difere tanto em certas palavras e na pronúncia que bem pode considerar-se lingua autónoma; e emite a opinião de que, entre o português e o castelhano, há a mesma relação que entre o inglês e o escocês.

In fact what this "mestre de linguas" did was to include in his *Dictionarie in Spanish and English* (1599) a new edition, corrected and augmented, of Richard Percivall's *Bibliotheca Hispanica containing a Grammar with a Dictionary in Spanish, English and Latin, ...*, London ... 1591, which had been a great success. This is what they usually did to "augment" and "use" other authors' works.

The marriage of Catherine of Braganza to Charles II was a stimulus to men of letters to begin the study of Portuguese. In the seventeenth century only James Howell and Monsieur De la Molliere appear. In this article only the former will be considered.

Gonçalves (1951: 11) considers James Howell "um escritor menor de certa categoria", although he admits that he was

---

<sup>13</sup> For more information about the different editions of the *Vocabulare* see Verdeyen (1925, 1926 and 1935) and Boulard (1933).

um dos primeiros que em Inglaterra ganharam a vida com a pena. Talvez nenhum outro prosador do século XVII inglês tenha deixado produção tão variada, ou reflectido tão plenamente os interesses e actividades complexas da sua época como ensaísta e epistológrafo, historiador e antiquário, polemista e tradutor, lexicógrafo e gramático.

And I would add that he was also a teacher of languages, tutor, traveller, royalist spy, and at the end of his life historiographer royal to Charles II (Sánchez Escribano: 1979). This “escritor menor,” this versatile writer left 70 published works and another eight can be attributed to him (Howell: 1890, Appendix).<sup>14</sup> He was so fortunate with his works that he continued to earn his living while he was in prison between 1642 and 1650.

He travelled a lot on different missions to the Low Countries, France, Italy, Denmark and twice to Spain: first between 1617 and 1618 and then between 1622 and 1624 when he was a witness of the Prince of Wales’ visit to Madrid. Although Gonçalves (1951: 11) says that he visited Portugal, I have not found any evidence of it.

The first reference to Portuguese as a dialect of Spanish appears in his *Instructions for Forreïn Travel* (Howell 1642: 127-8) where we read

The *Spanish* or *Castilian* tongue, which is usually called *Romance*, and of late years *Lengua Christiana*, (but it is called so only amongst themselves) for a *Spaniard* will commonly aske a stranger whether he can speake *Christian*, that is *Castilian*. The *Spanish* (I say) hath but one considerable dialect, which is the *Portugues*, which the *Jews of Europe* speake more than any other language, and they hold that the *Messias* shall come out of that tribe, that speake the *Portingal* language; other small differences there are in the pronunciation of the *gutturall* letters in the *Castillian*, but they are of small moment.

But it is in his *English Grammar* (Sánchez Escribano 1992: 277-91) that he dedicates an appendix to Portuguese as a “Sub-dialect” of Spanish. The book has the complex title:

A NEW / ENGLISH / Grammar, / Prescribing as certain Rules as / the Language will bear, for for- / reners to learn *English*. / Ther is also another Grammar of the / *Spanish* or *Castilian Tounge*, / With som

---

<sup>14</sup> James Howell’s *Epistolæ Ho-Elïanæ* or *The Familiar Letters*, were first published in four volumes in 1645, 1647, 1650 and 1655, the first three while he was in prison.

special remarks upon the / Portugues Dialect, & c. / *Whereunto is annexed / A Discours or Dialog containing a / Perambulation of Spain and Portugall / which may serve for a direction how to / travel through both Countreys, & c. / For the service of Her MAJESTY, / whom God preserve. / LONDON, / Printed for T. Williams, H. Browne, and H. Marsh. / 1662.*<sup>15</sup>

dedicated to the "*Ecelsa, y Serenissima Magestad, de Doña Catarina de Braganza.*"

Howell hoped to be nominated tutor of languages to the Queen but it did not come about. As we can see in the Appendix at the end of this paper, Portuguese is subordinated to Spanish and considered a sub-dialect. There are some rules of pronunciation and a glossary in Portuguese, Spanish and English. The source must be Minsheu's *Guide into the Tongues*. I wonder why Howell chose these words and not others.

The *Perambulation of Spain and Portugal* is a dialogue between Carlos and Felipe about a journey to both countries made by the latter. This is a new genre that appeared in the sixteenth century as a complement to Grammars and Dictionaries for the learning of languages.

The great plagiarist John Minsheu published in his *Dictionary* (1599) seven Dialogues followed by different reprints. Foulché-Delbosch (1919: 34-235) includes them in "Diálogos de antaño," together with those by W. Stepney (1591), César Oudin's Dialogue VIII, those of Juan de Luna (1619) and others. Howell's *Perambulation* is a "reproduction" of Oudin's Dialogue VIII with some "additions" (Sánchez Escribano 1979: 493-542). These additions refer to Portugal. Oudin points to "cuatro lugarcicos" between Elbas, Lisbon and Belen, while Howell makes his traveller Felipe tell more things about Portugal. He entered Yelbas (sic) and continued by way of Villaviciosa, Evora, Estremoso, Montemajor and Lisbon, which he describes. The capital deserves a proverb: *Quien no hà visto Lisboa no hà visto cosa boa*, Who hath not seen *Lisbon*, hath not seen a good thing.<sup>16</sup> And he continues,

---

<sup>15</sup> This volume has two pagination systems, one for the *Grammars* and another one for *La Perambulaci3n*. The volume is bilingual except for the Spanish Grammar which is only in English.

<sup>16</sup> J. Howell. *The Perambulation of Spain and Portugal*, p. 35. See Note 15.

The second Town in *Portugal* is *Santaren*, situated also upon the River of *Tagus*; The third is *Sintra*, upon the *Atlantic* Sea; The fourth *Coninbra* (sic), upon the River *Mondego*; The fifth *Braga* great Archbishoprick; The sixth *Porto* at the mouth of the Riveer *Duero*; The seventh *Miranda*; The eighth *Braganza*, whose Dukes were such great Princes, that the third part of the peeple (sic) of the Kingdom liv'd upon their Lands; the ninth *Eubora*, an Archbishopric; the tenth *Portolegre*; the Eleventh *Olivenza* upon *Guadiana*; the twelfth *Beja*; All these towns are situated upon considerable Rivers ... They say it hath in all above 150 great and small Rivers, whereof the chief are *Tagus*, *Duero*, *Guadiana*, *Minio* & c.<sup>17</sup>

There follows a description of the Kingdom of the Algarve that also belongs to Portugal, and he names the towns of Faro, Niebla, Villa Maona, Tavila, Lagos and Sylvia, and then gives a short description of the dominions of Portugal in Asia, Africa and America. What Philip says before leaving Lisbon for Sevilla is of considerable interest: "Before I budge from Portugal, I will confute a Proverb which the Castilians have, viz. *Los Portugueses son locos y pocos*, The Portugueses are Fools and few; but of late years the Castilian hath found them Many, and no Fools."<sup>18</sup>

That they were "many" and "not fools" was also mentioned by Howell in his *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae or Familiar Letters*. In one of them, addressed to Simon Digby, Howell tells him about the revolt of Catalonia following that of John of Braganza, now King of Portugal, "by the name of *El Rey Don Juan*, some twenty years ago." And he continues:

When the K. of *Spain* told *Olivares* of it first, he lighted it, saying, that *he was but Rey de Havas, a Bean-cake King*. But it seems strange that it transforms me to wonder, that the *Spaniard* being accounted so politic a Nation, and so full of precaution, could not foresee this; especially there being divers intelligences given, and evident symptoms of the general discontentment of that Kingdom (because they could not be protected against the *Hollander* in *Brasil*), and of some designs a year before, when this D. of *Braganza* was at *Madrid*. I wonder, I say, they did not secure his Person, by engaging him to some employment out of the way: Truly I thought the *Spaniard* was better sighted, and could see further off than so. You know what a huge Limb of the Crown of

---

<sup>17</sup> *Idem*. pp. 37 and 39. See Note 15.

<sup>18</sup> *Idem*. p. 41. See Note 15. For the complete itinerary followed by Philip see the map in Sánchez Escribano (1979, between pages 521 and 522).

*Portugal was to the Spanish Monarchy, by the Islands in the Atlantic Sea, the Towns in Afric, and all the East-Indies, insomuch that the Spaniard hath nothing now left beyond the Line* (Howell 1890: 349-350).<sup>19</sup>

Of great interest in the study of Hispano-Portuguese relations is a very short volume of only 6 pages hidden in Howell's *The Preheminence and Pedigree of Parlement*, etc. (1644). It is a vindication by a certain "Baltazar Oliveras" of the true winner of the battle of Montijo and others when the Portuguese army of King John IV invaded Galicia and Extremadura. Its title is

The Reall / VICTORIE / OF / PORTVGALL; / Against / The Powers of Spaine. / AND / Her veritie, confronting the *Castilian* Lyes. / Coppied out of the relations that came from / Lisboa by Baltazar Oliveras. / Printed at London in the yeare / 1644.

It contains a description of the decline of the Spanish army and power.

James Howell was also a paremiologist. The third part of his *Lexicon Tetraglotton*, etc. (1659-1660) is a volume of *The Choicest Proverbs in all the said Tounes, ... English, Italian, French, Spanish and British or Cambrian*. The Spanish part has the title

REFRANES, / O / PROVERBIOS / EN ROMANCE, / ò la Lengua Castellana; A los cuales se han añadido algunos Portuguezes, Catalanes, / y Gallegos, & c. / De los quales muchos andan GLOSSADOS.

It is introduced by a letter to Sir Lewis Dives, composed of Spanish Proverbs, in English and Spanish. At the end there is a "Carta embiada de un Galan a su dama, en que los mas usitados refranes le da cuenta de cosas que en su ausencia le avian Sucedido by Blasco de Garay."

The main source of these letters and proverbs is the edition of 1619 of Hernán Núñez de Guzmán's *Refranes o Proverbios en Romance, ... Y la Filosofia Vvlgar de IVAN de Mal Lara, en mil refranes glossados*,

---

<sup>19</sup> There are more references to this revolt and Portugal in pp. 409-10, 418, 420, 436, 455 (Portuguese wine), 473 (Portuguese as a dialect of Spanish), 489 and 512-3.

... *Van ivntamente las qvatro cartas de Blasco de Garay*. Madrid, 1619. (Sánchez Escribano 1996).<sup>20</sup>

The Portuguese collection is as follows:

Refranes Portugueses

*Portingal Proverbs*

A As (sic) vezes ruyn gadela roy boa correa.<sup>21</sup>

*Sometimes an ill-favoured bitch gnawes a good chord.*

A aden, moller, & a cabra, he ma cousa semdo magra.

*A duck, a woman, and a goat are ill things being lean.*

Bolsa vazia faz o home sesudo, mas tarde.

*An empty purse makes one wise, but too late.*

A fin louva a vida, & a tarde louva el Dia.

*The end commends life, and the evening the day.*

Aiamos salud e paz, e logo teremos assaz.

*Let's have health and peace, and we shall quickly have enough.*

Alem ou aquem, veias siempre con quem.

*Be it he or she look well with whom you converse.*

A limgo longa he sinal de mao costa.

*A long tongue is a sign of a short hand.*

A moller & a ovella concedo a corrella.

*The woman and the sheep let them go home betimes.*

A muyta costesia (sic) he especial dengano.

*Too much courtesie a kind of cheat.*

Amor, foguo, & tosse a seu dono descubre.

*Love, Fire and Cough discover their matter.*

Amores de Freyra, flores do medoeira cedo ven & pouco duraom.

*The love of a Nun, and the flowers of the Almond-tree soon come and soon depart.*

Moller fermoso, viña e figueral, muy malas son de guarar.

*A handsome wife, a vineyard and fig-tree are hard to be kept.*

Mouro que naon podes aver forrao por tu alma.

*The Mulberry which thou canst not reach lay up for thy soul.*

---

<sup>20</sup> There is another edition published at Lérida with the same contents. In the previous editions of Salamanca, 1555 and 1578, and Valladolid, 1602, Juan de Mal Lara's *Filosofia Vulgar* is missing.

<sup>21</sup> I have kept the order and spelling given by Howell. As can be seen both rhyme and rhythm are broken and sometimes the original and the translation have no meaning at all.

A o bom daràs, & do mau te afastaràs.  
*Give to the good, and depart from the bad.*

Mays val divida vella que pecado novo.  
*An old debt is better than a new sin.*

A on ny à, no ni cal cercar.  
*'Tis to no purpose to seek where nothing's to be found.*

A pedra & a palabra naom se recolle depois de deitada.  
*The stone and the word returns not when once out.*

Meu sono solto, meu enemigo mosto.  
*My sleep is sound my enemy being dead.*

Assi he dura cousa o a doudo calar, como a o sesudo mal falar.  
*'Tis as hard for a fool to be silent as for a wise man to speak foolishly.*

Millar he un possaro que tenno na mao, que dous que van volando.  
*I had rather have one sparrow in my hand than two in the wood.*

As Romerias e a as bodas vam as sandias todas.  
*Fools go to weddings and pilgrimages.*

Naom quero bacoro con chucallo.  
*I do not desire a pig with a bell.*

Barriga quente pe durment  
*A hot belly, a sleeping foot.*

Mellor he o meu que o nuestro.  
*Mine is better than ours.*

Castigo de vella nunca fez mella.  
*An old womans stroke breaks no bone.*

Ho homen cree, & alma duvida.  
*The man believes, and the soul doubts.*

Cacara sem dentes dos mortos faz viventes.  
*The hen without teeth makes living men of the dead, viz. With her Eggs.*

Naom fiar de caon que manqueia.  
*Trust not a lame dog.*

Can de can vello, y potro de potrelo.  
*A dog of an old dog, and a colt of a young horse.*

Judio per la Mercaduria, y frade per la hypocresia.  
*A Jew for Merchandise, and a friar for hypocrisy.*

Conciencia de Portalegre qui vende gato por liebre.  
*The conscience of Portulegre, which sells a cat for a hare.*

Comadre andareja naom vo a parte que vos naom veis.  
*A gadding wife is met every where.*

Falaon le en allos respondè en bugallos.

*They spoke to him in garlick, & he answers them in codshead.*

*La va la ligoa omde doe o dente.*

*There the tongue goes where the tooth akes.*

*Ida de Jan Gomez que foy na sela veo nos alfories.*

*John Gomez journey, who went with a saddle, and came back on a wallet.*

The Spanish paremiology is at times cruel to Portuguese people:<sup>22</sup>

*Apprendiz de Portugal no sabe coser, y quiere cortar.*

*A Portugal prentice that will cut, and yet he cannot sowe.*

*Ciudad por Ciudad Lisboa en Portugal.*

*City for City Lisbon in Portugal.*

*El Portuguès se criò del pedo de un Judio.*<sup>23</sup>

*The Portugues was born of a Jews fart.*

*Tres Portugueses, dos medio Christianos, el otro Judio.*

*Three Portugueses, two of them half Christians, and the third a Jew.*

To conclude we can say with some scholars that Howell had acceptable Spanish (Sánchez Escribano 1979) although Amado Alonso (1951: 326) thought that "Howell tenía más atrevimiento que conocimiento del español, y lo que no haya tomado de otros libros (Minsheu en primer lugar que ya era poco de fiar) no es material de confianza". I wonder if he knew any Portuguese at all. There is no evidence of his presence in Portugal. And, as we can see, he did not take the trouble to verify the spelling of a lot of words: perhaps his work was not given to somebody to review.

His collections of proverbs are more highly considered. I agree with Sbarbi (1891: 328) when he says that the Spanish one "es digna de ser consultada toda esta sección por los amantes de la Paremiología en general, a causa de incluirse en ella multitud de refranes algo raros."

#### References

Allison, A.F. 1974. *English Translations from the Spanish and Portuguese to the Year 1700*. London: Dawsons of Pall Mall.

---

<sup>22</sup> See proverbs 106, 196, 370, 576 and 1167 in Sánchez Escribano (1996).

<sup>23</sup> It is also in Howell (1890): 314: *A Portuguese was engender'd of a Jew's. As the Mahometans have a passage in their Alcorán, that a Cat was made of a Lion's breath.*

- Alonso, A. 1951. "Reseña Samuel Gili Gaya 1947 (and 1948). *Tesoro Lexicográfico, 1492-1726.*" *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*. Abril-junio: 324-328.
- Berlemont, N. de 1639 (1576, 1584, 1639). *New Dialogues or Colloquies, and, a little Dictionary of Eight Languages Latin, French, Low-Dutch, High-Dutch, Spanishe, Italian, English, Portugall ...* London: Printed by E.G. for Michael Sparke.
- Boulard C.B. 1933. "The Spanish Schoole-Master and the Polyglot Derivatives of Noel de Berlaimont's *Vocabulare.*" *Revue Hispanique* 81: 283-318.
- Catalogue 1950-1963. *British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books*. Photolithographic ed. to 1955. London: Trustees of the British Museum.
- Cooper, L. 1962. "Plagiarism in Spanish Dictionaries of the 16th and 17th Centuries." *Hispania* XLV : 717-720.
- Foulché-Delbosc, R. 1896. "Bibliographie des voyages en Espagne et en Portugal." *Revue Hispanique* 3ème année : 1-349.
- Foulché-Delbosc, R. 1919. *Diálogos de antaño*. Réédité par M. Gauthier. *Revue Hispanique* 107: 34-235.
- García Mercadal, J. 1959. *Viajes de extranjeros por España y Portugal*. Madrid: Aguilar.
- Gonçalves Rodrigues, A. 1951. *A lingua portuguesa em Inglaterra nos séculos XVII e XVIII. BIBLOS, vol. XXVII*. Coimbra.
- Hakluyt, R. 1905 (1598-1600). *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*. 12 vols. New York: AMS Press.
- Howell, J. 1642. *Instructions for Forreign Travel...* London. Printed by T.B. for Humfrey Mosley, at the Princes Armes, in Paules Church-yard.
- Howell, J. 1890 (4 volumes: 1645, 1647, 1650 and 1655). *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae or Familiar Letters*. Ed. J. Jacobs London. Published by D. Nutt in the Strand.
- Howell, J. 1659-60. *Lexicon Tetraglotton, An English-French-Italian-Spanish Dictionary: Whereunto is adjoined a large Nomenclature ... With another Volume of the Choicest Proverbs in all the said Towns...* London. Printed by J.G. for Cornelius Bee.
- Howell, J. 1662a. *A Brief account of the Royal Matches or Matrimonial Alliances Which the Kings of England have made from time to time since the year 800 to this present 1662...* London. Printed by J.G. for H. Brome.
- Howell, J. 1662b. *A New English Grammar...* London. Printed for T. Williams, H. Brome and H. Marsh.
- Martín Gamero, S. 1961. *La enseñanza del inglés en España*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Minsheu, J. 1599. *A Dictionarie in Spanish and English, First Published into the English Tongue by Ric. Percivale ... Now Enlarged ... Now Augmented by John Minsheu...* London. Printed by Edm. Bollifant.
- Minsheu, J. 1617. *Guide into the Tongues ... in These Eleven Languages...* London. Published and Printed by the industrie, Labour, and the charges of Iohn Minshey.

- Molliere, De la (Monsieur) 1662. *A Portuguez Grammar: or, Rules shewing the True and Perfect way to Learn the said Language*. London. Printed by Da. Maxwel for Samuel Broun.
- Núñez, H. 1619 (1555, 1578, 1602, 1621). *Refranes o Proverbios en Romance, ... Y la Filosofía Vvlgar de IVAN de Mal Lara, en mil refranes glossados, ... Van ivntamente las qvatro cartas de Blasco de Garay*. Madrid.
- Percivall, R. 1591. *Bibliotheca Hispanica Containing a Grammar with a Dicitonary in Spanish, English and Latin, ....* London.
- Purchas, S. 1905 (1625). *Hakluytus Posthumus, or Purchas His Pilgrimes, Contayning a History of the World in Sea Voyages and Lands Travells by Englishmen and Others*. 20 vols. Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons.
- Ruiz, J. M. 1977. "Robert Persons, S.J. (1546-1610) y su obra más polémica: *A Conference about the Next Succession of the Crowne of England*." *ES 7*: 117-216.
- Sánchez Escribano, J. 1979. *James Howell: un hispanista inglés del siglo XVII*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Sánchez Escribano, J. 1992. "Learning Spanish in England in the 16th and 17th Centuries." Ed. M.L. Dañobeitia. *Proceedings of the III International Conference of SEDERI*. Granada: University of Granada. 277-91.
- Sánchez Escribano, J. 1996. *Proverbios, refranes y traducción. James Howell y su colección bilingüe de refranes españoles (1659)*. Zaragoza: SEDERI.
- Sbarbi, J. M. 1891. *Monografía sobre los refranes, adagios i proverbios castellanos*. Madrid.
- Shaw, P. 1976. "James Howell: un galés del siglo XVII curioso de las gentes y de las cosas de España." *Archivum XXVI*: 403-419.
- Thomas, Sir H. 1933. "English Translations of Portuguese Books before 1640." *Revista da Universidade de Coimbra XI*: 690-711.
- Verdeyen, R. 1925, 1926, 1935. "Colloqia et Dictionariolum Septem Linguarum. Gedrukt door fickaert te Antwerpen in 1616 opnieuw uit gegeven door Prof. Dr. R. Verdeyen." *Uitgave van de Vereeniging der Antwerpsche Bibliophilen* nos. 39 (I, 1926, 122 pp.), 40 (II, 1925, without pagination) and 42 (III, 1935, 159 pp.).
- Wing, D. 1948. *Short-Title Catalogue of Books printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales and British America and on English Books printed in other Countries*. New York: Columbia University Press.

APPENDIX<sup>24</sup>

OF THE  
Portugues Language,  
OR  
SUB-DIALECT, &c.

As *Scotland* is to *England*, so *Portugall* may be sayed to be in relation to *Spain*, in point of Speech; The *Scott* speaks somewhat broader, and more gaping; so doth the *Portugues* compared to the *Castilian*, and shorter farr: for wheras the *Castilian* out of an innated humor of gravity is addicted to long-traind words, the *Portuguès* doth use to curtayl divers of them, some in the middle, some in the end; But to know the main difference betwixt them, take these Instances.

The Portugues is not much affected to *l* or *n*; touching the first, hee turns her to *r*, the snarling letter, as the Philosopher calls her: For example, wheras the Castilian sayes *Inglatierra* *England*, hee sayes *Ingraterra*; *Noble Inglés*, a Noble Englishman, *Nobre Ingrès*; *Flamenco* a *Flemin*, *Framengo* in *Portuguès*; *Blando* soft *brando*; *Blanco* white *branco*; *Hermoso* fair *fermoso*; *Complido* finishd, *comprido*; *Emplear* to employ, *Empregar*; *Flaco* weak, *fraco*; *Diablo* the Devil, *Diabro* o *Diabo*, & c.

