

English in Transition 1500-1700: On Variation in Second Person Singular Pronoun Usage¹

Teresa Fanego

UNIVERSIDAD DE SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA

In the course of the Middle English period, a number of major changes took place in the structure of English. Most important among these were: a) the reduction of inflectional contrasts in nouns, verbs, and adjectives; b) the shift from a basic word order SOV to one predominantly SVO; and c) the trend towards the use of analytic resources instead of synthetic ones.

These and other related changes were still going on during the Early Modern English period. In fact, because of the ongoing changes, speakers and writers of Early Modern English often had at their disposal a choice of forms and constructions where today we have no choice -for example, in verb inflections, in personal and relative pronouns and in several other areas of grammar and syntax-. In the course of the seventeenth century, however, the abundance of variant expressions was gradually reduced, with the result that by the eighteenth century the structure of the language came to resemble fairly closely the structure of Present-day Standard English. It can be said, therefore, that in the course of the period under discussion there is a movement from greater grammatical variability and lack of organization towards a more regulated and orderly state. This description of the development of Early Modern English is, of course, a traditional one, but, still, there is a great deal of truth in it.

In what follows, I will try to illustrate some of this existing variability by looking at a well known grammatical development starting in Middle English, but completed only within the Early Modern period. Specifically, my discussion will focus on the variation between the second person singular pronouns *thou* and *you*, that is, the so-called pronouns of address. I have chosen this much explored topic primarily because it constitutes a good illustration of how complex could at times be the contrasts in usage between existing variant forms. So complex, in fact, that the changes affecting the pronouns of address from the fourteenth to the early eighteenth centuries are usually described as lying at the interface of linguistics proper, sociolinguistics, and pragmatics.

Let me start, then, with a brief summary of the history of the second person pronouns since Middle English times. As is well known, *ye/you* were originally the pronouns of the second person plural (from OE *ge/eow* respectively); *thou/thee*, in their turn, are historically the singular forms (from OE *thu/the*). From as early as the 13th century, however (cf. Mustanoja 1960: 126; Blake 1992: 536), *ye/you* came to be used as singular pronouns of reverential or polite address, probably on the model of French *vous*, which could also be used in this way (see Wales 1983: 108). The use of *you* as a polite form became more and more widespread, until it eventually brought about the decline of *thou/thee*. Opinions vary as to the exact date when this took place in actual speech, as distinct from literature, but, on the whole, it can safely be said that by the middle of the 18th century (cf. Strang 1970: 140; Barber 1976: 212) *thou* had become confined to biblical use, to the speech of Quakers, and to a sociolectally restricted use in local dialects.

¹ Research for this study was supported by a grant of the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science (DGICYT grant no. PB94-0619).

This, then, is the outline of a change which brought about a substantial modification of the English pronominal system, since there is now no morphological contrast between the second persons singular and plural. Important issues are: a) which exactly were the factors controlling the distribution of the *you/thou* forms?; b) why was *thou* ousted by *you* and exactly at what time? This second question is, of course, of great interest, but I will not be concerned with it today, so the audience is referred to studies such as Strang (1970: 139-140), Wales (1983), or, more recently, Mausch (1993).

Turning then to question (a), as expounded above, the received answer to it was supplied by Brown and Gilman in their celebrated analysis (1960) of the evolution of second person pronoun systems in European languages. This was followed in 1989 by another, more detailed study using as evidence data collected from Shakespeare's 'four major tragedies', that is, from *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Othello*. In these two analyses, Brown & Gilman put forward the sociological concepts of 'power' and 'solidarity' to account for the pronoun usages observed in dramatic texts; roughly, as Hope (1993: 85) notes, "characters '+power' (monarchs, the rich, men, parents, masters and mistresses) can expect to give *thou* and receive *you* when interacting with those '-power' (subjects, the poor, women, children, servants). Theoretically, under this model, we expect characters of equal power, or equal social status, to exchange reciprocal *you* if they are upper class, and *thou* if they are lower".