Besides, when *ll* begins a word in *Spanish* the *Portuguès* turns them to *ch*; As, *Llamar* to call *chamar*; *Llama* a flame, *chama*; *Llaga* a wound, *chaga*; *Lleno* full, *Cheo* wherby the *n*. allso is lost; *Luna* the Moon, *lua*; *Llegar* *allegar* to com or approach, *chegar* *achegar*; *Llave* a key, *chiave*; *Lloro* weeping, *choro*; *Luvia* Rain, *chuva*.

Yet the *Portuguès* is not so well affected to *ch*, when hee finds it in a *Spanish* word, for then he turns it to *yt* commonly, as *noche* night, *noyte*; *Ocho* eight, *oyto*; *Pecho* the brest, *peyto*; *Provecho* profit, *proveyto*, &c.

In divers words hee leaves *l* quite out, when hee finds it about the middle, as *Delante* before, *díante*; *Cielo* Heaven, *ceo*; *Candela* a Candle, *candea*; *Mala* ill, *maa*; As *Maa noyte y faz Filinha*, An ill night and make a girl.

The Portugues likes not allso the aspiration *h* in the beginning of a word but turns it to *f*, whereby his language comes neerer (in many words) to the *Latin*, which is the *Mother* of both; as, wheras the Spaniard sayeth *Hazer* to do, the *Portuguès* sayeth *Fazer*; *Hado* Fate, *Fado*; *Horca* the Gallows, *Forca*; *Hazaña* an exploit, *Fazanha*; *Hacha* a Torch, *facha*; *Hablar* to speak, *falar*; *Horno* an Oven, *forno*; *Hormiga* an Ant, *formiga*; *Holgar* gaudeo *folgar*; *Hidalgo* a Gentleman, *fidalgo*, &c.

Note allso that where the *Portugues* finds the throaty *j*, or *ishota* in a word, he turns it to *lh*, As, *Abeja* a Bee, *abelha*; *Oveja* a sheep, *ovelha*; *Ojo* the Ey, *olho*; *Aparejar* to prepare, *aparelhar*; *Trabajo* toyl, *travalho*; & c. But it is observed, that those words in *Portugues* must be pronouncd as if an *i* followd; As, *Abelha* a Bee, *abelhia*; *Travalho* toyl, *travalhio*, & c.

Nor is the *Portuguès*, much affected to the letter *n*, for where hee finds her in the middle of a *Spanish* word, hee quite cutts her off; As, for *Cadena* a chain, he sayeth *cadea*; *Amonestar* to warn, *amoestar*; *Cenar* to supp, *cear*; *Corona* a Crown, *coroa*; *Freno* a bridle, *freo*; *Buena* good, *boa*; *Mano* a hand, *mao*, & c.

---

<sup>24</sup> It has been a hard task to "read" the words because much of the text available to me was barely legible, especially the Glossary. I have modernised some spellings.

Moreover the *Portugues* turns *Spanish* Dissyllables into Monosyllables; As, *Tener* to hold, *ter*; *Venir* to com, *vir*; *Poner* to putt, *por*; *Color* colour, *cor*; *Dolor* greif, *dor*; *Mayor* a *Maior*, *mor*, & c.

The *Portugues* also turns oftentimes *Spanish* Trissyllables into Dissyllables; As, *Menester* need, *mister*; *Ganado* a flock, *gado*; *Generar* to engender, *gerar*; *General* General, *geral*; *Obispo* a Bishop, *Bispo*, & c.

Furthermore where the *Spanish* words end in *bre*, the *Portugues* turns it to *me*, or *mem*; As, *Costumbre* custom, *costume*; *Hombre* a man, *homem*; *Nombre* a name, *nomem*; *Cumbre* the top, *cume*, & c.

The *Portugues* also turns the *Spanish* *ble* into *vel*; As, *Possible* possible, *possivel*; *Insufrible* unsufferable, *insufrivel*; *Mudable* changeable, *mudavel*; *Durable* durable, *duravel*, & c.

The *Portugues* makes also Trissyllables of *Spanish* Quatrosyllables often; As, *Solamente* only, *somente*; *Malamente* ill, *mamente*; *Enemigo* an Enemy, *imigo*, & c. Yet sometimes the *Portugues* adds a syllable more; As, *Duvida* to the *Spanish* *duda*, a doubt; *Duvidosamente* for *dudosamente*, doubtfully; *Duos* for *dos*, two, & c.

The *Portugues* also adds *e* to *Spanish* words ending in *d*; As, *Mocidade* for *mocedad*, youth; *Amistad* friendship, *amizade*; *Libertad* liberty, *libertade*; *Liberalidad* liberality, *liberalidade*; *Piedad* piety, *piedade*, & c.

Now, Though the *Castilian*, and the *Lusitanian* language bee both derivd from the *Latin*, the first *immediately*, the other mediately by means of the *Castilian*, wheof shee is a Dialect, and therby a *subdialect* to the *Latin*; yet shee hath divers words for which shee is beholden to neither, nor to the *Morisco* also, wherof I thought it worth the while to give a particular Catalog.

A Short  
DICTIONARY  
OR,  
CATALOG  
Of such  
Portuges Words  
That have no Affinity with the  
SPANISH.

<i>Portugues</i> ,	<i>Spanish</i> ,	English
Abafar	Garrotar	<i>To strangle</i>
Abalroar	Pelear	<i>To fight</i>
Abalo do animo	Desasossiego	<i>Trouble of mind</i>
Abegaon	Rustico	<i>A swayne</i>
Abelhaon	Colmena	<i>A hive of bees</i>
Abelhudamente	Appressurosamente	<i>Hastily</i>
Abençoer	Bendezir	<i>To blesse</i>
Acamar	Enfermarse	<i>To be sick</i>
Agastar	Provocar	<i>To provoke</i>
Aginha	Presto	<i>Speedily</i>
Agoacento	Humedo	<i>Watry</i>
Alagar	Deribar	<i>To overthrow</i>
Alapardarse	Escondarse	<i>To hide himself</i>
Alardo	Nombramiento de soldados	<i>A list of Soldiers</i>

Alar	Socorrer	<i>To succour</i>
Alcunha	Sobrenombre	<i>A surname</i>
Alem	Mas de esto	<i>Moreover</i>
Alfayate	Sastre	<i>A taylor</i>
Alfaqueque	Mensajero	<i>A messenger</i>
Alvacento	Blanquecino	<i>Whitish</i>
Alvela	Milan	<i>A kite</i>
Aniae	Alfiler	<i>A pinn</i>
Amuado	Obstinado	<i>Obstinat</i>
Andorinha	Golondrina	<i>A swallow</i>
Apodar	Paragonar	<i>To compan</i>
Apupar	Aullar	<i>To houl</i>
Arreceo	Miedo	<i>Fear</i>
Atlhar <sup>25</sup>	Impedir	<i>To hinder</i>
Atafanero	Panadero	<i>A baker</i>
Bacoro	Puerca	<i>A sow</i>
Bafo	Aliento	<i>The breath</i>
Bafio	Hediondez	<i>A stink</i>
Balisa	Carcel	<i>A gaol</i>
Baque	Cayda	<i>A fall</i>
Barça	Cofre	<i>A coffer</i>
Bicho	Gusano	<i>A worm</i>
Bragante	Ruyn	<i>Lewd</i>
Bren	Pez	<i>Pitch</i>
Bugio	Mono	<i>An Ape</i>
Buraco	Agujero (sic)	<i>A hole</i>
Burrifar	Aguar	<i>To sprinkle</i>
Cachopo	Mocito	<i>A little boy</i>
Cadela	Perra	<i>A bitch</i>
Canga	Yugo	<i>A yoke</i>
Cardume	Muchedumbre	<i>A multitude</i>
Crestaon	Cabron	<i>A goat</i>
Carpinha	Lamentaciòn	<i>Lamentation</i>
Caranca	Mala cara	<i>An ill face</i>
Caramelo	Yelo	<i>Ice</i>
Cavidarse	Guardarse	<i>To beware</i>
Colheyta	Cosecha	<i>The harvest</i>
Coceyra	Começon	<i>The itch</i>
Cocegas	Coxquillas	<i>Tickling</i>
Cossar	Arañar	<i>To soratch<sup>26</sup></i>
Coyma	Dolor	<i>Pain</i>
Cafra <sup>27</sup>	Yunque	<i>An Anvil</i>
Cedo	Presto	<i>Quickly</i>
Ceyfa	Cosecha	<i>Harvest</i>
Chambaon	Tonto	<i>A dullard</i>

---

<sup>25</sup> Atalhar.

<sup>26</sup> To scratch.

<sup>27</sup> Çafra.

Cheyrrar	Oler	<i>To smel</i>
Decepar	Romper	<i>To break</i>
Derrancar	Corromper	<i>To corrupt</i>
Desazo	Ociosidad	<i>Sloth</i>
Desdobrar	Exprimir	<i>To expresse</i>
Desmiçar	Aboler	<i>To abolish</i>
Desmanchar	Quebrantar	<i>To break</i>
Devesa	Selva	<i>A Wood</i>
Dia azinhago	Dia Escuro	<i>A black day</i>
Dia de Hotem	Ayer	<i>Yesterday</i>
Dianteyra	Frente	<i>The forehead</i>
Discante	La lyra	<i>The harp</i>
Doudo	Bobo	<i>A fool</i>
Elche	Apostata	<i>An Apostat</i>
Embevedarse	Emborracharse	<i>To be drunk</i>
Embleçar	Engañar	<i>To cosen</i>
Embicar	Ofender	<i>To offend</i>
Embelar	Cunar	<i>To rock</i>
Emborcar	Invertir	<i>To invert</i>
Empencilho	Obstaculo	<i>A stopp</i>
Emperrar	Porfiar	<i>To be obstinat</i>
Emposta	Ayuda	<i>Help</i>
Encampar	Obtruder	<i>To obtrude</i>
Enculca	Noticia	<i>Knowledg</i>
Endoudecer	Enloquecer	<i>To grow foolish</i>
Enfastiar	Enfadar	<i>To trouble</i>
Engeytar	Menospreciar	<i>To cast away</i>
Ensejo	Ocasión	<i>Occasion</i>
Entraz	Carbunculo	<i>A Carbuncle</i>
Entulhar	Entoñalar	<i>To fill up</i>
Escavedar	Huyr	<i>To fly away</i>
Esfalfar	Cansar	<i>To tyre</i>
Esmechar	Herir	<i>To wound</i>
Esqueho	Tuerto	<i>Crooked</i>
Espaçar	Alargar	<i>To lengthen</i>
Esmolar	Dar limosna	<i>To give alms</i>
Esmera	Perfecto	<i>Perfect</i>
Esmoga	Synagoga	<i>A synagog</i>
Esquecimento	Olvido	<i>Forgetfulness</i>
Esterqueyra	Muladar	<i>A denghil</i>
Estulagem	Venta	<i>An hostry</i>
Estabalhoado	Arrebatado <sup>28</sup>	<i>Rash</i>
Estrondo	Alboroto	<i>A noise</i>
Faim	Lança	<i>A lance</i>
Fala	Voz	<i>A voice</i>
Faisca	Centella	<i>A flash</i>
Fanar	Costar	<i>To cut</i>

<sup>28</sup> Arrebatado.

Fanchono	Mugeril	<i>Effeminat</i>
Faqua	Cuchillo	<i>A knife</i>
Fanquey	Lencero	<i>A linnendrapaper</i>
Fanga	Hanega	<i>A bushel</i>
Farelo	Salvado	<i>Bran</i>
Febre	Delgado	<i>Slender</i>
Felugem	Hollin	<i>Soot</i>
Felinha	Hijuela	<i>A little Girle</i>
Figo Lampo	Precoz	<i>Too soon ripe</i>
Fiquar	Quedar	<i>To stay</i>
Focinho	Boca	<i>The mouth</i>
Folga	Gozo	<i>Mirth</i>
Fraga	Peña	<i>A rock</i>
Franga	Polastra	<i>A pulet</i>
Fracayro	Putaniero	<i>A wencher</i>
Furna	Caverna	<i>A den</i>
Fuzilar	Relampaguear	<i>To lighten</i>
Gabo	Loor	<i>Praise</i>
Gabar	Loar	<i>To prayse</i>
Gafern <sup>29</sup>	Lepra	<i>The leprosie</i>
Gaguo	Tartamudo	<i>A stutterer</i>
Galbo	Ramo	<i>A branch</i>
Geyto	Ademan de cuerpo	<i>Gesture</i>
Gear	Yelo	<i>Yce</i>
Gielho	Rodilla	<i>The knee</i>
Hontem	Ayer	<i>Yesterday</i>
Huyvar	Aullar	<i>To howle</i>
Ianella	Ventana	<i>A window</i>
Jentar	Comida	<i>A diner</i>
Ilharga	Lado	<i>The side</i>
Inçar	Propagar	<i>To propagat</i>
Ingoas	Las buas	<i>The Pox</i>
Lapa	Cueva	<i>A Cave</i>
Leycenço	Ladroncillo	<i>A little thief</i>
Lembrar	Acordar	<i>To remember</i>
Machado	Segur	<i>An ax</i>
Magao	Congoja	<i>Grief</i>
Madraço	Picaro	<i>A Rogue</i>
Mamote	Lechoncillo	<i>A sucking pigg</i>
Maminher	Esterilidad	<i>Barrenesse</i>
Marral heyro	Vellaco	<i>A cunning knave</i>
Madoso	Liberal	<i>Liberal</i>
Matiz	Retrato	<i>A picture</i>
Matreyro	Zorro	<i>Crafty</i>
Mealherro	Casa de tesoro	<i>Exchequer</i>
Morno	Tibio	<i>Lukewarm</i>
Morgado	Primogenito	<i>The first born</i>

---

<sup>29</sup> Gafeira.

Mouco	Sordo	<i>deaf</i>
Orate	Mentecato	<i>A madman</i>
Ontiva	Arrebatadamente	<i>Rashly</i>
Payxaon	Enfado	<i>Trouble</i>
Pancado	Bofeton	<i>A Blow</i>
Pao	Madera	<i>Wood</i>
Porolento	Mohoso	<i>Musty</i>
Patife	Desembuelto	<i>A loose fellow</i>
Pezinho	Piojo	<i>A lowse</i>
Pelouro	Bala	<i>A bullet</i>
Peneyra	Harnero	<i>A sive</i>
Perto	Cerca	<i>Neere</i>
Pinga	Gota	<i>A drop</i>
Pissa <sup>30</sup>	Carajo	<i>A mans yard</i>
Pomba	Pañoma	<i>A pigeon</i>
Povo	Pueblo	<i>The peepie</i>
Presunto	Pernil	<i>A gammon</i>
Resenn	Caucion	<i>A pledg</i>
Rilhar	Roer	<i>To gnaw</i>
Roldar	Tener centinela	<i>To keep watch</i>
Rolda	Centinela	<i>The watch</i>
Saloya	Rustica	<i>A Country woman</i>
Sandeu	Frenetico	<i>Madd</i>
Saluço	Suspiro	<i>A sigh</i>
Sisa	Pecho	<i>A tax</i>
Soada	Fama	<i>A rumor</i>
Tamancas	Alpargatas	<i>Wodden shoos</i>
Tamalaves	Un ratico	<i>A little while</i>
Tarefa	Obra	<i>A task</i>
Tayvar	Rabiar	<i>To rage</i>
Tolo	Necio	<i>A fool</i>
Traquinada	Ruydo	<i>An uproar</i>
Trevas	Tinieblas	<i>The dark</i>
Valhacouto	Refugio	<i>A refuge</i>
Colhor	Cuchara	<i>A spoone</i>
Ambicar	Tropesar	<i>To stumble</i>
Calleyro	Granja	<i>A barn</i>
Suncho <sup>31</sup>	Hinojo	<i>Fenell</i>
Sedo	De mañana	<i>Early</i>
Sargueyro	Saulze	<i>A willow</i>
Radea	Carcel	<i>A gaol</i>
Zombar	Motejar	<i>To geere</i>

The *Portugês* in nombring five dayes of the week differs from the *Castilian*, and all other, but it agrees with the *Roman*, *Missal*, As Munday, Twesday, Wenesday,

---

<sup>30</sup> Picha.

<sup>31</sup> Funcho.

Thursday, Friday are calld *Segunda, Terca, Quarta, Quinta, Sexta, Feyra*; But Saterdag and Sunday are calld *Sabado y Domingo*.

Thus have I given a short Essay of the *Lusitanian* Toung, which, by observing the *differential* precepts pointed at before, may be attained with much ease by any who hath but an indifferent knowledg of the *Spanish* from whom she is derivd but become somewhat more rugged; so that it may be sayed, as a *Castilian* was making of a Toledo blade, a *Portugês* came, and taking up the silings he made a *Toung* of them; Indeed, it must be granted that the *Castilian* is in more esteem, yea, in *Portugal* it self, where the best sort of the Gentry and Merchants speak it, with Church and cloysterd men; most of their Sermons, their musical sonets, and madrigals, with their stage plays being in *Spanish*. Insomuch that as it is a saying in *Italy, Lingua Toscana*, in *Lingua Romana*; So there is one among them *Lingoa Castelhana em boca Portugueza*; The *Spaniard* hath so little esteem of it, That he sayes there is but one good word in all the *Portugues* Tongue, and that is *Saudades* which is a large word, and a kind of *Amphibolon*, for it signifies many things, as *Tenho mil saudades de vm*. I have a thousands desires of you; *Muero de saudades*, I die for sorrows, & c.

Concerning the preceding *Spanish* Grammer, ther went more oyle, and labor to rayse up (as I may say) that little *Castle of Castile*, wherein and Ingenious Student may find not only a *survey* of the Language, but he may take *livry* and *saisin* thereof in a short time; To which purpose we have consulted the best Artists upon this Subject<sup>32</sup> as *Miranda*, and *Salazar*; together with *Franciosini* the Florentin, and *Oudin* the Frenchman, with others who have laudably taken pains herin, and are more extensive in the conjugating of som Verbs; For as soon as the idea of this work entered into the imagination, the first thing we designd was *brevity*, yet without making it subject to Lameness or *Obscurity*.

*Nec dum Brevis esse Laboro Obscurus, vel mancus ero –*

*Author's address:*

Facultad de Filosofía y Letras · C/ Pedro Cerbuna, 12 · 50009 Zaragoza  
fsanchez@unizar.es

<sup>32</sup> For the sources of Howell's *Spanish Grammar* see Sánchez Escribano (1992: 280-281).

# Two Spanish renderings of Philip Sidney's "First Song" from *Astrophil & Stella* (1591): a reappraisal and a new proposal<sup>1</sup>

Jorge Luis BUENO ALONSO  
*University of Vigo*

## ABSTRACT

Translating poetry has always been a difficult, hard and complex task. If a translator decides to use prose when rendering a poetic text, he is opting for a completely justifiable approach to translation, although it seems perhaps an option too frequently adopted nowadays. An attempt to translate poetry into poetry should always be made when rendering a poetic text. The aim of this note is to discuss the question of poetic translation through a brief comparative analysis of the only two published Spanish translations of Philip Sidney's *Astrophil & Stella* (1591), made by Fernando Galván (1991) and Sonia Hernández (2002). I will focus on a sample case, the translation of the "First Song" from *Astrophil & Stella*, to revise the translator's techniques, to discuss problems and solutions and to offer my own proposal: a verse translation that keeps a rhyme pattern similar to that of Sidney's text.

## 1. Preliminary words

On the issue of poetic translation and its related topics, that is, is it possible to translate poetry?, is it better to use prose or poetry when translating poetry?, Samuel Taylor Coleridge stated his well-informed opinion as follows: "I do not admit the argument for prose translations. I would, in general, rather see verse in so capable a language as ours." This quotation from Coleridge's *Table Talk* allows Paul Selver (1966: 13) in his classic monograph *The Art of Translating Poetry* to elaborate arguments for and against both critical stances, which in the end just expressed the old question that has been worrying translators of poetry all over the world since the very beginning of literary translation: should poetry be translated into

---

<sup>1</sup> This research was funded by the Spanish Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, through its Dirección General de Investigación, grant number HUM2005-02351. This grant is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

prose or into poetry? In the Spanish academic community such a question was also tackled and summarized by Garcia Yebra's (1983: 139) old aphorism on translation: "vale más una buena traducción en prosa que una mala traducción en verso, pero una buena traducción en verso vale más que una buena traducción en prosa." Selver (1966: 13) sums up the question with a quotation from Alexander Fraser Tytler's *Essay on the Principles of Translation*, which clearly favoured the "poetry into poetry" option:

To attempt, therefore, a translation of a lyric poem into prose, is the most absurd of all undertakings; for those very characters of the original which are essential to it, and which constitute its highest beauties, if transferred to a prose translation, become unpardonable blemishes.

In my opinion, what Tyler's quotation, Coleridge's statement, Garcia Yebra's aphorism and Paul Selver's own book have in common is that they all defend the same: an attempt – at least an attempt – to translate poetry into poetry should always be made. It is a difficult, hard and complex task, but when someone decides to translate a poem, it is an option that should not be just abandoned at the very beginning of the process. If a translator decides to use prose when rendering a poetic text, he is opting for a completely justifiable approach to translation, although it seems perhaps an option too frequently and blithely adopted nowadays. If when rendering poetry we could abide by the formal requirements of poetry, the results will definitely be better.

The aim of this note is to keep on discussing the question of poetic translation through a brief comparative analysis of the only two published Spanish translations of Philip Sidney's *Astrophil & Stella* (1591): the first and most quoted one, composed by Fernando Galván (1991) and the most recent and problematic one written by Sonia Hernández (2002). To be more precise, it is my intention to focus on the translation of the "First Song" from *Astrophil & Stella*, revising thus every stanza to point out the merits and the weaknesses of the translator's techniques, to discuss problems and solutions and, above all, to offer my own verse translation as a proposal that tries to keep on defending that the option of translating poetry into poetry must be taken into account, or at least, must be attempted by translators.

## 2. Galván (1991) and Hernández (2002): a reappraisal and a new proposal

### 2.1 *The translators' task: decisions adopted beforehand*

I think that the best way to start revising the translations is by having a look at the poetics guiding the translator's task in both versions. It is in such an important issue when the first significant difference could be found. Fernando Galván (1991: 58-60) states his approach to translation and his translating technique from the very beginning:

La traducción que contiene esta edición está concebida, pues, y en primer término, como apoyo para leer el original ... El fin último de la traducción ha sido ofrecer una versión "legible", que preservara la simplicidad, la fluidez, la soltura y la gracia del original ... y por ello he renunciado a forzar el significado y la naturalidad del lenguaje para buscar una rima o un número de sílabas determinado ... Un equivalente completo del texto inglés requeriría desde luego – como en alguna ocasión se ha hecho muy bien con los sonetos de Shakespeare o de Donne – una versión en endecasílabos y en sonetos españoles; pero ello forzaría, desde luego, el significado.

Galván adopts a hybrid procedure by offering a sort of blank verse that aims at transmitting the meaning of Sidney's poetry and supporting the reading of the original text. Galván also states (1991: 57) that his edition reproduces Sidney's text as edited by William A. Ringler, Jr. in his 1962 edition but without the critical apparatus "que está fuera de lugar en una edición de las características de ésta." So, translation prevails over edition in Galván's text, and his notes constitute in all cases an explanation of his translation: cultural and historical concepts, ideas, words, etc. Thus, the editorial procedure and the translating approach have been clearly defined and well defended by the translator.

Surprisingly enough, these two crucial aspects are omitted by Hernández in her work. She presents a volume that attempts to produce a new translation and a new revised edition of Sidney's original text. It seems, though, that from both aims Hernández favours the first one, or so she says (2002: 57) in the introduction: "El principal objetivo de esta edición revisada de *Astrophil & Stella* es la de acercar al lector a los manuscritos y las ediciones tempranas a través de un elaborado aparato crítico que proporciona las distintas versiones del texto." As far as the translation procedure is concerned,

there is no reference whatsoever to the style of translation she wants to produce. As Maria José Mora (2003: 153) has pointed out in her thorough revision of the volume:

Al explicar los objetivos de esta “edición revisada de *Astrophil & Stella* [la autora] no consigue aclarar qué aporta esta revisión sobre ediciones anteriores, en particular, la de Ringler (1962), que suele considerarse como texto de referencia. [La autora] obvia totalmente el problema de la traducción; de hecho, sorprende que entre la lista de ediciones consultadas no figure la de Galván, pues al tratarse de la única traducción española cabía esperar al menos una mención.

I am not interested in mentioning the problems that her edition may have, though from the reading of the volume I agree with Mora’s evaluation. As far as the issue of translation is concerned, the fact that Hernández does not explain her approach to translation is almost unbelievable. She does mention Galván’s translation, but I understand why Mora says she does not. It is a reference difficult to find, as Hernández does not locate it in the section where she indicates the editions used. Rather, she hides it in the final bibliography – in fact it is the only translation she mentions in the whole bibliographical section – with Sidney’s works, as follows (2002: 580): “Sidney, P. (1991) *Astrophil y Stela*, Galván, F. trad. Letras Universales. Edición bilingüe. Madrid: Cátedra”. Anyway, Mora is totally right when she states that Hernández avoids mentioning any reference not only to translation but also – and mainly – to *her* translation. So, what kind of approach is she adopting? Guessing, then, is our only hope as her approach can be deduced exclusively by having a look at what she translates. Again, I agree with Mora (2003: 154) when she states that:

En cuanto a la traducción, aunque la autora nunca nos aclara cómo ha abordado esta tarea, es evidente que su método y su objetivo coinciden con los de Galván: ofrecer un texto paralelo lo más literal posible que sirva de apoyo para leer el original.

It is clear that – with great differences in the final results, as we shall see later on – both translations aim at being literal and avoid any attempt to keep the verse patterns or the rhyme of the original. I agree with Galván when he says that “el desigual reparto silábico de las dos lenguas ... obliga normalmente a acortar el sentido del original,” but I think that we could abide at least by some of the

formal requirements of poetry. If in this case it is difficult to select a given Spanish verse pattern, we could perhaps try to keep rhyme and rhythm. That is, then, my verse proposal: to obtain a hybrid text that keeps a rhyme pattern similar to the original text. It is true that to offer such a translation we will have to make some changes, but I think the final result will produce a text faithful to Sidney's form and content. Let's proceed then with the main aim in this note: to offer a brief revision of "First Song" in both translations and to give my own version of it.

### 2.2 *The translated texts*

From a formal point of view it is obvious that both published renderings do not want to reproduce the rhyme pattern of the poem. A quick glance at the first stanza<sup>2</sup> is enough to see this fact:

<p>Doubt you to whom my muse these notes intendeth, Which now my breast, o'ercharged, to music lendeth? To you, to you. all song of praise is due; Only in you my song begins and endeth.</p>	<p><i>My proposal</i> ¿Acaso dudas a quién mi musa estas notas envía, esas que mi triste pecho da a la música en garantía? A ti, solo a ti, que mereces un poema así, solo en ti comienza y concluye mi melodía.</p>
<p><i>Galván (1991)</i> ¿Dudas quién es al que estas notas mi Musa dirige, que presta ahora a la Música mi pecho afligido? Tú, tú, que mereces toda loa y canción, sólo en ti mi canción comienza y concluye.</p>	<p><i>Hernández (2002)</i> ¿Dudáis a quién mi Musa estas notas dedica, que mi pecho abrumado a la Música cede? A vos, a vos, todo canto de alabanza se debe, sólo en vos mi canción comienza y culmina.</p>

The internal rhyme of the third line, "you" and "due", is also avoided. Leaving this aside, the content is appropriately rendered in both versions, with acceptable variants like "afligido", "abrumado" for "o'ercharged", or "concluye", "culmina", "comienza" for "begins and endeth". I prefer, though, Galvan's syntax, as it is clear and coherent with his approach. I think that it is also more successful to

---

<sup>2</sup> When commenting the translations I will include in all cases the original text as it appears in Katherine Duncan-Jones 1989 edition. The four texts (Duncan-Jones 1989, Galván 1991, Hernández 2002 and my own) are listed in the appendix.

use “tú” instead of “vos”, which in Spanish has excessively formal implications that are not expressed by the original “you”. My proposal also follows this trend as far as the vocabulary selection is concerned, exception made of “song”, which I prefer to render as “melodía” to keep the rhyme structure. I think both rhyme structures could be kept, with a slight change though. In my proposal, “ti” and “así” are a good solution to obtain internal rhyme in line 3, and we only have to make a minor variation in line 2 to get the appropriate rhyme with “garantía”. Of course, in my effort to abide by the rhyme pattern some minor alterations like this one will have to be made.

The lexical selection in the second stanza is also acceptable in both versions:

<p>Who hath the eyes which marry state with pleasure, Who keeps the key of Nature's chiefest treasure? To you, to you, all song of praise is due; Only for you the heav'n forgat all measure.</p>	<p><i>My proposal</i> ¿Quién tiene ojos tales que a estado y placer emparejan? ¿Quién guarda la llave del más preciado bien de la Naturaleza? A ti, solo a ti, que mereces un poema así, solo por ti se olvidaron los cielos de su grandeza.</p>
<p><i>Galván (1991)</i> ¿Quién tiene los ojos en que estado con placer confluyen, quién guarda la llave del más grande tesoro de Natura? Tú, tú, que mereces toda loa y canción, sólo por ti olvidóse el cielo de toda medida.</p>	<p><i>Hernández (2002)</i> ¿Quién posee esos ojos que aúnan ansiedad y placer, quién guarda la llave del escogido tesoro de Natura? A vos, a vos, todo canto de alabanza se debe, sólo por vos el cielo olvidó la medida.</p>

“Nature's chiefest treasure” is adapted into “más grande tesoro de Natura” and “escogido tesoro de Natura.” I prefer Galván's option again as it keeps the superlative, so I render this as “máspreciado bien de la Naturaleza,” choosing “Naturaleza” and not “Natura” for metrical reasons. The same causes drive my selection of “grandeza” instead of “medida” in the final line. However, it is in the first line where I disagree with the version given by Hernández. I am referring to “which marry state with pleasure.” Galván offers an appropriate reading, “estado con placer confluyen.” I render the line as “a estado y placer emparejan” for metrical and lexical reasons: rhyme is kept, and the double meaning of the verb “to marry” is better expressed. There is only one

difference between Galván's reading, my own and the version given by Hernández: the word "state". Why does she render "state" as "ansiedad"? Hernández (2002: 469) defends this reading in the explanatory notes offered in the second part of the volume:

*5 the eyes which marry state with pleasure ...* El término *state*, según las acepciones del OED 1b (*a dirty, disorderly or untidy condition*) y 7b (*an agitated, excited or anxious condition of mind or feeling*) se refiere al sufrimiento y la ansiedad que los ojos de Stella causan en el enamorado. Por otra parte, estos son también motivo de placer. Por tanto, en este verso, el poeta proclama la propiedad de los ojos de Stella de provocar sufrimiento y gozo a la vez.

This argument seems correct. But if you check the entry "state" in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, which by the way has 41 meanings listed in 7 pages, and scan the whole list you get to meaning 18a, which reads as follows:

18. a. Dignity of demeanour or presence; dignified appearance, stateliness of bearing. Now *rare*. a 1586 SIDNEY *Astroph & Stella* Song 1.ii, Who hath the eyes which marrie state with pleasure!

Surprisingly enough, this definition not only explains a meaning of the word that is totally suitable for its rendering in Spanish as "estado" but it does so by making an explicit reference to this very line of *Astrophil & Stella*. It is very strange that Hernández makes no reference at all to this particular meaning, especially after mentioning meanings 1b and 7b of the same entry, which at least in the 1989 edition of the OED do not appear as Hernández says. This could be one of the many "errores de diccionario" spotted by Mora (2003: 156-157) all over the text rendered by Hernández. Mora does not mention the case of "First Song" but she lists many lexical misconceptions in the sonnets that could be similar to the one I have noted here.

The rest of the stanzas follow similar patterns with minimum variations – more conservative and prosaic in tone in the selections that Hernández made<sup>3</sup> – acceptable in all cases. The style of both translations is very clearly defined by the comments I made on the

---

<sup>3</sup> The already mentioned use of "vos" to translate "you" or the use of "poseer" to render "hath" are two very appropriate examples of linguistic options that, in my opinion, raise the style of the tone in the Spanish version.

first two stanzas and by the reading of the three texts that have been included in the final appendix. However, I think that it is interesting to comment briefly on some translation units that present worth mentioning aspects:

a) Stanza 3, “both decks and staineth.” Both versions offer a variation of the same idea: “a la vez engalana y mancilla” (Galván) and “engalana a la vez que mancilla” (Hernández). My proposal is forced by verse structure, “a un tiempo mancilla y enjaeza,” but I consider it appropriate and poetic, not only for using “a un tiempo” – to render “both” it is a more powerful option than “a la vez” from an stylistic point of view – but also for including “enjaeza”. This word keeps the rhyme structure and could be used in Spanish as a metaphoric synonym for “engalanar”, “adornar” (Seco et al. 1999 and DSA 1996).

b) Stanza 5, “when it chides doth cherish?” Although both renderings offer a direct version, Hernández presents a more prosaic and expansive line: “que cuando regaña es toda ternura.” Galván opts for a line with a rhythm closer to the original text: “que cuando riñe acaricia.” My proposal plays more with the content of the phrase than with the literal faithfulness of the terms in order to keep the rhyme structure in a somewhat uncertain but poetically powerful line: “que respeto abriga en la censura.”

c) Stanza 6, “long dead beauty with increase reneweth?”. This example is similar to the previous one. Both versions respect the literal meaning of the text, although Galván is again more successful when respecting the literal meaning of Sidney’s verse – “quién belleza largamente muerta con añadidos renueva?” – than Hernández who modifies the essential significance of the line by disregarding the meaning of “long dead”: “quién antiguas bellezas con creces renueva.” Perhaps, using “con añadidos” to translate “with increase” is not a very successful option but it is far more adequate than turning “long dead beauty” into “antiguas bellezas.” My proposal offers a more poetic alternative to render both translation units – “¿Quién con medro renueva la belleza muerta antaño” – and marks the rhyme pattern for the whole stanza in the Spanish version.

d) Stanza 6, “all envy hopeless rueth.” This line is another example of how excessively prosaic verse may sound in a prose version. Galván again offers a more stylistically appropriate text: “la envidia toda sin esperanza se arrepiente.” To avoid reproducing Galván’s translation, Hernández is forced to render “hopeless” as

“desesperanzada”, a term that breaks the internal rhythm of the line: “la envidia, desesperanzada, se arrepiente.” If “hopeless” has to be odified, my option will keep the rhyme and abide by the poetic structure: “la envidia toda abjura en desengaño.” The meaning of the Spanish sentence does not deviate too much from the content of Sidney’s verse, and the result is undoubtedly poetic.

e) Stanza 7, “hair which, loosest, fastest tieth.” This example stresses the importance of maintaining a certain rhythmical pattern when translating verse even in prose renderings. Galván manages to keep a very interesting rhythm in his version and, as it has been the case in previous lines, his “¿Quién tiene el cabello más suelto que más firme sujeta” is more rhythmical than the prosaic and arrhythmic alternative presented by Hernández: “¿Quién posee esos cabellos que cuanto más sueltos, atán más.” In my proposal I prefer to offer a direct rendering of the line with the intention of using it as rhythm and rhyme marker for the rest of the stanza: “¿Quién tiene cabellos que cuanto más sueltos más fuerte atan?” The next line – “Who makes a man live, then glad when he dieth? – will abide by the structure proposed: “¿Quién hace vivir a un hombre alegre si lo matan?”

f) Stanza 7, “flatterer never lieth.” My proposal for this line has to maintain the rhyme structure previously presented. It could be done by saying what Sidney wants to convey but with a different selection of vocabulary. Instead of “the flatterer never lies,” I opt for “the flatterer always tells the truth.” Thus, the whole verse will be “solo de ti al zalamero verdades le sacan.” I prefer “zalamero” and not “adulador” because, though the latter would not change the rhythm of the line, the former seems a more poetic word for the context of the poem and it is well documented in Spanish as a synonym for “adulador” (e.g. Moliner 1999). In the prose versions, though both translators render the end of the line with the same words, Galván obtains a more rhythmical version by using “de ti” instead of “acerca de vos” to render the “only of you” from the beginning of the line. Although both endings are the same, if you compare both versions, the rhythm of the prose changes drastically because of that first part of the line: “sólo de ti el adulador nunca miente” / “sólo acerca de vos el adulador nunca miente.”

### 3. “Verse in so capable a language as ours”: final comments

The translations I have revised in this note – with their defects and merits – are coherent with their initial premises: to offer a parallel

text, as literal as possible, that could be used as a guide to read the original English text. However, it is also true that, though with identical initial assumptions, Galván's final result seems to be more successful at all levels than the rendering offered by Hernández. Although it could be improved on, my own verse proposal offers a model that could be defended as an accurate poetic rendering of Sidney's text. My aim has just been to keep on defending the poetic translation of poetry. Sidney himself began his *Astrophil and Stella* by stating: "Loving in truth and faine in verse my love to show." It is "verse" what he is using to express himself, and "in verse" all renderings should be made or, at least, attempted in "verse in so capable a language as ours." Although it was not the model he followed, Galván (1996: 59) declared in the introduction to his translation that, as I previously mentioned, there had been some satisfactory verse translations in Spanish:

Un equivalente completo del texto inglés requeriría desde luego – como en alguna ocasión se ha hecho muy bien con los sonetos de Shakespeare o de Donne – una versión en endecasílabos y en sonetos españoles; pero ello forzaría, desde luego, el significado.

In spite of being an incidental commentary, since he explicitly mentions Shakespeare and Donne, I think that he might be referring to two magnificent instances of verse translation into Spanish: the excellent rendering of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* by Agustín García Calvo (1974) and the equally brilliant translation of John Donne's *Songs and Sonnets* by José Benito Álvarez-Buylla (1986). These are two very good examples of the fine results that can be obtained by adapting not only the content but also the external form of the poem. Just to mention a brief example, if you compare Álvarez-Buylla's translation of "The Expiration" with the rendering of that poem that appears in one of the most recent translations of John Donne's *Songs and Sonnets* – made by Purificación Ribes (1996) – the differences between both rendered texts are remarkable:

*The Expiration*

So, so breake off this last lamenting kisse,  
Which sucks two soules, and vapors Both away,  
Turne thou ghost that way, and let mee turne this,  
And let our selves benight our happiest day,  
We ask'd none leave to love; nor will we owe  
Any, so cheape a death, as saying, Goe;

Goe; and if that word have not quite kil'd thee,  
Ease mee with death, by bidding mee goe too.  
Or, if it have, let my word worke on mee,  
And a just office on a murderer doe.  
Except it bee too late, to kill me so,  
Being double dead, going, and bidding, goe.<sup>4</sup>

*La expiración, una despedida*

Rompamos este beso lastimero,  
Que aspiran nuestras almas, y  
evapora;  
Tú, sombra, ve, yo vuelvo a mi  
sendero,  
Apaguemos tu y yo esta feliz hora.  
A nadie debo carta para amarte,  
Ni tan barata muerte decir: "Parte".

Si tal palabra no te ha muerto a ti,  
Dame muerte mandándome al camino;  
Oh, si así es, mi palabra obre en mí,  
Y haga justicia con este asesino;  
Si no ya es tarde para así morir,  
Muerto dos veces: yendo, y por  
mandarte ir.  
(Álvarez-Buylla 1986: 107)

*La expiración*

Así, sí, interrumpe este ultimo beso de  
lamento,  
que a dos almas absorbe, y a ambas  
evapora.  
Vuélvete, espectro, hacia ese lado, y  
vuélvame yo hacia este otro,  
y oscurezcamos nuestro día más dichoso.  
A nadie pedimos venia para amar; y a nadie  
muerte tan vulgar adeudaremos como el  
decir: "Partid".

Parte, y si esa palabra aun no te ha matado,  
alíviame con muerte, al pedirme que me  
vaya.  
Si ya lo hubiere hecho, actúe mi palabra  
sobre mí,  
y justo proceder sobre un verdugo muestre,  
a menos que para matarme así sea ya muy  
tarde,  
estando doblemente muerto, porirme y  
pedirme que te vayas.  
(Ribes 1996: 183)

It is evident that, though both approaches are defensible and appropriate, the two translators differ in the aim of their renderings. Although Ribes does not explain her approach to translation, it is very clear that she only wanted to offer an explanation of the original text, avoiding any poetical attempt, just as it was the case with the *Astrophil and Stella* text offered by Hernández. However, which of both renderings is closer to the poetic expression of John Donne? In my opinion, Álvarez-Buylla's, which surprisingly enough does not appear in the list of the Spanish translations of *Songs and Sonnets* included by Ribes (1996: 73) in her volume.

This poetic approach to translation could still be applied to Renaissance English Poetry with very good results, especially when rendering texts as easily adaptable as for example Thomas Wyatt's

---

<sup>4</sup> I am quoting Donne's text as it appears in Álvarez-Buylla's bilingual edition.

poem LXX. Since I have not found any Spanish version of this poem, I would like to offer my own rendering of it as a supplement to the comments I have made in this note. In this case it is possible to keep both the rhyme structure and – increasing the number of syllables – the syllabic distribution in the rhythmical structure of the Spanish verse:

<p>Like as the swan towards her death Doth strain her voice with doleful note, Right so I sing with waste of breath: I die! I die! And you regard it not.</p>	<p>Como el cisne hacia su muerte Su voz eleva con triste sonido, Canto así, malgastando mi suspiro: Muero, muero, y no te importa mi suerte.</p>
<p>I shall enforce my fainting breath That all that hears this deadly note Shall know that you doth cause my death: I die! I die! And you regard it not.</p>	<p>Y sabrán que causas tú mi muerte Todos los que oigan el mortal sonido. Así lo contará mi débil suspiro: Muero, muero, y no te importa mi suerte.</p>
<p>Your unkindness hath sworn my death, And changed hath my pleasant note To painful sighs that stops my breath: I die! I die! And you regard it not.</p>	<p>Mas tu maltrato maldijo mi muerte, Y trocado ha mi dulce sonido En grave lamento que sesga el suspiro: Muero, muero, y no te importa mi suerte. En lágrimas se funde mi cruel muerte. Han forjado tus culpas mi sonido.</p>
<p>Consumeth my life, faileth my breath; Your fault is forger of this note. Melting in tears, cruel death I die! I die! And you regard it not. My faith with me after my death Buried shall be, and to this note I do bequeath my weary breath, To cry, "I died! And you regard it not!".<sup>5</sup></p>	<p>Se consume mi vida, se va el suspiro: Muero, muero, y no te importa mi suerte. Esta mi fe, conmigo tras mi muerte Será enterrada, y a este sonido Le lego mi fatigado suspiro Que dirá. "He muerto. No te importa mi suerte."</p>

Before going straight to the “good prose translation” – as García Yebra (1983: 139) stated – as a substitute of the “bad verse,” I think we should try to find the “good verse” first, no matter how discouraging such a task could be. In the vast majority of the cases, verse translations obtain better final results, or at least, they offer a more accurate combination of form and content. To translate a text does not only mean to offer the rendering of the text itself. It also implies to foster a cultural context to understand the rendered text.

---

<sup>5</sup> I am quoting Wyatt’s text as it is edited by González et al. (1989: 80-81).

This is something accomplished in critical bilingual editions such as those I revised here. But as far as the quality of the translation offered in such editions is concerned, not all of them are equally successful.

I think we should keep on trying to combine both form and content when translating poetry. The work done by the author of a very good critical edition can be totally spoilt if the translation offered does not tally with the quality of the critical comments. This should be a key aspect of modern editorial practice because we should not forget that the text is vital, as it is what the reader – whether he is an expert on the text or not – will read to fully appreciate the quality of the translated author. To get that accurate combination of form and content should be the main aim of every verse rendering into any given language. If we do not strive enough to offer good verse renderings we will be giving a very bad treatment to all the authors – and therefore to all their readers – who, like Donne, Shakespeare or Sidney, wanted to “show in verse” the expression of their art and their innermost feelings.

#### References

- Álvarez-Buylla, J.B. ed. and trans. 1986. “John Donne: canciones y sonetos.” *Scripta in Memoriam José Benito Álvarez-Buylla Álvarez*. Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo. 38-113.
- Diccionario de Sinónimos y Antónimos*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1996.
- Duncan-Jones, K. ed. 1989. *Sir Philip Sidney: A Critical Edition of the Major Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Galván, F. ed. and trans. 1991. *Philip Sidney: Astrophil y Stella*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- García Calvo, A. ed. and trans. 1974. *William Shakespeare: Sonetos de amor*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- García Yebra, V. 1983. *En torno a la traducción*. Madrid: Gredos.
- González, S.I., R. Pérez, A. Bravo and F. García eds. 1989. *Anthology for a History of the English Language II*. Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo.
- Hernández Santano, S. ed. and trans. 2002. *Astrophil y Stella: Sir Philip Sidney*. Huelva: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Huelva.
- Moliner, M. 1999. *Diccionario del uso del español*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Mora Sena, M.J. 2003. “Review of Sonia Hernández Santano ed. & trad. 2002. *Astrophil y Stela* de Sir Philip Sidney.” *Atlantis XXV/2*: 153-158.
- Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Ribes, P. ed. and trans. 1996. *John Donne: Canciones y sonetos*. Madrid: Cátedra.

Ringler, Jr. W.A. ed. 1962. *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Seco, M., O. Andrés and G. Ramos 1999: *Diccionario del español actual*. Madrid: Aguilar.

Selver, P. 1966: *The Art of Translating Poetry*. London: John Baker Ltd.