One problem with the power rule as formulated by Brown and Gilman is that it cannot easily account for the fact that, in English usage, there was, right from the beginning, considerable fluctuation between *thou/you* forms in the singular. In other words, speakers could vary from one pronoun to another even when addressing the same interlocutor. Such shifts, as Mossé (1952: 94), Wales (1983: 114), or Blake (1992: 537-540, note), can be found already in Middle English times, and occur even within one and the same sentence or line. In this connection, Mossé (1952: 94) calls attention to the apparently inconsistent use of pronouns in, for instance, lines 485-486 of *Havelok the Dane* (end of 13th century):

(1) Al Denemark I wile *you* yeve
 To that forward *thu* late me live
 ['All Denmark will I give you in return for the agreement that thou lettest me live']

This type of swift pronominal shift, which is very prominent in dramatic dialogue during the Early Modern period, has come to be usually explained in terms of "a fluctuation of feeling, a raising of the emotional atmosphere or a change in an affective relationship" (Calvo 1992: 9). In other words, by the side of socially motivated uses, critics have long recognized the existence of emotionally expressive uses of the second person pronouns; as Barber (1976: 209) puts it:

We also find that *thou* is used, even in situations where *you* would be normal, when the emotional temperature rises. There are two cases in particular where we find this emotional use of *thou*. The first is to indicate intimacy, affection, tenderness: members of the polite classes who are social equals may slip into the *thou* forms to express such affectionate feelings, and return to *you* to indicate greater formality and distance. The second case is just the opposite: *thou* can be used, even by a social inferior to a superior, to show anger, contempt, disgust [...] Curiously enough, there are situations where the reverse is true, and *you* becomes the insulting and hostile form: a master who normally addresses a servant as *thou* may in anger switch to *you*.

Since *thou* was used to social inferiors, the use of *thou* to a stranger of equal rank was a deliberate insult. Cf. in this connection the passage adduced as (2) below, or the oft-quoted line from *Twelfth Night* III.ii.45 ("If thou thou'st him some thrice, it shall not be amiss") where Sir Toby Belch advises Sir Andrew Aguecheek, who is about to write a challenge, to use the insulting *thou*.

(2) 1603 *The Trial of Sir Walter Raleigh* I, 209.C1 [cf. Hargrave 1730]:

RALEIGH: I do not hear yet, that *you* have spoken one word against me; here is no Treason of mine done: If my Lord Cabham be a Traitor, what is that to me?

ATTORNEY: All that he did was by *thy* Instigation, *thou* Viper; for I *thou thee, thou* Traitor.

RALEIGH: It becometh not a Man of Quality and Virtue, to call me so: But I take comfort in it, it is all *you* can do.

ATTORNEY: Have I anger'd *you*?

RALEIGH: I am in no case to be angry.

LORD CHIEF JUSTICE POPHAM: Sir Walter Raleigh, Mr. Attorney speaketh out of the Zeal of his Duty, for the Service of the King, and *you* for *your* life;

So, summarising so far, 16th and early 17th century usage of the pronouns of address is usually accounted for on the basis of the following assumptions:

a) The overall distribution of the *thou/you* forms is largely controlled by norms dictated by the social model of power and solidarity.

b) Beyond these socially conditioned uses, there are emotionally expressive ones, which can result in rapid changes of pronominal choice, such as those alluded to by Barber, or as those exemplified in (2) above. Very importantly, the usual assumption is that these emotionally expressive uses derive their pragmatic force, that is, their contextual effect, from the fact that they are 'deviations' from the norms predicted by the power and solidarity model. In other words, as Brown and Gilman themselves note (1989: 177), "in cases where *you* is expected, the occurrence of *thou* indicates that the speaker is emotionally aroused".

c) Also importantly, discussions of second person pronoun usage are based almost exclusively on drama, and, more specifically, on Shakespearean drama. This is usually justified by the rather dubious claim that "dramatic texts provide the best information on colloquial speech of the period" (Brown and Gilman 1989: 159), or by assuming that "Shakespeare surely used *thou* and *you* with a confident intuition that mirrored general Elizabethan usage" (*ibid.*: 179). In other words, as Hope (1993: 85) notes, drama is resorted to because it is taken for granted that dramatic usage of the *thou/you* distinction will mirror the actual usage of that distinction in Early Modern spoken English.

So far, then, I have briefly summarised a number of commonly accepted tenets concerning the distribution of the second person pronouns in Early Modern English. Recently, however, a few studies have appeared which challenge at least some of those tenets, and this has brought about a renewal of interest in the issue of how *you* and *thou* really differed. Essentially, the studies I am alluding to are Lass (1996), Calvo (1992), and Hope (1993, 1994).