Appendix: Verse Renderings of "First Song" from *Astrophil & Stella*

*Text from Duncan-Jones (1989: 178-179)*

Doubt you to whom my Muse these  
notes intendeth,  
Which now my breast o'ercharged to  
music lendeth?  
To you, to you, all song of praise is due;  
Only in you my song begins and endeth.

*My proposal*

¿Acaso dudas a quién mi musa estas  
notas envía,  
esas que mi triste pecho da a la música  
en garantía?  
A ti, solo a ti, que mereces un poema  
así,  
solo en ti comienza y concluye mi  
melodía.

Who hath the eyes which marry state  
with pleasure,  
Who keeps the key of Nature's chiefest  
treasure?  
To you, to you, all song of praise is due;  
Only for you the heav'n forgat all  
measure.

¿Quién tiene ojos tales que a estado y  
placer emparejan?  
¿Quién guarda la llave del más  
preciado bien de la Naturaleza?  
A ti, solo a ti, que mereces un poema  
así,  
solo por ti se olvidaron los cielos de su  
grandeza.

Who hath the lips, where wit in fairness  
reigneth,  
Who womankind at once both decks and  
staineth?  
To you, to you, all song of praise is due;  
Only by you Cupid his crown  
maintaineth.

¿Quién tiene labios donde tiento reina  
con belleza?  
¿Quién lo femenino a un tiempo  
mancilla y enjaeza?  
A ti, solo a ti, que mereces un poema  
así,  
solo por ti Cupido preserva corona y  
riqueza.

Who hath the feet, whose step all  
sweetness planteth,  
Who else for whom Fame worthy  
trumpets wanteth?  
To you, to you, all song of praise is due;  
Only to you her scepter Venus granteth.

¿Quién tiene pies que al pisar siembra  
toda dulzura?  
¿A quién sino a ti dignas trompetas  
Fama le asegura?  
A ti, solo a ti, que mereces un poema  
así.  
Solo a ti Venus otorga su cetro de  
hermosura.

Who hath the breast, whose milk doth  
passions nourish,  
Whose grace is such, that when it chides

¿Quién tiene pechos cuyo jugo sustento  
a la pasión procura,  
cuya gracia es tal que respeto abriga en

<p>doth cherish? To you, to you, all song of praise is due; Only through you the tree of life doth flourish.</p>	<p>la censura? A ti, solo a ti, que mereces un poema así. Solo por ti da el árbol de la vida fruto sin mesura.</p>
<p>Who hath the hand which without stroke subdueth, Who long dead beauty with increase reneweth? To you, to you, all song of praise is due; Only to you all envy hopeless rueth.</p>	<p>¿Quién tiene manos que todo lo someten sin hacer daño? ¿Quién con medro renueva la belleza muerta antaño? A ti, solo a ti, que mereces un poema así. Solo ante ti la envidia toda abjura en desengaño.</p>
<p>Who hath the hair which, loosest, fastest tieth, Who makes a man live, then glad when he dieth? To you, to you, all song of praise is due; Only of you the flatterer never lieth.</p>	<p>¿Quién tiene cabellos que cuanto más suelos más fuerte atan? ¿Quién hace vivir a un hombre alegre si lo matan? A ti, solo a ti, que mereces un poema así. Solo de ti al zalamero verdades le sacan.</p>
<p>Who hath the voice, which soul from senses sunders, Whose force but yours the bolts of beauty thunders? To you, to you, all song of praise is due; Only with you are miracles not wonders.</p>	<p>¿Quién tiene voz tal que separa del sentido la conciencia? ¿Quién logra que los rayos de la belleza truenen con violencia? A ti, solo a ti, que mereces un poema así. Solo contigo los milagros ni saben de su existencia.</p>
<p>Doubt you to whom my Muse these notes intendeth, Which now my breast o'ercharged to music lendeth? To you, to you, all song of praise is due; Only in you my song begins and endeth.</p>	<p>¿Acaso dudas a quién mi musa estas notas envía, esas que mi triste pecho da a la música en garantía? A ti, solo a ti, que mereces un poema así, solo en ti comienza y concluye mi melodía.</p>
<p><i>Galván (1991: 153-155)</i> ¿Dudas quién es al que estas notas mi Musa dirige, que presta ahora a la Música mi pecho afligido? Tú, tú, que mereces toda loa y canción, sólo en ti mi canción comienza y</p>	<p><i>Hernández (2002: 187-189)</i> ¿Dudáis a quién mi Musa estas notas dedica, que mi pecho abrumado a la Música cede? A vos, a vos, todo canto de alabanza se debe,</p>

concluye.	sólo en vos mi canción comienza y culmina.
¿Quién tiene los ojos en que estado con placer confluyen, quién guarda la llave del más grande tesoro de Natura? Tú, tú, que mereces toda loa y canción, sólo por ti olvidóse el cielo de toda medida.	¿Quién posee esos ojos que aúnan ansiedad y placer, quién guarda la llave del escogido tesoro de Natura? A vos, a vos, todo canto de alabanza se debe, sólo por vos el cielo olvidó la medida.
¿quién tiene los labios donde con belleza ingenio reina, quién a la mujer a la vez engalana y mancilla? Tú, tú, que mereces toda loa y canción, sólo por ti <i>Cupido</i> su corona mantiene.	¿Quién posee esos labios, donde ingenio sobre belleza reina, quién a la mujer engalana a la vez que mancilla? A vos, a vos, todo canto de alabanza se debe, sólo por vos <i>Cupido</i> su corona mantiene.
¿Quién tiene los pies, cuya pisada toda dulzura siembra, quién más hay para que Fama precise dignas trompetas? Tú, tú, que mereces toda loa y canción, sólo a ti <i>Venus</i> su cetro concede.	¿Quién posee esos pies, cuyos pasos toda dulzura siembran, por quién más la Fama requiere preciadas trompetas? A vos, a vos, todo canto de alabanza se debe, tan sólo a vos su cetro <i>Venus</i> cede.
¿Quién tiene el pecho cuya leche pasiones alimenta, cuya gracia es tal, que cuando riñe acaricia? Tú, tú, que mereces toda loa y canción, sólo a través de ti el árbol de la vida florece.	¿Quién posee ese pecho cuya leche pasiones alimenta, quién gracia tal posee que cuando regaña es toda ternura? A vos, a vos, todo canto de alabanza se debe, sólo a través de vos el árbol de la vida florece.
¿Quién tiene la mano que sin golpear somete, quién belleza largamente muerta con añadidos renueva? Tú, tú, que mereces toda loa y canción, sólo ante ti la envidia toda sin esperanza se arrepiente.	¿Quién posee esa mano que sin golpes somete, quién antiguas bellezas con creces renueva? A vos, a vos, todo canto de alabanza se debe, sólo ante vos la envidia, desesperanzada, se arrepiente.
¿Quién tiene el cabello más suelto que mas firme sujeta, quién hace que viva un hombre alegre	¿Quién posee esos cabellos que cuanto más sueltos, atan más, quién hace al hombre al morir vivir

cuando muere?

Tú, tú, que mereces toda loa y canción,  
sólo de ti el adulator nunca miente.

¿Quién tiene la voz que el alma de los  
sentidos separa,  
quién más fuerza que tú para que los  
rayos de la belleza truenen?  
Tú, tú, que mereces toda loa y canción,  
sólo contigo ni los milagros sorprenden.

¿Dudas quién es al que estas notas mi  
Musa dirige,  
que presta ahora a la Música mi pecho  
afligido?  
Tú, tú, que mereces toda loa y canción,  
sólo en ti mi canción comienza y  
concluye.

contento?

A vos, a vos, todo canto de alabanza se  
debe,  
sólo acerca de vos el adulator nunca  
miente.

¿Quién posee esa voz que el alma de los  
sentidos aparta,  
qué fuerza sino la vuestra hace a los  
rayos de belleza tronar?  
A vos, a vos, todo canto de alabanza se  
debe,  
sólo en vos los milagros maravillas no  
parecen.

¿Dudáis a quién mi Musa estas notas  
dedica,  
que mi pecho abrumado a la Música  
cede?  
A vos, a vos, todo canto de alabanza se  
debe,  
sólo en vos mi canción comienza y  
culmina.

---

*Author's address:*

Departamento de Filoloxía inglesa, francesa e alemá · Facultade de Filoloxía e Tradución · Campus Universitario · 36310 Vigo  
jlbueno@uvigo.es

## English music in the Library of King João IV of Portugal<sup>1</sup>

David CRANMER  
*Universidade Nova de Lisboa*

### ABSTRACT

King João IV became King of Portugal in 1640 through the political will of others. His own true passion in life was music. He built up what in his day may well have been the richest music library in Europe. His ambassadors, besides their political duties, were constantly called upon to obtain new musical editions for the library. English music – Catholic sacred music, madrigals, instrumental music – formed a significant part of this collection. This article seeks to describe the extent and comprehensiveness of the English works and to lament the loss of so unparalleled a library in the Lisbon earthquake of 1755.

In 1578 the 24-year-old King Sebastião of Portugal led his ill-conceived crusade against the Moors in North Africa. The battle that ensued at Alcazar-Qivir proved to be catastrophic for the Portuguese nation. Not only was the monarch never seen again, but the cream of the Portuguese nobility was killed or taken prisoner. Among the prisoners was Teodósio, the 10-year old Duke of Barcelos, eldest son of the Duke of Braganza and third in line to the throne.

The heir to the throne, Sebastião's great-uncle, Cardinal Prince Henrique, was in his mid-seventies when he succeeded and within 18 months was dead. The second in line, Ranuccio Farnese, son of the Duke of Parma, belonged to a family with close links to Spain, which chose not to press the claim but to support the Spanish King Felipe II in his own claim to the Portuguese crown, through his mother Queen Isabel, daughter of King Manuel I of Portugal. The Spanish authorities conveniently ransomed the Duke of Barcelos, keeping him out of harm's way while Felipe annexed Portugal.

For the remainder of his life Teodósio, in due course Duke Teodósio II of Braganza, while fully aware of his position as the leading Portuguese noble and maintaining a household befitting

---

<sup>1</sup> This article was originally presented as a paper at the 15th SEDERI Conference, Lisbon, March 2004.

such a position, kept a low political profile. Thus when his own son, João, was born at the Ducal Palace of Vila Viçosa on 19th March 1604, Teodósio determined to give him a good but discreet education. And music was to be central to the ‘politically harmless’ upbringing of the Duke of Barcelos, the title given to each first-born son of the Dukes of Braganza.

Duke Teodósio maintained a fine chapel at Vila Viçosa, with an excellent choir, well supplied with liturgical chant books and volumes of polyphonic masses, motets and other sacred music by the leading composers of the period. As music teacher for his son he took on a young Englishman, very likely an exiled Catholic recusant, known in Portugal as Roberto Tornar. After a period in training in Madrid, sponsored by Duke Teodósio, Tornar returned to Vila Viçosa by 1608 and was chapelmaster there from 1616 to 1624.<sup>2</sup>

It seems that Tornar had great difficulty in motivating the future Duke of Braganza and King; indeed, all the evidence is that the latter had little respect for him. It is noticeable, for example, that in the years to come, neither as Duke of Braganza, nor as King did João ever sponsor the publication of any of his compositions, which he did for a number of other composers.<sup>3</sup>

We do not know exactly when João’s lack of motivation was overcome, but in 1624 a young musician named João Lourenço Rebelo, at that time aged 15, became part of the ducal household and study companion to the Duke of Barcelos. They were to become and remain close friends.

In 1630 Duke Teodósio of Braganza died. In his will he went to some pains to stress to his son the importance of maintaining his chapel and the music therein as an absolute priority:

I remind my son that the best thing that I leave him in this house is my chapel, and thus I ask that he should never neglect the embellishment of it, being present whenever possible at the divine offices celebrated therein, seeking that they be maintained with the perfection and continuation that they have enjoyed hitherto, and likewise the chaplains, musicians, officers and all others that give service, with which I charge him as earnestly as I can.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> For further information on this subject see Ryan (2001: 191-202).

<sup>3</sup> João Lourenço Rebelo and Frei Manuel Cardoso, to name the two most celebrated cases.

<sup>4</sup> “Lembro a meu filho, o Duque, que a melhor cousa que lhe deixo nesta Casa é a minha Capela e assim lhe peço se não descuide nunca do ornato dela, assistindo-lhe

And thus it was, both at the Ducal Palace at Vila Viçosa, and later at the Royal Chapel in Lisbon, after the Spaniards had been expelled in 1640 and the Portuguese nobility had placed the Duke of Braganza on the throne as King João IV. Both institutions were maintained at the highest level, with particular importance being placed on the music performed there. The reluctant apprentice had become the most avid of music lovers. To gain an idea of just how great was his passion for music, it is sufficient to read the description of the King's daily routine, as described by Francisco da Cruz, in the *Biblioteca Lusitana*:

Every day he would rise at five; and until seven he would study music, even taking with him to Alcântara a chest with his papers so as not to miss studying: he did not take an afternoon nap and would employ this time in trying out music which came from all over, ordered for his library. He would distinguish the works with these letters: B, MB, MMB, R, that is to say *boa* (good), *muito boa* (very good), *muito muito boa* (very very good), *reprovada* (reject). These last went to a trunk to which he had given the name 'hell'. He always finished these sessions with a *Miserere*. He didn't try out profane works, nor did he want his singers to sing them, saying that they made the voice effeminate.<sup>5</sup>

Here we see the crucial importance of his music library. He had, of course, inherited a notable collection of sacred music books for use in the Ducal Chapel. But from the moment he became Duke of Braganza, João spared nothing in energy or money in the acquisition of printed music and music manuscripts, as well as books on the theory and practice of music. He wanted everything that he did not already possess in his library. His ambassadors in Madrid (prior to

---

enquanto puder aos officios divinos que se celebram nela, procurando que sejam com a perfeição e continuação que até aqui, assim de Capalães, músicos, oficiais, como de todo o mais serviço, o que lhe encarrego quanto posso" (cited in Freitas Branco 1956: 11).

<sup>5</sup> "Todos os dias se leuanta a cinco horas; e ate às sete tinha estudo de Musica, e ate hindo a Alcantara leuava hum Bau com os seus papeis p<sup>a</sup> não perder o estudo: não dormia sesta, e empregava aquelle tempo a prouar Musica q[ue] lhe uinha de diuersas p<sup>tes</sup> p<sup>a</sup> a mandar por na sua liuraria distinguindo as obras com estas letras B. M.B. M.M.B. R. Hoc est boa; m<sup>to</sup> boa; m<sup>to</sup> m<sup>to</sup> boa; Reprouada e estas hião p<sup>a</sup> o Caixão a q[ue] tinha posto o nome Inferno. Sempre acabava as prouas com um Miserere. Não fes obra humana, nem queria que seus Musicos a Cantacem, dizendo afiminaua as uozes" (cited in Nery 1984: 140-141).

the Portuguese Restoration), Paris, London, Rome, and so on, would receive regular instructions regarding musical affairs, alongside affairs of state – considerable correspondence survives to this effect. The pains he went to in order to buy manuscripts from Spain,<sup>6</sup> as well as autograph scores of the Papal composer Palestrina, were extraordinary.

Throughout his reign as Duke and then King, João IV of Portugal amassed a collection which, had it not been lost in its entirety in the Lisbon earthquake of 1755, would be the envy of the musical world. In 1649 he published the first of two parts of an index of the works contained in his library, two copies of which *have* survived, and which gives us a detailed picture of the enormous quantity and variety that it contained.<sup>7</sup> We do, in fact, find the indications B, MB, MMB and R beside the entries for a good many of the manuscripts, the direct result of the many afternoons spent listening to and evaluating the music in his collection.

A small but significant part of the index is made up of listings of English music, in all but four instances, printed music. In chronological terms the earliest is the volume *Cantiones Sacrae* (Index N<sup>o</sup>. 275), Latin motets and liturgical polyphony by Thomas Tallis and William Byrd, published by the two of them in 1575, the first of their publications under the terms of the ten-year monopoly on music printing granted them that year by Queen Elizabeth I. The last was Martin Peerson's *Motets or grave chamber music*, published in London in 1630 (Index N<sup>o</sup>. 897 and 905 – the King possessed two copies). In total the index lists as many as 76 different volumes that were published in London, of which there were two copies of six items, plus a further 15 volumes by English composers published in Antwerp.

In terms of repertoire, this music consisted principally of madrigals and lute-songs or ayres. If we take the case of madrigals,

---

<sup>6</sup> Particularly manuscripts by the Franco-Flemish composer Matthieu Rosmarin, who came as a choirboy to Spain in 1586, living there until his death in 1647, under the translated form of his name, Mateo Romero (though more often known locally by the nickname 'El Capitán'). At the time of Rosmarin's death, King João was trying to obtain his complete works. For further information on João's acquisition policy, see Nery 1990: Vol. I, 203-223.

<sup>7</sup> The copies are preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, and the Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo, Lisbon. The latter copy originally belonged to the Cistercian Monastery at Alcobaça. Sampaio Ribeiro 1967 publishes the work in facsimile.

including canzonets and balletts, by way of example, King João's library contained all of the major collections: *Musica transalpina*, the first ever madrigal publication in England, consisting of madrigals by Italian composers in English translation, published by Nicholas Yonge in 1588, followed by a second volume with the same title in 1597 (respectively, Index Nos. 552 and 584), Thomas Watson's comparable 1591 collection *First Set of Italian Madrigals Englished* (Index N<sup>o</sup>. 552), *The Triumphs of Oriana*, a compendium of madrigals in praise of the Queen, published by Thomas Morley in 1601 (Index N<sup>o</sup>. 913), as well as almost all the major madrigal collections of Thomas Morley himself, John Wilbye, Thomas Weelkes, John Farmer, John Bennet, Thomas Bateson, Michael East and others.

The picture is rather similar in the case of lute-songs or ayres, the only really notable absence being Thomas Campion's *Third and fourth books of Ayres*, published together in 1617.

Publications of instrumental music in London were fewer and further between. This serves in part to explain why all four manuscripts listed as being in King João's library were of instrumental music, two by John Coprario, one of them autograph, one probably by Alfonso Ferrabosco, the younger, and one by Orlando Gibbons.<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, the library did include virtually all the instrumental publications to come out in London at this period, including, for example, Holborne's *Pavanes, galliards and allemands*, of 1599 (Index No. 880), John Dowland's *Lachrimae* of 1604 (Index No. 920) and the two books published by the viola da gamba player Tobias Hume: *First Part of Ayres or Musical Humours*, of 1695, and *Poetical Music*, of 1607 (both volumes form part of Index No. 941).

The picture with regard to sacred music is also quite striking. The library included all of William Byrd's published sacred music, without exception. Although Byrd did happen to be a Roman Catholic, the only major Catholic musician not to convert to Anglicanism or flee the country, King João clearly gave no instructions to his ambassador in London to avoid Anglican church music. Among the Anglican church music collections in his library we find, for example, William Daman's *Psalms of David in English metre*, of 1579, and his *Second book of the music*, of 1591 (both volumes

---

<sup>8</sup> Index No. 466: "*Fantásias para tanger*. Giouanni Coprario, & outros escritos da mão do mesmo Autor." (autograph); No. 574: "*Madrigais, ou Cançoens*. Giouanni Coprario, a 5. para as violas. *Escritos de mão*."; No. 576: "*Fantásias*. Alfonso, & outros, a 4. para tanger com as violas. *Escritos de mão*."; No. 577: "[*Fantásias*.] Or Gibbons, & outros, a 3. & mais vozes. *Escritos de mão*."

Index No. 895), John Amner's *Sacred hymns*, of 1615 (Index No. 281), as well as the above-mentioned *Motets or grave chamber music*, published by Martin Peerson in 1630. These represent a very much smaller proportion of the published books of this genre, when compared with madrigals and lute-songs, but then many of these volumes would have been of little use to anyone but a practising Anglican, which King João, of course, was not. That the King had nothing specially against Protestant music as such can be shown not only by his possessing these few Anglican books, but also a volume of Claude Goudimel's settings of the Huguenot Genevan Psalter, probably the first volume, published in 1557 (Index No. 931).

On the other hand, the exiled recusant English Catholics Richard Dering and Peter Philips are well represented in the collection, with three publications by Dering and as many as eleven by Philips, including Italian madrigals as well as church music, particularly worthy of note being a two-part posthumous publication, the first part containing Masses and Psalms, the second motets, no copy of which has survived. All were published in Antwerp. Also from Antwerp is a volume entitled *Melodieuses, Paduanes, Chansons, Gallardes, Almandes & Courantes*, of 1619, consisting of instrumental music by Richard Brade, an instrumental virtuoso working at this time in Hamburg (Index No. 291).

Reference should also be made to an English book on musical pedagogy included in the *Index*, namely Thomas Robinson's *The Schoole of Musicke* (London, 1603), a milestone in the teaching of lute technique (Index No. 938). A manuscript by King João's music librarian João Álvares Frouvo, entitled *Scriptores de Musica*, evidently postdating the publication of the *Index*, indicates that the library also possessed Thomas Morley's *A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musicke* (London, 1597) and *A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Song*, by the Irish-born (and therefore, at that time, an English subject) William Bathe (1564-1614).<sup>9</sup> Bathe was briefly the Principal of the Irish College in Lisbon (the so-called 'Colégio dos Inglesinhos'), from 1604 to 1606, when he settled in Salamanca.<sup>10</sup>

This brief description of the contents of the English music in King João's music library gives us a sense of the significance of the printed books and manuscripts he had gathered. There is no library

---

<sup>9</sup> Biblioteca Nacional, Lisbon, Cod. 6958, respectively ff. 89r and 88r, cited in Nery (1990, Vol. 1, pp. 289-90).

<sup>10</sup> See the entry for William Bathe in Sadie ed. (1980, Vol. 2).

today with such a comprehensive collection of English music of this period. When I earlier described it as 'small', it was only in terms of its proportion within the library as a whole, which only serves to give us a sense of the vastness of what King João had brought together and the absolute priority he gave it.

One thing we are bound to speculate on, given that all the works cited are in part I of the published *Index*, is what would have been in Part II? We do not know whether Part II was in fact published but lost, or whether it never came to be published in the first place. Taking just the English music, it would perhaps be foolish to try to come to any clear conclusion, but if the contents of the rest of the library as indicated in Part I were analysed and were to reveal a picture similar to that of English music, there are two obvious areas that Part II might have included. Firstly, such gaps as there are might have been filled – the Campion lute songs, for example. Perhaps some more Anglican music? More importantly, given that the latest publication mentioned in Part I dates from 1630, ten years before King João even came to the throne, we could reasonably suppose that Part II would have contained the more recent publications that we know he continued to collect throughout his reign.

We are bound to ask what use was made of the library. The fact of the matter is that this was in every sense a private library. It was not even a court library available to the court musicians in general. It was the Duke, later King's personal library and great care was taken not to admit anyone without his personal authorisation. Apart from the musicians who sang the works each afternoon for his personal edification and evaluation, probably the only other person with regular access would have been João Lourenço Rebelo, his comrade in study.<sup>11</sup>

And how far the King and Rebelo ever actually looked at the volumes of English music, well, who knows?

#### References

- Freitas Branco, L. de 1956. *D. João IV, Música*. Lisbon: Fundação da Casa de Bragança.
- Nery, R.V. 1984. *A música no ciclo da «Bibliotheca Lusitana»*. Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Nery, R.V. 1990. *The Music Manuscripts in the Library of King D. João IV of Portugal (1604-1656): A Study of Iberian Music Repertoire in the Sixteenth*

---

<sup>11</sup> On this vexed question, see Nery (1990, Vol. I, 249-64).

- and Seventeenth Centuries*. Doctoral thesis, 2 vols., University of Texas at Austin.
- Ryan, M. 2001. *Music in the Chapel of the Dukes of Bragança, Vila Viçosa, c. 1571-1640*. Doctoral thesis, University of London.
- Sadie, S. ed. 1980. *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 20 vols., London, MacMillan.
- Sampaio Ribeiro, M. de 1967. *Livraria de música de El-Rei D. João IV: estudo musical, histórico e bibliográfico*. 2 vols., Lisbon, Academia Portuguesa da História.
- 

*Author's address:*

Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas · Av. de Berna, 26C · 1069-061 Lisboa  
cranmer@netcabo.pt

## Emasculated subjects and subjugated wives: discourses of domination in John Banks's *Vertue Betray'd* (1682)

Paula DE PANDO MENA  
*University of Seville*

### ABSTRACT

After a modest career as a playwright, John Banks acquired notoriety with his 'she-tragedies', plays dealing with English queens as tragic heroes, which proved controversial despite their favourable reception by the public. The Prologue and Epilogue to *Vertue Betray'd or Anna Bullen* (1682) defend the poet against possible attacks asserting his detachment both from the Tory and the Whig cause. However, critics such as Canfield and Owen have analyzed the links between sentimental tragedy and the Whig faction: the representation of feeble or tyrannic kings on stage was part of the Whig propagandistic strategy to create an anti-monarchic consciousness during and after the Exclusion Crisis (1678-81). *Vertue Betray'd* is a paradigmatic example of this political use of Restoration drama: Banks's anti-Catholic portrait of Cardinal Wolsey, his compassion for Protestant Anna, his vindication of Queen Elizabeth and, above all, the denunciation of the king's tyranny, evidence his sympathies clearly. However, the relationship between Banks's pro-Whig play and its success with the female public in the late seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries has been systematically neglected by critics. My aim is to show that the discourses of domination which served to create the appropriate frame of mind against popery and arbitrary government also operated on an unexpected field: women's empathy towards Banks's female heroes who pioneered a new kind of drama.

Between 1681 and 1704, John Banks prepared for the stage four tragedies dealing with British history; three of them were centered on the meteoric rise and fall of doomed queens: Anne Boleyn, Mary Queen of Scots and Lady Jane Gray.<sup>1</sup> They deserve a restricted but

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Unhappy Favourite; or the Earl of Essex* (1681), *Vertue Betray'd; or, Anna Bullen* (1682), *The Innocent Usurper; or, The Death of the Lady Jane Gray* (1694), and *The Albion Queens; or, The Death of Mary, Queen of Scotland* (1704 – a revised version of *The Island Queens*, banned in 1684).

significant place in the literary canon as they pioneered the new genre later called the 'she-tragedy', in which the tragic hero is a woman. Although they have not attracted much critical attention, they represent the transitional step between the heroic drama of the early Restoration period and the sentimental drama of the eighteenth century. Banks's plays combine the recreation of a recent political past with the sentimental conflicts of women torn apart between love and duty which, to judge from their enthusiastic reception, proved a successful formula.

The first of Banks's 'she-tragedies', *Vertue Betray'd; or, Anna Bullen*, was premiered in March 1682, the aftermath of the Exclusion Crisis. Whig attempts to prevent Charles II's Catholic brother James from standing first in the line of succession had proved inefficient. Whig leaders were persecuted or in exile, and the Tory final triumph was to become apparent in a few months. Nevertheless, the Whigs were still very powerful in the streets and there was a general feeling that, should they fail to fulfill their aim, no other chance would come.<sup>2</sup> Their use of the press and their massive distribution of propaganda gave an illusion of power on the Whig's side. The theatre, as a privileged state apparatus, suffered an unprecedented politicization.

The prologue and the epilogue to *Vertue Betray'd* attempt to distance the play both from the Tory and the Whig cause. This move may have been designed to protect the playwright from accusations that could have led to the banishment of the play, a censorship that he was not able to prevent in his subsequent tragedies. The prologue, "written by a Person of Quality", states that the poet "meddles not with either Whig, or Tory" (6), and appeals to the unity of the country pointing to the threat of a new civil war:

Was't not enough, vain Men of either side,  
Two Roses once the Nation did divide?  
But must it be in danger now agen,

---

<sup>2</sup> Although the Whigs were clearly in recess, they gave a last proof of power only four months before the first performance of the play: in late November 1681, Shaftesbury, the Whig leader, was acquitted of a charge of high treason because the jury was predominantly Whig. In 1682, Shaftesbury turned to Monmouth, who had started a campaign to win Whig support, as his last chance. As this last strategy proved unsuccessful, Shaftesbury fled to Holland in November and died in exile in January 1683. The Rye House Plot, which led to the execution of the remaining principal Whig leaders that same year, marked the definitive Tory victory.

Betwixt our Scarlet, and Green-Ribbon Men?  
Who made this diff'rence, were not Englands Friends;  
Be not their Tools to serve their Plotting Ends. (7-12)

Nevertheless, we should not take these protestations at face value: with his rewriting of the history of Henry VIII and his second wife, the playwright is clearly responding to the political anxieties of his time. Early criticism on Banks failed to recognize the topical significance of the play (Rothstein 1967, Brown 1981), interpreting its cathartic display of pathos as a defective development of the heroic mode. More recent research has been fairer: critics like Diane Dreher (1981) and Susan Owen (1996) have read *Vertue Betray'd* in the light of its political nuances, pointing to the links between sentimental tragedy in general, and Banks's works in particular, with the Exclusionists: the presentation of feeble or tyrannic kings on stage was part of the Whig propagandistic strategy to create an anti-monarchic consciousness (Munns 2001, Owen 2001). The Whigs saw themselves as the true defenders of Protestantism and national unity, as opposed to the two evils of the country: popery and arbitrary government. They resisted James's ascension to the throne because they feared the new king would advance the Catholic cause, but they also disapproved of Charles's present politics, especially concerning his dependence on Catholic France and his undisguised desire to rule without Parliament.

*Vertue Betray'd* can be considered a paradigmatic example of the political use of sentimental drama during the Restoration: Banks's anti-Catholic presentation of Cardinal Wolsey, his compassion for Protestant Anna, his defence of Queen Elizabeth and, above all, the representation on stage of a lustful, easy to manipulate king, they all show the author's sympathy for the Whig faction. Since royal censorship prevented direct criticism on the figure of the present monarch, political opposition had to be vehicled by means of allegories, rewritings of previous sources, and parallelisms with other troubled periods in the history of the country.

In her study on the influences of the Exclusion Crisis on Restoration drama, Jessica Munns classifies plays in three categories: plays about dysfunctional royal families, the "succession crisis" play and works portraying "rulers who struggle against the necessity of putting the public good above private inclination" (2001: 118). *Vertue Betray'd* epitomizes this last category. Henry's lust and recklessness, which echo those of Charles II's himself, make him blind to the

needs of his subjects. Those who dare to expose the evils of the court are punished because they evidence the weakness of the monarchy: this is not only Anna's case, but also that of the innocent men who die because of her alleged transgression. Thus, Banks presents a story which would be familiar to the audience, but reshapes history and literary tradition alike in order to create an enlightening portrayal of a corrupt monarchy, suspiciously similar to the absolutist court the Whigs challenged.<sup>3</sup>

*Vertue Betray'd* is the story of a woman painfully subdued by a man, but it is also the tragedy of a subject annihilated by the tyranny of a king. The play starts with Anna's wedding to King Henry, despite the strong opposition of Cardinal Wolsey and Elizabeth Blunt, the king's former mistress. Anna was secretly betrothed to young Piercy, but their respective families had different plans for them: Piercy's father wanted him to marry the heiress of Shrewsbury, and Anna's family pursued the social advancement that her wedding to the king would bring. When her own brother deceived Anna into believing that Piercy had married, she accepted the royal match, even though from the very beginning we are told "With what remorse she took the Regal Burthen,/ That sate upon her like a heavy Armour/ On a Child's back; she staggered with the Weight" (l.i.p.2). Anna cannot disobey the requirements of her king and family, although she foresees the dangers of her situation:

Their very Breath that now Proclaims, with joy,  
Sad Katherine to be no longer Queen,  
And my unwelcome Coronation;  
Would the same moment, should my Stars permit,  
Shout louder at the Sentence of my Death. (l.i.p.7)

These fears will prove true when the King becomes attracted to Jane Seymour, a fact that makes him inclined to believe Wolsey and Blunt's machinations and false evidence which eventually will lead

---

<sup>3</sup> The story acquired a new relevance with Davenant's revivals of Shakespeare and Fletcher *Henry VIII* (Dec. 1663/ Jan. 1664, Dec. 1668, Sept. 1672, Nov. 1675). Banks compresses the events in order to erase any trace of encomiastic celebration of the monarchy. McMullan rightly contends that the less subtle delineation of plot and characters "realigns and simplifies the play's engagement with Protestantism" (2000: 24). By choosing such a well-known story, the playwright was circumscribing the subject to an easily recognizable framework in order to deploy his allegory of the current situation.

Anna to the scaffold: Lady Blunt, by Wolsey's advice, seduces Anna's brother and uses his love letters, in which he called Blunt "sister", to ruin them both accusing them of incest (V.i.p.62).<sup>4</sup> Anna, a loyal subject and a faithful wife, falls prey to the corruption of the court and the inefficacy of the king, who neglects the welfare of the kingdom in order to pursue his personal goals. Henry is wilfully deceived by Wolsey because he is already infatuated with in Jane Seymour:

Take thou my Scepter, bind it to thy Cross,  
And to thy Mitre add my humble Crown;  
'Tis all my *Woolsey's*. *Woolsey* shall be king.  
I ask but only Seymour in exchange. (II.i.p.17)

This negligent transfer of power surely recalled that of Charles II himself, whose strategy was to make concessions to a Catholic power, the France of Louis XIV, in order to obtain the financial support necessary to rule without Parliament.<sup>5</sup> The defence of Parliamentary independence and Protestantism went thus hand in hand, since the one was perceived to safeguard the other.

Owen contends that it is difficult to differentiate between Tory and Whig plays because their core structure is very similar (1996: 239). Characters in both kinds of plays are usually passive, unable to respond to the aggressions they suffer. Canfield points out that, in political dramas, "no matter how weak the king, no matter what crimes he himself may have committed, loyal subjects must leave vengeance to the Lord" (2000: 41). Indeed, Whig plays did not encourage the audience to take explicit action against the two evils of the time: popery and arbitrary government. Instead, they helped to create the appropriate frame of mind for prospective changes. Although the Whig features in *Vertue Betray'd* are remarkable, there

---

<sup>4</sup> Although *Vertue Betray'd* has been recently analyzed in the light of its theatrical predecessor, Shakespeare's *Henry VIII* (see McMullan 2000: 23-24), the plot follows closely the account that appears in *The Novels of Elizabeth Queen of England*, attributed to Mme d'Aulnoy (1680); nevertheless, the sexual tension between Wolsey and Blunt is completely new. Wolsey's characterization as an ambitious and lecherous man is hardly surprising: Protestant propaganda commonly identified Catholics with both vices.

<sup>5</sup> The savage prosecution of French Huguenots, many of whom went into exile to England, was a source of concern for English Protestants, who saw French religious intolerance as a terrifying warning (see Coward 1980: 274).

is no call to action but to inactivity and patient suffering, a feature that is usually found in Tory plays:

The heroes of avowedly royalist or Tory plays are often masochistic, passive and paralysed by a sense of right action ... Loyalty without hope of reward is a stifling ideal when loyal heroes must annihilate themselves in conformity with the ideal of absolute obedience to kings who do not deserve or value it. (Owen 2001: 134)

One of Banks's greatest innovations is that he rewrites the discourse of loyal endurance usually found in Tory plays, transferring it to his Whig denunciation of absolutism. His characters, suffocated by the oppressive power of the king, can only face their fate with stoic confidence in the afterlife. By presenting the subjugated self-righteousness of his protagonists, Banks is denying Tory claims that the Whigs would not hesitate to provoke a new civil war in order to achieve their ends: "Charles and the Tories successfully smeared the Whigs with the taint of republicanism; moreover, the Whigs themselves by their extremist tactics lost the support of the propertied classes" (Coward 1980: 291). Instead of overtly inviting the audience to rebel against the current situation, Banks adhered to the "principal discourses of later seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century politics, virtue and right" (Braverman 1993: xii). Virtue, representing "the principle of parliamentary independence in a mixed government" (xiii), can only be understood within the current political theory that identified the body politic as a feminized body:

sexual difference applied to the political difference of crown and parliament because that difference was inscribed in the hierarchy of the body politic; in that context the conflict between sovereign and nation over traditional powers and privileges was a contest over the definition and control of a political body. (Braverman 1993: xii)

Drawing on this identification between the feminized body and the body politic, political messages found their means of expression in the parallelism between state and household. Critical misapprehensions have usually based the reading of *Vertue Betray'd* on the second aspect, obliterating the first and thus missing the topical ideological framework that was in force during the Restoration. For instance, according to Brown, "Banks goes to almost ridiculous lengths to eliminate public motive from historical events"

(1981: 96). This interpretation misreads the symbolic potential of this identification: absolutism in the court is represented by means of Henry's despotic exercise of power in the domestic sphere. As Wheatley states, "Henry's hubris is shown by his intrusion on the newly private realm of affection" (2000: 78), separating Anna from Piercy and forcing him to marry a woman he would never love. The private and the public spheres are skilfully intertwined in a new kind of drama: the wronged wife stands for the subjugation of loyal Protestantism under the foot of absolutism, symbolized by a tyrannic husband. Popery and court corruption, incarnated by Wolsey and Lady Blunt respectively, unite to pervert the king's mind, turning him into an egotistic and malleable ruler.

Anna stands as the protomartyr of Protestantism harassed by popish forces. According to Dreher, the "anachronistic representation" of Wolsey (who actually died before Anne Boleyn's trial and beheading, although in the play he survives her and rejoices at her misfortune), along with his affair with Blunt, makes him "an evil caricature of the Catholic Church itself" (1981: vi). Banks manipulates chronology to create an allegorical character, simplistically manichean because it does not correspond to the portrait of a real man. Blunt herself describes Wolsey's dishonesty and flattery, and their mutual bonds of lust and greed:

Art thou the Thing that from the Chaff of Mankind,  
From the base scurrilous Rubbish of the World,  
First found thy self a way to thrive by Wit?  
Then edging it with sharpest villanies,  
Mow'd thee a passage to thy Princes Breast,  
And cut down all the Virtuous from his sight,  
Who choose thee for the Champion of his Vices;  
...  
This you did once confess to me, and more,  
When you declar'd how hot you were in love. (I.i.p.4)

Anne has a reputation for being the most conversant in theology of all of Henry's queens: even if she was not as pious and saint-like as the Spanish Catherine of Aragon, she nonetheless enjoyed discussing religious issues with her husband, and she sometimes interceded for dissenters or heretics (see Warnicke 1991: 100-130). Her ideological confrontation with the Cardinal would surely seem plausible to the audience. Anna and Wolsey's enmity encapsulates in fact a religious struggle, that of papistry facing, as

Wolsey exclaims in a rage, “a Lutheran Queen upon the Throne of England” (I.i.p.3).

Anna’s role as the cornerstone of the Church of England is further emphasized by the vindication of Queen Elizabeth at the end of the play. With an unbelievable loquacity for a three year-old baby, Elizabeth identifies Wolsey with popery and scorns both:

*Child:* He looks for all  
The World, just like the Picture of the Pope.  
*King:* Why, don’t you love the Pope?  
*Child:* No indeed don’t I,  
nor never will. (V.i.p.67)

Banks stresses Elizabeth’s power to clean her mother’s name and defeat popery, emphasizing the double bond that unites mother and child: they are both Protestant and also women:

*Queen:* Thou, little Child,  
Shalt live to see thy Mother’s Wrongs o’-re-paid  
In many Blessings on thy Womans State  
... That holy Tyrant,  
Who binds all *Europe* with the Yoak of Conscience,  
Holding his Feet upon the Necks of Kings;  
Thou shalt destroy, and quite unloose his Bonds,  
And lay the Monster trembling at thy Feet.  
When this shall come to pass, the World shall see  
Thy Mothers Innocence reviv’d in thee. (V.i.p.74)

Elizabethan nostalgia was a commonplace in Whig plays, celebrating a golden age of prosperity and unity that the Stuarts were not able to maintain. Banks had already chosen Elizabeth as the tragic heroine of *The Unhappy Favourite or the Earl of Essex* (1681, published in 1685). In that play, as in *Vertue Betray’d*, the favourable presentation of the Queen as a judicious and compassionate monarch sharply contrasts with the critical portrayal of the court as a site of corruption and partisan interests, a criticism that could be easily applied to the contemporary situation. As Munns contends, “the most positive images of royalty come not from Tory poets seeking to support a troubled monarchy but from Whig writers happily opposing it with propagandistic images of a national icon” (2001:121). This vindication of the monarchy is not at odds with the Whig oppositional discourse. The Whigs did not support a

republican form of government, but aimed to preserve the dignity of the royal institution by removing the elements that could impair it, which accounts for the conservative tone of this kind of drama (see Knights 1994: 313).

By way of contrast with Anna's steadfast convictions, Henry is easily manipulated by his subjects, especially by Lady Blunt, whose ambition precipitates the queen's downfall. Distrust towards royal sexual misconduct was deeply rooted, since Charles' French mistresses were suspected of influencing his decisions regarding English policy abroad (see Owen 1996: 10). The king is not only too inclined towards popery, epitomized in Wolsey, the Machiavel of the play, but also towards arbitrary government, oppressing his people. Yet, Anna decides to face her duty both as a woman and a subject by obeying a superior authority, even though she knows it to be unfair:<sup>6</sup>

Just Heav'n, whose is the Sin?  
Punish not me, I sought not to be Queen;  
But Henry's Guilt amidst my Pomp is weigh'd,  
And makes my Crown sit heavy on my Head,  
To banish from his Bed, the chastest Bride,  
That twenty years lay loving by his side!  
How can I give it, without tears, a Name  
When I reflect my Case may be the same? (I.i.p.14)

The real tragedy of the play is that Anna is able to foresee her fate, but she cannot rebel against it: external pressures force her to walk towards her own destruction. Her ambitious family uses her as a means of social promotion, reifying her into a commodity. Anna repeatedly laments the unyielding demands of her king and family, in a recurrent identification between tyrannical fathers and monarchs: "Parents threats and Kings Authority,/ Rent me, like Thunder, from my fixt Resolves" (I.i.p.10). As Owen states, the theme of bad fatherhood is unmistakably Whiggish (1996: 272). The image of the king as *Parens Patriae* is severely challenged since, as Banks repeatedly emphasizes, unnatural fathers might lead their offspring to destruction.

---

<sup>6</sup> Curiously enough, this double bond as mistress and subject was part of Henry VIII's discourse of seduction in his love letters to Anne Boleyn in real life: in one of them, the king assured her that "if she found it more agreeable to be his servant than his mistress, he was willing for her to hold that position" (Warnicke 1991: 79).

It would seem that a play so dependent on topicality was bound to be forgotten as soon as the events that conditioned its composition were past. *Vertue Betray'd*, however, overcame its predictable fate and was, as it happened, a very popular play in the following century. Curiously enough, the same reasons which contributed to the political interest of the play explained also its successful revivals in the eighteenth century, when the Exclusion Crisis was a forgotten issue. The denunciation of tyranny was extrapolated to the domestic realm, and female audiences welcomed Banks's allegory with the same enthusiasm as Whig supporters had originally done. Banks was not only voicing a political message, he was participating in an ideological shift at the turn of the century, when women started to assert their right of resistance in the private sphere, as their husbands did in the public one.

Parallel to the increasing debate about the right to oppose an unlawful or tyrannical monarch (see Knights 1994: 33), another focus of controversy was being developed. Juliet Dusinberre traces the first signs of the clash between the new Puritan concept of the companionate marriage and the reinforcement of patriarchy:

One source of tension was the Puritan insistence on the spiritual equality of man and wife, and on a concept of relationship which stresses equal fellowship in preference to the subjugation of the woman. The reconciling of an authoritarian model with egalitarian practice was obviously fraught with difficulty. It would in due course have its own repercussions on ideas of government, that the political as well as the domestic state should be run by mutual consent. (1996: xvi)

According to Stone, "patriarchy within the family is a characteristic of societies with strong authoritarian state systems" (1977: 152); there is therefore a direct correlation between the discourses of domination at work in the public and private spheres. When resistance to royal authority became a political issue, women adopted the Whig's discourse in order to state their right to limit abuses within the household. This debate would acquire force progressively, culminating in Queen Anne's reign as a new era of women's empowering and self-legitimation (see Barash 1992). Mary Astell's *Some Reflections upon Marriage* (1700) is probably one of the best known and most remarkable instances of a woman writer transferring the political discourse of the petitioners to the domestic sphere:

He who has Sovereign Power does not value the Provocations of a Rebellious Subject, but knows how to subdue him with ease, and will make himself obey'd; but Patience and Submission are the only Comforts that are left to a poor People, who groan under Tyranny, unless they are Strong enough to break the Yoke, to Depose and Abdicate, which I doubt wou'd not be allowed of here. For whatever may be said against Passive Obedience in another case, I suppose there's no Man but likes it very well in this; how much soever Arbitrary Power may be dislik'd on a Throne, Not *Milton* himself wou'd cry up Liberty to poor *Female Slaves*, or plead for the Lawfulness of Resisting a Private Tyranny. (28-29)

Banks was probably no less patriarchal than his contemporaries, but his female heroes certainly established a new trend in drama and extended the possibilities for women on stage. Besides, by choosing influential women as patronesses, he was publicly acknowledging the social and political role of women in court faction. Banks maintained a symbiotic relationship with women throughout his literary career: he was protected and advanced by them; at the same time women, who traditionally were less politically involved in society than men, benefited from the innovative presentation of female heroes in his plays. Banks was a man and a playwright, which surely gave his ideas a wider reach than those of Mary Astell or any other woman writing in prose for a small circle of friends and family (usually female too). Heroic loyalty and patriotism, which had traditionally been inextricably linked to manliness, were for the first time identified with courageous women. The transitional nature of Banks's 'she-tragedies' contributed to the dramatic development towards melodrama, which proves that feminine tastes were a lasting target long after Banks ceased to write for the stage. In Derek Hughes's words,

One benign parallel to the weakening theoretical credit of hereditary hierarchy was a growing interest in the rights and potentialities of women; and, of course, the stage itself gave women a new forum, both as writers and actresses, at a time when some traditional areas of commercial activity were becoming closed to them. (1996: 23)

The Exclusion Crisis accelerated the rise of the sentimental; as Owen explains, "both Tory and Whig playwrights use sentimentalized, suffering characters to dramatize the horrors of

rebellion and republicanism, and tyranny and popery, respectively" (2001: 138). Writers chose pathetic characters as warnings against the stifling power of the monarchy; the more undeserved and unjust their punishments were, the more evident the unpredictability of subjects' fates. Women, having a traditional image of powerlessness, were the ideal sufferers, less harmful and aggressive than men and thus more compelling than they were:

The history of serious drama is closely wedded to the changing position of women in English society. The evolving attitudes toward property marriage, toward women's economic functions, toward the nature and importance of the family, and toward female chastity, which result, in part, in the eighteenth-century bourgeois cult of womanhood, produce a new female prototype that is reflected in the crucial role of the passive, virtuous woman in these plays. (Brown 1981: 99)

The male characters in these plays are also weak and pathetic, emphasizing the emasculating power of tyranny, against which no man can fight without risking his own life and estate, as well as those of his beloved ones: "His [Banks's] heroes, when they share the stage with their suffering or wounded counterparts, resemble them in passivity, pathos, and ineptitude, and achieve an almost feminine reduction in effectual status as a result" (Brown 1981: 96). This emasculation, which was intended to make the audience aware of the evils of arbitrary government, is actually a change of roles in Banks's plays: women live blamelessly and die heroically, while men provoke their ruin (as in the case of Banks's version of the story of Lady Jane Gray, in which her husband convinces her to accept the crown despite her moral scruples at what she believes to be an act of usurpation) or have a far less honourable attitude than their chaste and judicious ladies, becoming more a burden than a help. This is the case of Piercy and Anna: she stoically faces her fate as Henry's chaste wife, whereas Piercy complains in vain about the impossibility of their love, increasing Anna's misery.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> In Rothstein's seminal book *Restoration Tragedy*, emasculated subjects are "blatantly foolish or naive" (1967: 96). For him, the "stupid hero" is an invention of Banks's, who "alters the received structure of tragedy by having the lovers victimized together, in the three plays of the eighties, without differentiating by sex the nature of the life that they might choose ... Consequently, Banks goes further than Lee in downgrading honor, the more masculine of the perpetual antitheses" (1967: 97). In fact, this refusal to comply with traditional generic expectations can be interpreted in the opposite

Apart from the fact that women protagonists boost the pathos of the plays, the other major reason why Banks turned to women as the centre of his tragedies may have been the different political implications that male and female figures had in drama. Female protagonists allowed Banks to present political nuances that, with a male protagonist, would have been impossible to display on stage. Banks defended himself against political attacks saying that his plays were mainly aimed ‘for the fair sex,’ and his dedicatory epistles prove a biased interest towards this specific section of the audience. With the consolidated presence of women on stage, Banks’s innovations were the suitable outcome of an age in British drama in which women had full protagonism as writers, actresses, spectators, and patronesses. As Elizabeth Howe explains, the actresses’ “talent and popular success fostered a shift from male-based drama to female” and, although it did not translate in a remarkable change in women’s living conditions and social status, it is indisputable that “the end of the century left them more articulate than ever before” (1992: xii-xiii). The excessive pathos in the delineation of some Restoration women characters should not, as has happened too frequently, obscure the fact that drama was experiencing a significant shift of focus, and moving towards a primarily feminine arena.

The parallelism between the monarchic and patriarchal systems proved extremely useful in the seventeenth century. In exposing the injustice inherent in one, Banks was indirectly criticizing the other as well. There is a glorification of ‘quietism’, so it could be too adventurous to talk of Banks’s ‘proto-feminism’; however, the connection between women’s subjugation and subjects’ annihilation was there, exposing an injustice that others had the chance to denounce properly.<sup>8</sup> In the subsequent wave of sentimental drama, domestic conflicts are explored in depth, and subversive conclusions are frequently represented on stage. The

---

fashion: Banks is not undermining men but elevating women, conferring on them a moral superiority and a clearer insight that make them exceptional exemplary figures. Men are unable to react appropriately when facing transcendental trials which can only be rewarded in the afterlife: they are blinded by passion, court intrigues and ambition.

<sup>8</sup> My analysis of ‘quietism’ differs from that of Susan Owen, who interprets it as an essentially Tory phenomenon (1996: 30). As has been shown, the refusal to rebel can be found in Whig plays too. In Banks, martyred women incarnate the injustices of tyranny in a much more compelling way than an explicit call to arms, not to say that these plays had more chances to pass uncensored than overtly political works.

door was open for women writers, readers and play-goers, who had their forerunners in the suffering queens of Banks's plays. Feminist criticism has failed to see the subversive potential of Banks's 'she-tragedies', and political criticism has been deterred by what was perceived as an excessive sentimentality. It is time to reappraise the value and contemporary relevance of plays like *Vertue Betray'd*, and start considering its innovative multiplicity of targets as Banks's greatest contribution to the history of political drama and feminism alike.

#### References

- Astell, M. 1700. *Some Reflections upon Marriage, Occasion'd by the Duke and Dutchess of Mazarine's Case; Which Is Also Consider'd*. London.
- Aulnoy, M.C. Jumel de Berneville, Comtesse de 1680. *The Novels of Elizabeth, Queen of England; Containing the History of Queen Ann of Bullen*. London.
- Banks, J. 1681. *The Unhappy Favourite or the Earl of Essex*. London.
- Banks, J. 1682. *Vertue Betray'd: or, Anna Bullen*. London.
- Banks, J. 1684. *The island Queens: or, the Death of Mary, Queen of Scotland*. London.
- Banks, J. 1694. *The Innocent Usurper or the Death of Lady Jane Gray*. London.
- Barash, C. 1992. "The Native Liberty ... of the Subject." Eds. I. Grundy and S. Wiseman. *Women, Writing, History. 1640-1740*. London: Batsford. 55-69.
- Braverman, R. 1993. *Plots and Counterplots. Sexual Politics and the Body Politic in English Literature, 1660-1730*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, L. 1981. *English Dramatic Form, 1660-1760: An Essay in Generic History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Canfield, D. 2000. *Heroes and States: On the Ideology of Restoration Tragedy*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Coward, B. 1980. *The Stuart Age*. Harlow: Longman.
- Dreher, D. 1981. "Introduction." Ed. D.S. Rodhes. *Vertue Betray'd: or, Anna Bullen*. By John Banks. Los Angeles: The Augustan Reprint Society. iii-xi.
- Dusinberre, J. 1996. *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Howe, E. 1992. *The First English Actresses. Women and Drama 1660-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hughes, D. 1996. *English Drama 1660-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Knights, M. 1994. *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McMullan, G. 2000. "Introduction." *King Henry VIII*. By William Shakespeare and John Fletcher. London: Thomson. 1-199.
- Munns, J. 2001. "Images of Monarchy on the Restoration Stage". *A Companion to Restoration Drama*. Oxford: Blackwell. 109-125.

- Owen, S. 1996: *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Owen, S. 2001: "Restoration Drama and Politics: an Overview". *A Companion to Restoration Drama*. Oxford: Blackwell. 126-139.
- Rothstein, E. 1967. *Restoration Tragedy. Form and the Process of Change*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Stone, L. 1977. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England. 1500-1800*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Warnicke, R.M. 1991. *The Rise and Fall of Anne Boleyn*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wheatley, C. 2000. "Tragedy." *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*. Ed. D. Payne Fisk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 70-85.
- 

*Author's address:*

Av. Alvar Núñez 53, 2º dcha · 41010 Sevilla  
theintendedppm@hotmail.com

Henderson, Diana E. ed. 2006  
*A Concise Companion to Shakespeare on Screen*

Oxford: Blackwell Publishing<sup>1</sup>

Jorge Luis BUENO ALONSO  
*University of Vigo*

The position of Shakespeare on screen studies is so relevant as an independent research and teaching field that one can hardly find a Shakespeare companion or a journal devoted to media or film studies that does not include a chapter or a full section dedicated to tackle the issue of Shakespeare on film. The very critical analysis of this topic has also changed with the passing of time. The early approaches to the subject mainly compared the literary text with its film adaptation. Those prospects have been left behind in favour of daring new perspectives that not only look at the literature-film connection through new interesting ways but also explore, as Cartmell (2000: xi) stated, "the ways in which comparisons of film texts can reveal assumptions about Shakespeare and how these assumptions are created, perpetuated or challenged on screen."

Such variety of critical approaches has been the spice of the critical life of Shakespeare on screen studies up till now. In the shape of monographic volumes, chapters in companions on Shakespeare, or companions on the subject of Shakespeare on film itself, the critical work published on the issue has been plentiful and varied. As far as monographic studies is concerned, since the classic volume by Peter S. Donaldson (1990), some interesting works have been published lately. Among those that became a compulsory reference for researchers on this field we have to mention the monumental *History of Shakespeare on the Screen* by Kenneth Rothwell (1999), the analysis by Deborah Cartmell (2000) or even Stephen Buhler's revealing volume (2002). Regarding chapters on general companions, many interesting pieces have also been published. The impressive companion edited by Richard Dutton and Jean Howard (2003) – four volumes extensively reviewed on *Sederi 14* (Bueno 2004:

---

<sup>1</sup> This research was funded by the Spanish Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, through its Dirección General de Investigación, grant number HUM2005-02351. This grant is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

249-264) – included the chapters written by Mark T. Burnett (2003), Kenneth Rothwell (2003), Barbara Hodgdon (2003) and Peter J. Smith (2003) on contemporary and classic film versions of Shakespeare's comedies, tragedies and history plays. Recently, the volume edited by Stanley Wells and Lena Orlin (2004) also included its mandatory article on Shakespeare on Film and Video written by Tony Howard (2004). With regard to companions or collections of critical essays, the Shakespeare on screen field of research has been very well represented by several interesting works – some of them already classic references – such as those edited by Richard Burt and Linda Boose (1998 and 2003), Anthony Davies and Stanley Wells (2002), Robert Shaughnessey (1998), Courtney Lehman and Lisa Starks (2002) or Russell Jackson (2002).

From these three subdivisions of critical material, I think it is the latter category the one that offers the most innovative critical approaches. This is so not only because the way we look at both Shakespeare criticism and at the movies based on Shakespearean material has changed nowadays, but also because the way we understand the world – and the very concept of Culture itself – has also changed to some extent. In a visually saturated world driven by images, the need to elaborate critical interpretations of visual texts has never been so important. It is essential – I would even say vital – that we include in the future curricula of our degrees a section devoted to analyse visual texts from a well-based critical point of view. This new companion edited by Diana E. Henderson – and included in the *Blackwell Concise Companions to Literature and Culture* series – constitutes an essential reference to see how this complex issue will be dealt with in the future, as it offers an approach to the subject that differs from what previous companions have already offered up till now. In these changing times in which our conforming to the European Higher Education Area will convey a severe change for English Studies in our country, Diana Henderson's remarks (2), taken from her introductory chapter "Introduction: Through a camera, Darkly" (1-7), are more than appropriate:

At a time when education is increasingly driven by the logic of the international marketplace and the role of the humanities is much in debate, we cannot afford the luxury of ignorance ... Never has been so urgent and important, then, that we as students, consumers and producers of screen images comprehend and convey the skills needed to analyze them and interpret them well. And just as

Shakespeare's plays, over the centuries, have provided occasions for thought and argument about human society, character and experience – and at the same time have provided great pleasure – so too Shakespeare on screen presents a rich territory for developing these skills as well as taking delight ... The wider reach and potential democratic possibilities of screen media broaden access to Shakespeare, but also raise questions about the appropriateness of reiterating centuries-old and often dated political or moral assumptions. The complex play between mediation and immediacy, past and present, aesthetics and politics, imagination and realism: all these and more can be explored through the study of Shakespeare on screen.

As the volume wants to be faithful to this preliminary assumptions, it offers a series of essays that consider different critical approaches to Shakespearean visual texts, trying to shed some light on the skills needed to evaluate them and on their contents, in an effort to teach the reader "to distinguish between the trivial and the significant in analyzing human creations (3)," a goal that humanities and cultural studies have always aspired to obtain. Thus, a first-rate group of contributors – many of them authors of some of the works quoted at the beginning of this review – presents a wide-ranging study of the Shakespeare on screen topic in eleven chapters that deal with the subject from different conceptual categories or points of view: authorship, cinema studies, theatricality, the artistic process, cinematic performance, gender studies, globalization, cross-cultural interpretation, popular culture, television studies and remediation. My aim in the following lines will be to offer a brief but precise account of the contents of these essays.

After the introduction by the volume's editor, Elsie Walker, in chapter one "Getting Back to Shakespeare. Whose film is it anyway?" (8-30), analyses the essential question of film authorship, of the director as an *auteur* who sees through the textual 'author', i.e. Shakespeare, to offer a filmic text that to a certain extent establishes a conversation with the source text. After considering how Shakespearean academics have dealt with these issues of "textual fidelity," of "being true to Shakespeare" – issues that have caused many problems when evaluating Shakespearean films in the past –, Walker studies the strategies adopted by several Shakespearean productions and by their directors/*auteurs* – Branagh, Pacino, Luhrmann, Taymor, Almerayda, Hoffman and Loncraine – when "getting back to Shakespeare." The essay presents a very interesting

multiplicity of strategies that share a common ideal “to explore the complex significance of the sign *Shakespeare*” (27). And it is precisely that complex significance of “Shakespeare The Icon” that makes this issue a topic that will always be present in any critical volume gathering Shakespeare on screen studies.

Once the essential question of authorial dialogue has been presented, Anthony R. Guneratne leads the same debate to the film studies arena. In chapter two, “‘Thou Dost Usurp Authority’: Beerbohm Tree, Reinhardt, Olivier, Welles, and the Politics of Shakespeare” (31-53), Guneratne focuses on the political implications of four directors in four different Shakespearean adaptations that “had explicit political dimensions for their intended audiences” (32): Herbert Beerbohm Tree’s *King John* (1899), Max Reinhardt’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (1936), Laurence Olivier’s *Henry V* (1944) and Orson Welles’ *Othello* (1952). In a well structured essay Guneratne reviews the first fifty years of Shakespeare on screen, focusing the issue on the author(*auteur*)ship relations established between the four adapters, their four Shakespearean texts and the political-ideological implications of their films. Guneratne vindicates that “any adaptation is an ideological gesture expressive of an attitude to a textual residue.” His essay is a good proof of such an assertion.

From author and text we move to staging. In chapter three, “Stage, Screen, and Nation: *Hamlet* and the Space of History” (54-76), Robert Shaughnessey presents one of the best essays of the volume. He analyses the evolution of the concept of staging not only in Shakespearean adaptations but also in their recent critical evaluation. Shakespeare on screen studies have become fully cinematized, as many of the most successful recent adaptations have been, in which the stage space of the play has been replaced with the screen space. Theatricality disappears in favour of full cinematic enactment. After a thorough introduction to the topic (54-62) that explains such a *mise-en-scene* displacement, Shaughnessey focuses on the problematic relation between theatre and film taking *Hamlet* as an example. To be more precise, two films are analysed, Olivier’s *Hamlet* (1948) and Tony Richardson’s *Hamlet* (1962). Though commonly described as examples of cinematic theatricality, Shaughnessey uses these two films in order to “suggest ways in which theatre may be more nuanced, more historically located, than has previously been conceded, and that in a cultural context of seemingly endless and inescapable mediatization, this may be a

positive force" (62). Shaugnessey's essay succeeds in bringing the theatre into sympathy with the screen.

Also *Hamlet* driven, chapter four, "Learning from Campbell Scott's *Hamlet*" (77-95) fully deals with the creator's perspective. The volume's editor, Diana Henderson, writes a simple but highly interesting piece of work where she focuses on the aforementioned important dichotomies: *auteur*/author, theatre/film, text/adaptation, Shakespeare on film/Shakespeare on film criticism. However, this time the aim of the essay is to think about these issues from both perspectives: that of the artist and that of the Shakespearean scholar, which by the way also constituted one of the key intentions of some experimental films such as Al Pacino's *Looking for Richard* (1996). So, the creator clashes with his creation, the scholar confronts the finished work of art, and through the analysis of Campbell Scott's *Hamlet* (2000) as a case study, Henderson examines "the concerns preoccupying filmmakers, their views of their own roles, and the ways in which their priorities redirect or even defy the usual forms of scholarly interpretation" (77). By confronting the scholar and the artist, Henderson offers a very interesting view of looking at Shakespeare on film.

Within the same performative perspective we move a step ahead. In chapter five, "Spectacular Bodies, Acting + Cinema + Shakespeare" (96-111), Barbara Hodgdon studies, as she states, a central issue to understanding any performance: the relationship between the emotive speaking voice and the still or moving body. Hodgdon considers the interaction between the actor and his/her cinematic performance in a wide film corpus that ranges from Loncraine's *Richard III* (1995), Almereyda's *Hamlet* (2000) to Branagh's film of *Henry V* (1989). A well structured essay that brings the language of Early Modern England face to face with modern bodies and performances.

The actor/acting perspectives have been dealt with. So it is time to move on closer to a critical analysis of such performative perspectives through the filter of gender studies. This is what Pascale Aebischer does in the next chapter of the volume, "Shakespeare, Sex, and Violence: Negotiating Masculinities in Branagh's *Henry V* and Taymor's *Titus*" (112-132). She offers a very interesting study of male representation in these two excellent films, both of them landmarks of two crucial moments in the history of Shakespeare on film. As she had partly done in two previous works (2002 and 2004), Aebischer analyses in two different epigraphs how both directors build in their

films several male stereotypes that form the body of their narrative. The article works quite well as an introduction to a very interesting topic that could be completed with the reading of Aebischer's monograph (2004).

With a slight change of perspective, Mark Thornton Burnett presents in chapter seven, "Figuring the Global/Historical in Filmic Shakespearean Tragedy" (133-154), an analysis of several interpretations of the concept of history and Shakespearean tragedy in a world dominated by a global filmic conception. As he did in a previous work (Burnett 2003), though he focused on different films, Burnett now examines "a discrete group of Shakespeare films that display an acute responsiveness to the conventions and exigencies of the global Hollywood machine." Such films are Jeremy Freeston's *Macbeth* (1997), Michael Bogdanov's *Macbeth* (1998) Kenneth Branagh's *Hamlet* (1996), Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet* (2000), Gregory Moran's *Macbeth* (2001), Billy Morrisette's *Scotland PA* (2001) and Stephen Cavanagh's *Hamlet* (2005). *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* are thus two tragical icons whose filmic versions "enter into a critical dialogue with the historical process." How that dialogue is built in these films bearing in mind that "glocal" process we are all immersed in is the aim of Burnett's essay.

The issue of cross-culturality is highly connected with the question of globalization and with the understanding of history. That is precisely the topic of chapter eight, "Reading Kurosawa, Reading Shakespeare" (155-175), in which Anthony Dawson looks into the work of a classic *auteur* when it comes to transcultural filmic Shakespeare: Akira Kurosawa. Kurosawa's Shakespearean films constitute a subgenre within the field of film studies on Shakespeare. Just to mention several instances of critical works on this topic, we could bring up the epigraphs and chapters on Kurosawa's films included by Stephen Buhler (2002: 167-173), Kenneth Rothwell (1999: 191-200) and Peter S. Donaldson (1990: 69-92) on their monographs, or the superb article written by Robert Hapgood (2002) that appeared on Davies and Wells' companion, which by the way is the only work among these four I have quoted that Dawson cites in his reference list. As a follower of the lines laid down by classical scholarship on Kurosawa, Dawson focuses on *Throne of Blood* (1957) and *Ran* (1985), but presents a quite interesting socio-contextual perspective. He also criticises how Kurosawa uses some filmic devices in *Throne of Blood*, although in my opinion he does not show enough convincing evidence to support such criticism.

In chapter nine, “Will of the People: Recent Shakespeare Film Parody and the Politics of Popularization” (176-196), Douglas Lainer introduces the issue of popular culture. To a certain extent he follows the trend of previous works (e.g. Lehman and Starks 2002) that began to suggest how important the popular culture perspective was when it comes to evaluate Shakespeare on film. Lainer’s analysis not only focuses on the parodies – such as John Madden’s *Shakespeare in Love* (1996) – that have contributed to popularise the works of Shakespeare and his figure as an icon of English culture, but also examines in detail the parodic elements that form part of the narrative structure of some recent “canonical” films such as Richard Loncraine’s *Richard III* (1995) or Julie Taymor’s *Titus* (1999). Lainer deals with both aspects quite well and the list of revised films – especially as far as the first aspect is concerned – is really exhaustive.

Chapter ten, “Brushing Up Shakespeare: Relevance and Televisual Form” (197-215), finally brings up the topic of Shakespeare on the TV screen. Although it is an issue that had already been dealt with in previous works (e.g. Rothwell 1999; Burt and Boose 1998, 2002; Davies and Wells 2002), its inclusion clearly signals how Shakespearean criticism has evolved from a perspective exclusively based on Shakespeare *on film* to a more modern critical *on screen* stance that includes a wider meaning of the term “visual text.” Roberta E. Pearson and William Uricchio offer a thorough study of two British television programs: the chapter on Shakespeare included in the TV series *Great Britons* (2002) and *In Search of Shakespeare* (2003), the magnificent documentary in four parts directed by Michael Wood. The essay deals with both works in depth, though more attention is paid to the thematic and formal devices of *In Search of Shakespeare*, as it constitutes in my opinion a filmic work of greater significance in the history of Shakespeare on screen. This article is, as far as I know, one of the first critical analysis of Michael Wood’s documentary and it is also the first to be included in a critical companion. All those who lecture on Shakespeare on Film and include Wood’s documentary in the seminar’s syllabus – as it is my case – will appreciate the presence of this essay and will use it as an excellent supplementary reading material.

With the thematic label of *Remediation* and connected to some extent with the issue of popular culture, Peter S. Donaldson offers in chapter eleven a study of technology as the key narrative element of Michael Almereyda’s *Hamlet* (2000). The essay, “Hamlet among the Pixelvisionaries: Video Art, Authenticity, and ‘Wisdom’ in

Almeryda's *Hamlet*" (216-237), stresses the narrative importance of this element as the concept Almeryda bases his adaptation of *Hamlet* on. A specific narrative use of this concept is clearly seen in the videos *Hamlet* is constantly recording and editing, which constitute a fundamental part of Almeryda's filmic narrative. Donaldson also relates this thematic element to video art and studies the topic accordingly. Although the issue of technology in Almeryda's film had already been discussed in previous works – e.g. Burnett (2003), Rowe (2003) –, Donaldson presents a brief and very clear essay that offer new interesting points of view on the topic.

As a supplement to the editor's introduction, the companion concludes with a final afterword, "Unending revels: Visual Pleasure and Compulsory Shakespeare" (238-249), in which Kathleen McLuskie summarizes the aims of the volume and lists some ideas for future research in the field of Shakespeare on screen.

Just to conclude, I only want to make two general comments as far as structural and formal aspects are concerned. From an structural point of view, the essays are superbly interwoven with the overall structure of the volume. Diane E. Henderson's praiseworthy editorial work has to be mentioned here. The order of the topics in the volume has not been left to chance. Rather, it is due to a careful design in which every essay refers to the following one in a perfect thematic flow that makes the reading of the whole volume a coherent and pleasant activity. With regard to formal aspects, the presence of an index at the end of the volume (253-264) is always appreciated by the reader. In this case, the index is supplemented with a chronology (xii-xxiv) that offers very useful cross-references on historical events, media events and Shakespeare on screen, which allow the reader to obtain a general overview of the social, historical and filmic context of the essays included in the companion. Bibliographical references are listed in two sections: a select bibliography at the end of the volume that includes, as the editor stated, "works cited in multiple essays in order to avoid redundancy" (xi), and a reference and further reading list individually included in every essay. To me, this double system is sometimes confusing. I would have combined both sections into one single final bibliographical list.

All things considered, I think that the work presented in this volume is really impressive. It covers every necessary aspect needed to understand the discipline and completes what has been published

so far opening new avenues for research. If six years ago Deborah Cartmell (2000: 112) finished her monograph indicating that “it is time to rethink the way we interpret Shakespeare on Film,” I consider that all that rethinking done in the past years has been appropriately summarised and expanded in this magnificent volume. It presents enough material to “keep making sense of our subject, and await the next viewing” (7). What more could one ask for? The careful reading of the essays included in this companion will elicit from us the wish to “continue to discern something meaningful: perhaps a new perspective, a reminder of the world or a counterbalance to its more terrifying realities. Sometimes – let us hope often – we may feel sheer irrational pleasure. For the pictures continue to move, in many and mysterious ways” (7). So, the Shakespeare on screen show must – and will – go on. Let us, Shakespeare academics and scholars all, book our tickets for the next release. I am sure the sight will not be dismal.

### References

- Aebischer, P. 2002. “Women Filming Rape in Shakespeare’s *Titus Andronicus*: Jane Howell and Julie Taymor.” *Études Anglaises* 55: 136-147.
- Aebischer, P. 2004. *Shakespeare’s Violated Bodies: Stage and Screen Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bueno, J.L. 2004. “Review of Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard, eds. 2003: *A Companion to Shakespeare’s Works*.” *Seder* 14: 249-264.
- Buhler, S. 2002. *Shakespeare in the Cinema: Ocular Proof*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Burnett, M.T. 2003. “Contemporary Film Versions of the Tragedies.” Eds. R. Dutton and J.E. Howard. *A Companion to Shakespeare’s Works. Volume I: The Tragedies*. London: Blackwell. 274-283.
- Burt, R. and L.E. Boose eds. 1998. *Shakespeare, The Movie: Popularizing the Plays on Film, Tv and Video*. London: Routledge.
- Burt, R. and L.E. Boose eds. 2003. *Shakespeare, The Movie II: Popularizing the Plays on Film, Tv, Video and DVD*. London: Routledge.
- Cartmell, D. 2000. *Interpreting Shakespeare on Screen*. London: Macmillan.
- Davies, A. and S. Wells eds. 2002. *Shakespeare and the Moving Image: The Plays on Film and Television*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Donaldson, P.S. 1990. *Shakespearean Films/Shakespearean Directors*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Dutton, R. and J.E. Howard eds. 2003. *A Companion to Shakespeare’s Works*. London: Blackwell.
- Hapgood, R. 2002. “Kurosawa’s Shakespeare Films: *Throne of Blood*, *The Bad Sleep Well*, and *Ran*.” Eds. A. Davies and S. Wells. *Shakespeare and the*

- Moving Image: The Plays on Film and Television*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 234-249.
- Hodgdon, B. 2003. "Wooring and Winning (Or Not): Film/Shakespeare/Comedy and the Syntax of Genre." Eds. R. Dutton and J.E. Howard. *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works. Volume III: The Comedies*. London: Blackwell. 243-265.
- Howard, T. 2004. "Shakespeare on Film and Video." Eds. S. Wells and L.W. Orlin. *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 607-619.
- Jackson, R. ed. 2002. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare on Film*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehman, C. and L.S. Starks eds. 2002. *Spectacular Shakespeare: Critical Theory and Popular Cinema*, Cranbury, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Rothwell, K.S. 1999. *A History of Shakespeare on the Screen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rothwell, K.S. 2003. "Classic Film Versions of Shakespeare's Tragedies: A Mirror for the Times." Eds. R. Dutton and J.E. Howard. *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works. Volume I: The Tragedies*. London: Blackwell. 241-261.
- Rowe, K. 2003. "Remember Me: Technologies of Memory in Michael Almereyda's *Hamlet*." Eds. R. Burt and Lynda E. Boose. *Shakespeare The Movie II: Popularizing the Plays on Film, Tv, Video and DVD*. London: Routledge. 37-55.
- Shaughnessey, R. ed. 1998. *Shakespeare on Film: Contemporary Critical Essays*. London: Macmillan.
- Smith, P.J. 2003. "To beguile the time, Look like the time: Contemporary Film. Versions of Shakespeare's Histories." Eds. R. Dutton and J.E. Howard. *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works. Volume II: The Histories*. London: Blackwell. 146-169.
- Wells, S. and L.W. Orlin eds. 2004. *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---

*Author's address:*

Departamento de Filoloxía inglesa, francesa e alemá · Facultade de Filoloxía e Tradución · Campus Universitario · 36310 Vigo  
jlbueno@uvigo.es

Hattaway, Michael 2005  
*Renaissance and Reformations:  
An Introduction to Early Modern Literature*  
Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

Ton HOENSELAARS  
*Utrecht University*

In recent years we have witnessed the publication of a veritable spate of introductions to the literature of the English Renaissance designed for students and the general reader. One of the more conspicuous series of this kind is the one that Blackwell has been building up for a number of years now, and which includes, among many others, Dymphna Callaghan's smart *Feminist Companion to Shakespeare* (2001), David Bevington's Shakespeare biography (2002), the rich *Companion to English Literature and Culture*, edited by Michael Hattaway (2002), Laurie Maguire's *Studying Shakespeare* (2003), the 4-volume set of essays devoted to Shakespeare in terms of genre (edited by Jean Howard and Richard Dutton in 2003), as well as Arthur Kinney's edition of a range of canonical plays by Shakespeare's contemporaries (2004). Hattaway's *Renaissance and Reformations* is an attractive and valuable new addition to the series.

The overall structure of *Renaissance and Reformations* is based on the assumption expressed in the introduction that "our enjoyment of literature comes from a delight in a writer's verbal skills, from the satisfaction that comes from recognizing literary forms, and from reflection upon the complex ways by which texts might be related to one another and upon how they touch our own experience" (1).

For this reason, the opening chapter describes how terms such as 'literature' and 'fiction' meant different things in the early modern period, and how a writer would instead have been more familiar with disciplines of language, be it in Latin (as the staple of education) or in English (the language that gradually expanded and emancipated itself into an instrument for expressing the verbal skills that we tend to recognize as 'literature'). With many appropriate illustrations from familiar texts of the period (by writers including Shakespeare, Spenser, and Donne) and less familiar texts (by Fulke Greville, Aemilia Lanyer, Thomas Traherne and others), Hattaway

demonstrates how our awareness of the early modern education in the arts of logic and rhetoric will enhance the reader's appreciation of the argumentation in the soliloquies, or the ironically tripartite structure of Marvell's "To His Coy Mistress." He shows how it facilitates our appreciation of commonplaces, proverbs and maxims, and of the writer's creative appropriation of such elements. For the pre-Romantic poet, to write verse or prose was to display a certain "skill or craft of making." The process rather than the product held centre stage as the poet gracefully imitated a particular substance or style with apparent ease. Hattaway further takes the reader through the "arts of rhetoric," making sure to set the contemporary meaning of the phrase off against our own pejorative and distorted sense. The author is strong on the manipulation of figures of speech (anadiplosis, isocolon, paranomasia, parison, stichomythia and the like) as he argues a case for the performative qualities of Renaissance verse. Obviously, as readers and as critics we must become attuned again to what Hattaway calls "the 'thinginess' of words" (33).

The second chapter of the book is devoted to the invention of printing and its impact on early modern culture. Hattaway has many times more questions than he can answer in the space available, but even stating the complexity of the topic has great merit. Hattaway neatly sketches the diverse cultures of reading: not intensive reading (of many different books) so much as extensive reading (or rereading of the same texts); communal reading; reading out-loud vs. reading silently during the transition phase from oral to literate culture. He provides a good listing of what appeared in print, like recreational books, including prose fiction (stories, novel), pamphlets, ballads, books of jests, 'chapbooks', and almanacs. But he also devotes attention to the way in which the Reformation, with Protestantism defined as "a religion of the Book and of the Word" (44), both furthered and was furthered by the new industry that reproduced and disseminated texts and ideas. It argues for the strength of this chapter (which could have encompassed the space of an entire book), that a case is made for the continuing importance of the manuscript tradition and the circulation of unprinted texts throughout the period. This issue almost naturally brings Hattaway to considerations about the status of the author, the issue of (self-) censorship, and of plays in print (which have tended to numb our awareness of the liveliness and improvisation that these texts occasioned on stage).

Determined to problematize the way in which English Renaissance literature welded tradition with innovation, chapter 3 provides a survey of the various genres in which literary artists worked, and simultaneously illustrates their origins and their new directions. Arguing a case for what he calls the “positive power of forms” (72), Hattaway discusses the various decorum-anchored genres as sites of creativity, as poetic battlegrounds where (more often than not) the issue of the vital encounter remains undecided. Of special interest are Hattaway’s discussions of the early modern epic (with its special hierarchy), tragedy (with its Roman and Medieval traditions eventually also channelled through Guarini to produce early-seventeenth-century tragicomedy in England), comedy, and masques. Given the wealth of genres and of applications, the subdivisions in this chapter unfortunately tend to fracture the material too much and, as is the case with the section on ‘Quantitative verse,’ add too little to be relevant.

Chapter 4 introduces the reader to early modern views of history and the practice of historiography. For Hattaway, the writing of history is closely linked to the writing of the nation, even though conflicting discourses may be seen at work simultaneously during the period. Polydor Vergil’s history, for example, undermines the Arthurian legend of Geoffrey of Monmouth. In this chapter, however, Hattaway mainly realigns the modern reader with early modern realities by stressing that our tendency to judge another period’s view of history, and the way it recorded this (historiography) by the criterion of accuracy is alien to the perception of Shakespeare and his contemporaries for whom political or moral goals determined the self-acknowledged *re*-presentations of history that we know. In this connection, Shakespeare’s histories are particularly relevant, and Hattaway, a well-known expert in the field, discusses this “historiographic meta-fiction” with great panache. This chapter further profits from the discussion of continental historians like Tacitus, Plutarch, Machiavelli and Bodin, as well as Elizabethans and Jacobeans including John Hayward and, at considerable length, Sir Walter Raleigh whose *History of the World* allows for an in-depth discussion of the complex impact of the Reformation on the writing of providential history.

Chapter 5 inverts the focus and further develops the discussion of the way in which historiography and other modes of writing served to fashion the early modern nation’s present (as well

as its imagined future). In the case of historiography, the models were largely classical and biblical, and in this connection it is interesting to note how much republicanism was discussed under the Tudors. Biblical history, via the *Book of Homilies*, nourished visions of reforming the state, but it also merged with the discourse of the Golden Age as an attempt was made to capture the optimism and the opportunities that the new world seemed to offer. At the far end of the explicitly serious spectrum, we find Thomas More's *Utopia*, although its magic lay and lies in its ability to assume a central role at the same time, playing off against existing philosophies of social organisation and reform. Though less explicitly political or historical, Erasmus's *Praise of Folly* deserves its mention here as well, since, like the *Utopia*, it helped readers "by indirections" to "find directions out." The early modern fool who features behind Erasmus' prose treatise for church reform, was not an asylum case, but one whose fantasies and satire helped to bring into focus the way society was organized (with all that entails) and how it might be run if properly reformed. Returning to the literature of the age, Hattaway then, predictably perhaps, concentrates on *The Tempest* and Montaigne's essay "Of the Cannibals," but also, more creatively, on the subgenre of the idealizing 'country house poem' (Ben Jonson's "To Penshurst") and the satirical-cum-celebratory genres of *city* and of *citizen* comedy (Thomas Dekker and Thomas Middleton), testifying to the perceived fragility of a society whose structures registered the pressures that early modern capitalism and expansionism exerted.

Of special interest is chapter 6, devoted to "Fictive Persons and Places." Here Hattaway demonstrates how our post-Romantic view of character may lead us to misinterpret the rhetorical characterization in Renaissance drama, where allegorical characters, for example, serving to demonstrate certain issues may be no less 'real' than characters whom we recognize and with whom we find it easier (from our own, modern perspective) to identify. The author opens the reader's eyes to the many elements that may constitute a stage character, like verbal styles, image patterns, and costume. In terms of psychological interest, there is the theory of humours, and a significant degree of inwardness could also be revealed through the soliloquy. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to forget that the term 'character' is not synonymous with 'personality'. Just as the writer in the first instance drew on an existing store of more or less stock characters, he also relied on stock ingredients (like catalogues of

traits, commonplaces, and set descriptions) to deck out a character. Hattaway also sharpens our awareness of the persona granting dramatic force to, among other things, the Renaissance lyric. Much like character, Hattaway demonstrates, place in the literature of the period also has to be interpreted as part of a rhetorical strategy rather than as the result of realistic description.

The final chapter of Hattaway's book is devoted to the stamp that the Reformation and the period's religious factionalism left on its literature. In fact, Hattaway believes that this may well be more pervasive and determining than the impact of what, for the sake of convenience, we call the Renaissance in England. With reference to a vast range of examples from high and popular literature, he illustrates the diversity of responses to the religious transformation that took place across the nation: in the form of atheism, scepticism, the cultivation of Catholic spirituality, the discourse involving Protestant poetics. Especially attractive are the discussion of the sermon and its interreflections with plays like Shakespeare's *Henry V* and Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, as well as the discussion of the "mutual dependency between the languages of love and religion" in the poetry of the Metaphysicals, and the fusion of Christianity and Platonism in the poetry of George Chapman.

Michael Hattaway's introduction to early modern literature stands out for the lucid organisation of its material and its wide range of topics. *Renaissance and Reformations* gently and generously brings together the experience and insight of a full career in English Renaissance studies. It is also remarkable for the ever cautious way in which the author absorbs, interprets and presents Renaissance innovations and traditions against the background of recent theoretical debates (periodisation, chronology, history and literature, the canon, elite and popular literature). But no less noteworthy is the author's idiosyncratic, muscular style of writing. It captures an intellectual restlessness that gives each statement its thoroughly personal stamp. It also makes this book about a familiar area in English literature a cliché-free zone, a most refreshing read for students as well as teachers.

---

*Author's address:*

Department of English · Trans 10 · 3512 JK Utrecht (The Netherlands)  
Ton.Hoenselaars@let.uu.nl

Hatchuel, Sarah and Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin eds. 2005  
*Shakespeare on Screen: "Richard III."*

Rouen: Publications de l'Université de Rouen

Ton HOENSELAARS  
*Utrecht University*

*Shakespeare on Screen: "Richard III"* brings together the papers presented at an international conference on the topic held at the University of Rouen on 4 and 5 March 2005. With their variety of approaches to filmic Richards, the editors have sought to study not just one of the most popular of the histories, but also to interrogate the notion of Shakespearean film, in more general terms.

Any reader is likely to discover how easy it is to underestimate the complexity of the issues involved. A case in point is the essay by Adriane Hudelet devoted to language and sound in Al Pacino's *Looking for Richard*. In a paper rich in detail, the author effectively tunes our ears to the film's street sounds and music, and convincingly illustrates how Pacino brings the sounds of our contemporary world and the world of the play into a fine accord, making Shakespeare's language less strange, while appreciating its relevance in a contemporary world.

On a different note, Sarah Hatchuel looks at the representation of death in a number of film versions of *Richard III*, and observes how histrionic, over-played, and theatrical these moments tend to be. In order to account for this, she then develops an intriguing Freud-based theory about the inability to imagine our own death, and the general difference between stage representations and screen representations. Apparently, film makers are convinced that a histrionic character like Richard must die histrionically.

Sébastien Lafait sheds light on the genre of *Looking for Richard*, as he probes the way in which Pacino welds documentary with fiction to produce what also in other quarters has come to be recognized as the *documentary* movie. Intriguing and attractive is the suggestion that only this mode could serve to present Shakespeare's most manipulative character to modern audiences (and certainly the school audiences for whom the film was originally made). The *docudrama* seems tailor-made for Shakespeare's machiavel.

Along comparable lines, Michèle Willems approaches the *Richard III* version in the BBC Series (with Ron Cook as crookback Richard), and illustrates how Jane Howell's directorial strategies for the television medium succeeded in recreating, more or less, the original conditions of the play's production in Shakespearean London. Eventually, though, it is also Howell's stark stage/screen images in their own right (with Margaret holding the dead Richard in a pietà pose on top of a mountain of corpses that to some recall the horrors of Auschwitz) that makes sense of the claim that this BBC screen production has unjustly suffered recent critics' neglect.

Mariangela Tempera shares a wealth of examples of the way in which Shakespeare's *Richard III* has become part of both high and popular culture, quoted in serious movies, in comedy, and in television series around the world. Tempera organises her disparate material into four categories: (1) staging deformity, (2) acting and overacting, (3) the seduction scene and (4) quoting and misquoting. Tempera well conveys how one may develop a fascination with a field that is rapidly expanding, with quotations coming at us from all directions. As the record of the discussion following the presentation by Mariangela Tempera suggests, this side to Shakespeare's popularity may well have great classroom interest and serve to give students a fascinating sense of the continuity between the popular culture that they are likely to be familiar with in the form of, say, *Twin Peaks*, and the high culture to which academic Shakespeare still adheres.

Mark Thornton Burnett's essay would seem to confirm this assumption, as it studies in detail a number of *Richard III* parodies. Thornton Burnett is right to stress that parody should not be defined too narrowly, since more is at stake here than the generation of pure ridicule. Respect may also find an outlet in parody, which is, after all, the sincerest form of flattery. In a sense, parody preserves and revives the very text it seeks to undermine or destroy. In the process, though, emerge the poignant concerns of the parodic adaptor in relation to belonging, loyalty, identification, and citizenship.

In an intelligent piece, Michael Hattaway identifies varieties of Englishness in screen adaptations of *Richard III*. This can be done profitably by placing the available film versions within the context of English cultural history. The main point Hattaway is making is that with Richard, who is "always *sui generis*, the other," interpreters need to define a local habitation, and that since Richard III belongs to English history, Richard invites definitions and redefinitions of

Englishness. One wonders, though, if there are examples of non-British films (like Raoul Ruiz' rare adaptation), where Englishness may be addressed differently, if at all. One also wonders if the phenomenon is limited to film (for especially in the case of *Richard III* the screen versions tend to follow the ghosts of earlier stage productions more closely than other plays).

The number of screen adaptations of *Richard III* (even if we include feature films with quotations from the play, or parodic versions of larger sections) is limited, and one wonders if the study of Shakespeare on film might not start to yield diminishing returns some day. This certainly would not happen soon if we took example from Dominique Goy-Blanquet's subtle as well as bold confrontation of *Richard III* with Oliver Hirschbiegel's *Der Untergang* (2004). The criticism that the press levelled at Hirschbiegel for "humanizing" Hitler, and thus in a sense for making the criminal look like ourselves, leads to fascinating observations about the apparent desire of Shakespearean audiences with the available *Richard III* movies to have "evil ... shown as monstrous, never human, concentrated on one unnatural fiend."

But there is much more to enjoy in this collection. Kevin De Ornellas intelligently studies the boar imagery in screen adaptations of *Richard III*, which serves to convey the debasement of the central character, and Lucy Munro's study of the on-screen representation of children in three film versions of *Richard III* (Frank Benson, Olivier, and Loncraine) neatly historicizes these events, setting off our post-eighteenth-century view of children against Shakespeare's own markedly less sentimental attitude. Even more convincing is the contribution by Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin which studies the filmic treatment of "evil tongues" and "evil speech" as it occurs in *Richard III*. It is interesting to see how this play, in which an abundance of words is associated with inefficiency, translates into screen versions that reveal a greater economy of words and yet achieve greater screen impact.

Two essays by distinguished film scholars devote special attention to Laurence Olivier's screen version of *Richard III*. Anthony Davies argues that modern audiences used to Branagh and Loncraine may have become unjustly condescending towards Shakespearean films like Olivier's. Davies believes that in the case of McKellen and Loncraine's *Richard III*, it is obvious to see that we are dealing with cinematic experiments that have been boldly and impressively imposed onto a Shakespearean text, but it is rather

more difficult to gauge and accurately to describe the various forms of interaction between the cinematic language and the existing dramatic text. What seems clear, though, is that the “supernatural” elements that Shakespearean critics have discerned in *Richard III* are absent from the fast-paced and slickly periodized 1990s screen version. In this respect, Olivier’s *Richard III* (presenting a soulful and disturbed hero to the end) enforces respect as an effective welding of cinematic and dramatic modes. Russell Jackson takes another line, as he illustrates how the Olivier movie may still yield valuable insights, if we are prepared to contextualize it. Drawing on multiple English and American reviews, he attractively situates the film in the early 1950s shortly after the coronation of Elizabeth II, discusses it in the context of the relationship between Olivier and Vivien Leigh, in terms of its aesthetic experimentation, and of the internationalisation of Shakespearean cinema that is marked by Olivier’s *Richard III*.

Most of the papers in this collection are followed by a transcript of the discussions that they provoked at the original Rouen conference. Severe editing of these transcripts could have improved the collection, but on certain occasions, as in the case of the discussion following Michèle Willems’ paper on Jane Howell’s *Richard III* for television, valuable new lines of approach are developed. This collection would not be complete without the updated filmo-bibliography by José Ramón Díaz Fernández, put together, as ever, with great care. *Shakespeare on Screen: “Richard III”* is, therefore, a valuable contribution to Shakespeare and Film Studies. Its contributions are varied in theme and approach, and they suggest many new avenues for research and debate.

---

*Author’s address:*

Department of English · Trans 10 · 3512 JK Utrecht (The Netherlands)

Ton.Hoenselaars@let.uu.nl

**Dunmore, Laurence dir. 2005. *The Libertine***  
Screenplay by Stephen Jeffreys. Performed by Johnny Depp, Samantha Morton, John Malkovich. The Weinstein Company/Entertainment Films

María José MORA  
*University of Seville*

Laurence Dunmore's *The Libertine* attempts to entice the audience with the promise of a walk on the wild side. "He didn't resist temptation. He pursued it," the tag-line runs. The character who inspires these words is John Wilmot, 2nd Earl of Rochester, wit, poet and debauchee at the court of the "merry monarch," Charles II. Those familiar with this character will readily grant that the claim in the tag-line is not much overstated. On his death at the early age of 33, the family chaplain wrote of him: "so confirm'd was he in Sin, that he lived, and oftentimes, almost died, a Martyr for it" (Parsons 1680: 9). For those who may never have heard of the Earl the publicity released by the studio provides the necessary clues, with some helpful *aggiornamento*; it presents the story as the "sexy, irreverent and ultimately moving adventures of a man who broke all the rules," and describes the hero as "rebellious", "scandalous", a "wily and talented rogue who lived his short, wild life like a Restoration rock star." Put him in the shape of a charismatic, unconventional actor like Johnny Depp and it seems that this cannot fail to be, as the theatrical trailer announces, "the most controversial film of the year."

The script for this unorthodox biopic was adapted by Stephen Jeffreys from his play *The Libertine*, staged at the Royal Court, London, 1994. In 1996 Jeffreys' work was produced by the Steppenwolf Theatre, Chicago, with John Malkovich in the title role. It was Malkovich's idea to turn the play into a motion picture, and it was his impulse that saw the project through, though it was fraught with difficulties. Among other problems, the actor/producer has pointed out in interviews that the sexually explicit nature of the script made distributors recoil. This is hardly surprising, since the playwright's focus is largely conditioned by the work that first sparked his interest in the topic: *Sodom, or The Quintessence of Debauchery*, a burlesque playlet – often labelled pornographic – which is associated with Rochester, though authorship is uncertain

(Love 1999: xxviii). As Jeffrey's explains in the Press Notes, he came across this piece in the dentist's chair, of all places (his dentist was giving away his most scandalous books to keep them out of the reach of his teenage daughter). Jeffrey's found *Sodom* "the filthiest play" he had ever read and was intrigued to know more about the author. The character he discovered seemed to him surprisingly "fresh and contemporary," a rebel who "refused to obey any of the rules and dictates of his own age." His tragic end, which Jeffrey's saw as the result of a process of self-destruction, exerted a special fascination; it made him look at the story as representing "the darker side of human nature in the middle of the Enlightenment" (2005: 6).

This interest in the tragic end dictates Jeffrey's approach to his material. He chooses to begin in the mid-1670s, when the Earl had already carved a reputation as the maddest of the court wits, and chronicles the final years of his life. Even so, Jeffrey's manages to cram in a good share of the episodes that forged the Rochester legend, though some of them must be presented in recollection: his abduction of heiress Elizabeth Malet (who would eventually become his wife), his banishment from court on account of a lampoon mocking the king's sexual practices, his affair with actress Elizabeth Barry, his posing for a portrait crowning a monkey with the bays, the infamous Epsom incident (in which after drunk and disorderly rioting he fled, leaving one of his friends to die), his masquerading as a mountebank in Tower Hill, or his death-bed conversion, which caused considerable impact at the time (the account written by Bishop Burnet ran through at least five editions in print before the end of the century). All these elements are integrated in a picture to which *Sodom* is curiously central, as the narrative line weaves three different strands that come to a climax in an aborted performance of this piece: a transgressive penchant for the obscene, a passion for the theatre, and a love-hate relationship with King Charles.

Obscenity certainly looms large in *The Libertine*, not only in the verses that are quoted from the Rochester corpus, which are explicit enough, but also in the generous share of images director Laurence Dunmore regales us with – including the surreal multiple orgy scene that illustrates the recitation of lines from "A Ramble in St James's Park." A nude display or two seems *de rigueur* for the subject; yet, there is something oddly reductionistic in the way this is handled in the film. Dunmore seems to take obscenity as a signifier that can translate a wide variety of ideas and emotions with a single image. Thus, to establish at the beginning of the film that there is both love

and passion between Rochester and his wife, we have a scene in which he feels her up in their coach; to express his tender affection for his whore-mistress Jane Roberts, he brushes his hand over her breasts; to suggest his increasing obsession with Barry, we see him languish as Jane labours to arouse him with her mouth; to portray the wits as *enfants terribles*, we are treated to a shot of Charles Sackville baring his buttocks in the playhouse; to signify their defiance of authority, they piss on the constable's boots. All this may remind us of the lines in "An Allusion to Horace" in which Rochester mocks Dryden's attempts to imitate the "mannerly obscene" style of his circle of friends:

Dryden in vain tryd this nice way of Wit,  
For he to be a tearing Blade thought fitt.  
But when he would be sharp he still was blunt:  
To frisk his frolick fancy hee'd cry Cunt. (Love 1999: 73)

The second element which articulates the story of the libertine is his involvement with the theatre. Like many of his fellow court wits, Rochester took an active interest in the stage: he was a patron of playwrights, a lover of actresses (besides Barry, he is also credited with an affair with Sarah Cooke), and also an author: he wrote prologues, epilogues and scenes for other poets, and produced his own version of Fletcher's *Valentinian*. The portrait this film gives of the theatre world in the 1670s aims at a true sense of period. There is a bustling energy to the playhouse scenes: we have a boisterous audience, orange wenches and prostitutes plying their trade in the pit and the boxes, and men of fashion visiting the tiring room to fondle the actresses. The production of Restoration dramatists is, for once, given some visibility: we hear lines from Otway's *Alcibiades* (1675) and Etherege's *The Comical Revenge* (1664). The script is accurate in placing Henry Harris and Mrs. Betterton as leading players in the Duke's Company, though it is intriguing that the most famous of Restoration actors, Thomas Betterton, should not appear (possibly because the storyline requires the leading man to be a prig, and a more shadowy figure seemed preferable). It also follows a well established tradition in presenting Elizabeth Barry as an actress who did not show much promise, but was coached by Rochester and turned into a huge success.

The training of Mrs. Barry, which smacks of Method acting, may seem anachronistic, but it conforms basically to the account

attributed to Betterton: Barry had no ear for music and could not reproduce the actors' declamatory style without "running into a Tone"; the Earl realized this and made her instead "enter into the Nature of each Sentiment; perfectly changing herself ... and feeling really, and being really in the Humour, the Person she represented, was supposed to be in" (1741: 16). Where the screenplay deviates from the records is in making Barry triumph in the role of Ophelia, a part she never played; she rose to stardom acting the suffering heroines in Otway's tragedies. As in *Stage Beauty* (2004), Shakespeare again steals the show, as if his works were the only touchstone for a player's talent. But if there is one thing that is completely out of place, that is the notion that a text like *Sodom* was ever intended for a public theatre. Dunmore, besides, goes over the top in the staging of this play and abandons all pretence to realism: he has a back-cloth representing female genitals, giant dildos for props and even a phallus-shaped chariot ridden by a midget.

The performance of *Sodom* marks a climax in the protagonist's troubled relationship with King Charles. On this issue *The Libertine* gives us also an idiosyncratic mixture of truths and falsehoods. It is true that John Wilmot, the son of a loyal cavalier to whom the king was much indebted (he had been instrumental in Charles's miraculous escape from England after the battle of Worcester), was highly favoured, and also that he was repeatedly banished from court on account of some rash action or imprudent piece of writing. That he should be forgiven once and again was attributed by some to his personal charm and his ready wit; as Bishop Burnet wrote, "the King loved his company for the diversion it afforded" (1724: 264). Yet to suggest that the monarch had high hopes of the Earl, and felt betrayed that he failed to serve as his right hand, is stretching things too far; that role fell rather to the lot of the Duke of Buckingham, Charles's childhood playfellow, his companion in exile, his minister after the Restoration, and a veritable thorn in the king's side in the 1670s as a leader of the opposition. The picture is further muddled as the hero finally obliges, and rises from his sick-bed to redeem himself with a powerful speech in the House of Lords during the Exclusion Crisis. Here the film's historical researcher got her sources wrong, and followed Greene (1976: 202) or Lamb (2005: 252-53) in mistakenly attributing to John Wilmot a speech delivered in the Commons by Laurence Hyde (who would eventually be created Earl of Rochester) in November 1680. Wilmot had died in July.

The final act of a life marked – as is here suggested – by an irrepressible urge for self-destruction is chronicled in this biopic with some relish: we see the protagonist sink as a result of the combined effects of his own despondency, his addiction to alcohol and the sequels of venereal disease. Depp and the make up artist were both given free rein to exercise their talents, and we are shown the Earl in all the misery of his physical deterioration (complete with syphilitic sores, a decaying nose and incontinence of urine). It would be John Wilmot's fate to have his life used as an example to suit different interests; Germaine Greer has argued that Bishop Burnet's account of Rochester's death-bed conversion was a modest part of a propaganda campaign launched by the Whigs to denounce the corrupting influence of a debauched monarch, while the Jacobites fuelled the legend of his wit and charm to publicize a glamorous image of the banished court (2000: 4-6). In this film, even before Burnet appears to reclaim the libertine, the moral of the story suggests itself: you may live fast, die young, but you won't leave a good-looking corpse. The final scene, besides, seems designed to dispel doubts that the film may endorse self-destructive behaviour or substance abuse, as the funeral dirge (lyrics by Jeffreys, music by Michael Nyman) celebrates the penitent sinner's recantation and enjoins us to "pray for him, who prayed too late,/ that he may shine on Judgement Day." For a film that promises scandal and plays the rock-star note, this is surprisingly conservative.

Those who expect a period-piece set in the Restoration to be a rollicking romp will surely be disappointed. That was clearly not Dunmore's intention; the atmosphere of the film is dark and muddied, and the pervasive fog and jaundiced light seem designed to underline the corruption of the times. The star cast do not afford much mirth either: Depp and Samantha Morton give us fine acting, but they are required to play their roles with too much anger, and so is Rosamund Pike as Rochester's suffering wife. Malkovich never fails to offer a good performance, but his Charles II is weary and worn, and shows little trace of the "merry monarch." Comedian Johnny Vegas as Sackville might be expected to deliver some humour, but he is not given much scope besides pulling down his breeches. Only Tom Hollander, who is note-perfect as the urbane Etherege, and Richard Coyle as Rochester's servant (aptly named Alcock) are allowed to give us some true delight.

There is no denying that there is some fundamental truth to this bleak portrait of Rochester. It almost seems inspired by the

devastating vision of *A Satire against Reason and Mankind*. But the picture is too one-sided: we see the rake play the cynic and the daredevil, but never the suave, engaging seducer that allegedly inspired Etherege to write the part of Dorimant in *The Man of Mode* (1676). When Jeffreys' original play opened at the Royal Court, it was presented in a double-bill with Etherege's. This was a clever idea, as *The Man of Mode* gives us the side of the coin that is missing in *The Libertine*. "I know he is a devil, but he has something of the angel yet undefaced in him," says of Dorimant his cast-off mistress (2.2.15-17). There is, however, nothing undefaced about the hero of this film. In the theatrical opening shot, he looks into the camera and addresses the audience: "You will not like me," he states. Fans of Depp, or of Rochester, will think this impossible. They may be in for a surprise.

#### References

- Betterton, Th. 1741. *The History of the English Stage, from the Restauration to the Present Time*. London.
- Burnet, G. 1724. *History of his Own Time. Vol 1: From the Restoration of King Charles II to the Settlement of King William and Queen Mary at the Revolution*. London.
- Etherege, G. 1979. *The Man of Mode*. Ed. J. Barnard. London: Ernest Benn.
- Greene, G. 1976 (1974). *Lord Rochester's Monkey*. New York: Penguin.
- Greer, G. 2000. *John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*. Horndon: Northcote House.
- Jeffreys, S. 1994. *The Libertine*. London: Nick Hern Books.
- Lamb, J. 2005 (1993). *So Idle a Rogue: The Life and Death of Lord Rochester*. Stroud: Sutton.
- The Libertine*. Press Notes. 2005. <<http://media.movieweb.com/galleries/3126/notes.pdf>>
- Love, H. ed. 1999. *The Works of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parsons, R. 1680. *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Right Honorable John, Earl of Rochester*. Oxford.

---

*Author's address:*

Facultad de Filología · C/ Palos de la Frontera, s/n · 41004 Sevilla  
sena@us.es

**Carvalho Homem, Rui and Fátima Vieira eds. 2006**  
***Gloriana's Rule. Literature, Religion and Power***  
***in the Age of Elizabeth***

Porto: Editora da Universidade do Porto

Ana SÁEZ HIDALGO  
*University of Valladolid*

The fourth centenary of Queen Elizabeth's death was an excellent opportunity to study not only the figure of the monarch but also her historical and cultural importance in books (Dobson and Watson 2002, Doran and Freeman 2003, Walker 2003, Watkins 2002), exhibitions (Doran 2003) and conferences (Jansohn 2004). *Gloriana's Rule. Literature, Religion and Power in the Age of Elizabeth*, edited by Rui Carvalho Homem and Fátima Vieira, is precisely the result of a meeting of scholars hosted by the University of Porto in 2003, where, on the occasion of this anniversary, the myth of *Gloriana* was interrogated – in the editor's words – from a wide variety of viewpoints and critical approaches. But this is not merely another book in a long list of works devoted to one of the most attractive personages in English history; what, in my opinion, makes it interesting, is that even though the title apparently restricts the study to the Elizabethan period, there is an intended dialogue with the present, both in historical and critical terms. Rui Carvalho makes it clear in the introduction to the volume contextualizing this collection of twelve articles in the long history of Anglo-Portuguese relations and the mutual enrichment between both countries.

The articles cover several aspects related to Elizabeth I, ranging from religion, politics and marketing to artistic areas such as iconography and literature, including also some reflections on the image of the Queen abroad. J. Carlos Viana Ferreira (163-171) provides the religious background analysing the conversion “of one of the most Catholic countries into the most hostile to Catholicism” (163) throughout the sixteenth century; he remarks the importance of one of the policies fostered by Henry VIII as a result of his legislation in favour of his supremacy: the rewriting of the English past, to which a Manichean view is applied, so that Protestants were considered the absolute good (related to the early Apostolic

religiousness) and Catholics the absolute evil, identified with the apocalyptic Antichrist; it is in this light that works such as Bale's and Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* should be regarded, according to the author. M. Zina Gonçalves de Abreu (151-161) and Thomas Healy (25-42) focus on Elizabeth's choice of the *via media* from two complementary points of view: while the former tries to discover the religious convictions that lie behind her attitudes to Protestants and Catholics, the latter studies the effects of that attitude on reformists, who felt that their expectations of a Protestant rule were disappointed. M. Zina Gonçalves de Abreu finds three main reasons for the Queen's demeanour: her humanist upbringing, the bad experiences she had under both Protestant and Catholic rulers, and her political goals – trying to avoid the Catholic rage as well as to get the Protestant support for her legitimacy in the throne. The resulting panorama is, according to Gonçalves, one in which Elizabeth "persecuted the English Protestants in a more unyielding manner than her Catholic subjects" (159), treated – she insists – with leniency; and, paradoxically, her bet for moderation resulted in a radicalization of Protestantism. This conclusion can be contrasted with Healy's survey of the reformists' puzzlement at their Queen's religious policy as is manifest in Dekker's analysis of the catastrophes happened in 1603 in *The Wonderfull Yeare* or in the way the image of the Queen changed in the diverse editions of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*: from the potential martyr and "fulfilment of the divine plan" to a tyrant against bishops or even the merely-referred-to (and never-seen-in-action) Gloriana of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. Therefore, it is this feeling of "wonder" or uncertainty that Healy detects in Elizabeth's Protestant contemporaries rather than a more radical attitude to her.

T.H. Charlton (173-186) devotes his contribution to the political principles of Elizabeth's reign, in particular, the political control she exercised which, in Charlton's view, was contrary to the humanist and Ciceronian idea of *vita activa*, the active participation of citizens in public life. The Queen's restraints of this type of activism is epitomized in her reactions to two texts on the Alençon affair: John Stubbs's *The Discovery of a Gaping Gulf* (printed in 1579) and a private letter by Sir Philip Sidney. Stubbs, who thinks that the opinion of the English people should be taken into account in such a momentous matter, will trigger the 1581 censorship legislation, as its printed character might mean a threat to Gloriana's stability – a fear

that Sidney's letter, full with flattery and compliments, does not entail, as it circulated only in restricted circles.

Elizabeth's awareness of the importance of the public image has been agreed on since the seminal books of Frances Yates (1975) and Roy Strong (1977, 2003), and has led to a long list of works on Elizabethan iconography and its propaganda purposes. This critical tendency is likewise reflected in this collection of essays. Two of them, by Carol Chillington Rutter ("Show Me like a Queen: Elizabeth among the Players", 61-81) and Aimara da Cunha Resende ("Mass Culture, Elizabeth's Representation of Androgyny and Shakespearean Reconstructions", 207-220) coincide in quite a new and interesting approach, inasmuch as they find parallels between Gloriana's manipulation of her image and some present-day marketing and populist strategies used by politicians (da Cunha Resende 210-11) or by monarchs such as Elizabeth II (Rutter 61-2). Both found their analysis on the well-known notion that Elizabeth I felt the need of being acknowledged as a rightful monarch – notwithstanding her ascendancy and her gender. Rutter points out that one of the Queen's favourite means of achieving public recognition was "seeing herself, like an actor, set upon a stage" (62), as in pageants and progresses;<sup>1</sup> and though she forbade the representation of living persons onstage, several female characters resembling her appear in many plays, usually imitating her character or, in Shakespeare's works, meditating upon her role in characters like Titania or Cleopatra. Da Cunha Resende points out that one of the most important marketing strategies used by Elizabeth was to turn weaknesses into strengths, a double-faced way of looking at things apparent in the Queen's attitude to entertainments and in the exploitation of androgyny, which is reflected in many Shakespearean women; the last part of her essay is an interesting review of them and their success as a result of their androgynous character and their capacity for *double entendre*.

Another contribution on Elizabethan iconography focused on the feminine image is the article by Fátima Vieira (109-117), where she applies recent spatial and feminist theories; Toril Moi's distinction between "feminism" (as a political stance), "femaleness" (the biological traits) and "femininity" (culturally-defined

---

<sup>1</sup> The success of these processions in terms of propaganda has been recently questioned in a book that quite probably Rutter has not been able to consult for the printed version of her paper. See Leahy (2005).

characteristics) is rendered particularly fruitful for the widely-discussed androgynous iconography of the Queen. These images, according to Vieira, underline her cultural rather than the biological female features, and even when she calls herself a “king” or a “prince”, she does so “not because she wants to be recognized ... as a man, but because she wants to claim for herself qualities that are normally attributed to men” (116). Of course, as Vieira herself recognizes, this is not a very feminist standpoint, but these theoretical groundings give a new understanding of the social and cultural constraints that could have led to peculiarities of Elizabethan iconography.

Manuel J. Gómez-Lara’s article (83-107), also on iconography, presents an interesting, detailed and highly-documented comparative analysis of three different accounts of the same public event: Elizabeth’s pre-coronation procession as told by Richard Mulcaster, the Mantuan ambassador Il Schifanoja and Henry Machyn. Gómez-Lara is mostly interested in the interpretative disparities of the symbolic meaning of the Catholic-based imagery of the pageants which, though open by nature to several interpretations, is manipulated by the authors according to “their own political agenda” (98).

One more aspect that is discussed in *Gloriana’s Rule* has to do with reception, the image of the Virgin Queen transmitted abroad, studied by Paul Franssen (119-140) and Luz Santamarta Lorenzo (141-150). Franssen analyses the way in which Elizabeth is seen in the Netherlands, using as a starting point Yates’s statement that “the Protestant Dutch, seeking Elizabeth’s support in their quarrel with Philip of Spain, saw her in the same light as Foxe and Jewel, as the Royal Virgin triumphing over the Pope” (apud p.119). However, his detailed survey of literary texts, both contemporary to her reign and written in subsequent years, leads him to see that Yates’s assertion is only partially true, as after Elizabeth’s death a shift in attitude can be attested, no doubt the result of the new political circumstances: the 1604 peace treaty between England and Spain and the increasing political differences between Holland and England; thus, *Gloriana* will be no longer the exemplary ruler that might support the Dutch against the Spanish, but a more and more human character, exposed to flaws.

It is precisely a Spanish opinion on Elizabeth that is examined by Luz Santamarta, that of Guerau de Spes, ambassador in London (1568-71) after Diego Guzmán de Silva, highly esteemed by

Elizabeth. Santamarta shows that unlike him, Spes got involved in several Catholic plots, and that his letters reveal the low opinion he had of the Queen and her political counsellors, in particular Cecil who is, according to Spes, the person in charge of the government. Surprisingly enough, the image of Elizabeth transmitted here is that of a passive and weak person – though irritable – which contrasts with other contemporary (and mostly non-Catholic) views and modern analyses of her personality.

Two more articles complete the collection, both on literary aspects of the Elizabethan period. Katherine Duncan-Jones (43-60) studies how the events in the last years in the Queen's life had a crucial effect on the contemporary literary production. Her increasing paranoia took her to ban satires, epigrams and pornography, which led to an important burning of books, thus polarizing literature between popular, subversive texts and panegyric works; the middle course being Shakespeare. Duncan-Jones analyses the Shakespearean production in these years in the light of the contemporary events. Roderick J. Lyall (187-205) connects religion, poetry and politics in his paper on Henry Constable's sonnets with the poet's apparent sudden conversion into Catholicism after being an active Protestant propagandist. His remarkably in-depth knowledge of the textual evidence as well as of the author's life and connections allow him to establish a time line of the extant manuscript and printed versions, a convincing explanation of the arrangement of the poems and their association with the shift in the belief of this very particular instance of literary author.

In sum, *Gloriana's Rule* is a very rich collection in the wide range of aspects analysed, in the dynamic revision of the figure of Elizabeth, in the enlightening usage of the latest theories and methodologies and in the enriching dialogue between past and present, a clear exponent of one of the guiding principles of the humanist education in which Elizabeth was brought up, the Ciceronian *Historia magistra vitae*.

#### References

- Dobson, M. and N.J. Watson 2002. *England's Elizabeth: An Afterlife in Fame and Fantasy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Doran, S. and Th.S. Freeman eds. 2003. *The Myth of Elizabeth*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Doran, S. ed. 2003. *Elizabeth: The Exhibition at the National Maritime Museum*. London: Chatto & Windus in association with the National Maritime Museum.
- Jansohn, Ch. ed. 2004. *Queen Elizabeth I: Past and Present*. Münster-London: Lit-Transaction.
- Leahy, W. 2005. *Elizabethan Triumphal Processions*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Strong, R.C. 1977. *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Strong, R.C. 2003. *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. London: Pimlico.
- Walker, J.M. 2003. *The Elizabeth Icon, 1603-2003*. Houndsmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Watkins, J. 2002. *Representing Elizabeth in Stuart England: Literature, History, Sovereignty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yates, F.A. 1975. *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- 

*Author's address:*

Facultad de Filosofía y Letras · Plaza del Campus · 47011 Valladolid  
ana.saez@fyl.uva.es