Starting first of all with Lass (1996), Lass's analysis of the English pronouns of address is expounded in the morphology chapter of Volume 3 of *The Cambridge History of the English Language* (Cambridge: CUP), which was due to appear in June 1996. It has, therefore, not yet been published, though draft versions of it have been circulating around for some time. I personally have not seen any of these preliminary versions, but references to them can be found in, for instance, Hope (1993, 1994). Briefly, Lass's research on *thou* and *you* differs from earlier approaches to the topic primarily in the type of supporting evidence. In other words, Lass, unlike his predecessors, has not made use of dramatic dialogue, but rather of a collection of private letters. Aside from this, as might have been expected, he seems to have found ample evidence of the existence of (at least) two distinct uses of *thou* and *you*: a) socially determined uses, as largely predicted by the Brown and Gilman model; and b) what Lass terms 'micro-pragmatic' uses, these latter depending on immediate linguistic and situational context, rather than on broader social context. These micro-pragmatic uses correspond, basically, to the emotional or expressive uses of *thou/you* recognised by more traditional analyses.

Turning now to Calvo (1992), this is a brilliant paper in which the author questions much of the earlier work on the pronouns of address, and in particular, Brown and Gilman's power and solidarity model.¹ Detailed consideration of Calvo's many observations would be out of place here, so I will refer only to that aspect of her study which I have personally found most appealing, namely, her suggestion that, in Shakespeare's usage at least, shifts of pronominal address cannot always "be directly related to a character's emotional outbursts nor to a negotiation of social identities" (p. 22). Instead, in some contexts, *you* and *thou* appear to function as discourse markers that indicate "the presence of boundaries in the supra-sentential organisation of the dramatic dialogue" (p. 16). In other words, Calvo argues that *thou* and *you* can at times be seen as having a textual function, in the sense of Halliday (1985: 53; 1994: 52, etc.), in that there are passages where "the shift from one pronominal form to another seems to have [...] been exploited by Shakespeare to differentiate two intertwined conversational topics or to mark the boundary between two distinct sections in a dramatic dialogue" (p. 26). This novel proposal is illustrated by Calvo by examining pronominal usage in a few passages of *As You Like It* and *Much Ado about Nothing*. Thus, in this latter play, Benedick's sudden shift from *thou* to *you* in Act V, Scene ii, lines 72-94 (cf. [3] below) is accounted for by Calvo (p. 23) in this way: "[the] shift from *thou* to *you* which takes place in line 88 ('And now tell me, how doth *your* cousin?') coincides with an obvious change in discourse topic, in conversational mood and in deixis: Benedick moves from whether it is wise or not to praise oneself to enquiring about Hero, Beatrice's cousin. There is also a change in conversational mood: from jest to seriousness; and a change in deixis: from 'I-you' to 'she'. Benedick's pronominal shift in line 88 helps to establish the structural organisation of the discourse; it signals that the talk is now reaching some sort of discursal boundary, that a unit of the interaction -the jestful wooing, the comic interlude- is over, and that a new unit -the serious action, the as yet unresolved problem of Hero's damaged reputation- is about to begin".

(3) 1600 Shakespeare *Much Ado About Nothing* V.ii.72-92:²

BENEDICK: *Thou* and I are too wise to woo peaceably.

BEATRICE: It appears not in this confession; there's not one wise man among twenty that will praise himself.

BENEDICK: An old, an old instance, Beatrice, that liv'd in the time of good neighbors. If a man do not erect in this age his own tomb ere he dies, he shall live no longer in monument than the bell rings and the widow weeps.

BEATRICE: And how long is that, think *you*?

BENEDICK: Question: why, an hour in clamor and a quarter in rheum; therefore is it most expedient for the wise, if Don Worm (his conscience) find no impediment to the contrary, to be the trumpet of his own virtues, as I am to myself. So much for praising myself, who I myself will bear witness is praiseworthy. And now tell me, how doth *your* cousin?

BEATRICE: Very ill.

BENEDICK: And how do *you*?

BEATRICE: Very ill too.

As Calvo herself points out later in her paper (p. 26), from this perspective, therefore, "it is not the use of one particular pronominal form or another in a precise context that is meaningful but rather the *shift* from one pronoun to the other. The shift, and not each pronominal form *per se*, performs a signalling function in the global organisation of the dramatic dialogue". Calvo acknowledges, however, that her approach is not a new magic formula for the pronouns of address which can account for all kinds of pronominal shift; the primary aim of her paper is, basically, "to

¹ See also Calvo (1996), this volume.

² Quotations of Shakespeare's plays are from *The Riverside Shakespeare* (Blakemore Evans 1974). The emphasis on the pronouns *thou* and *you* is mine.

question the validity of some extant approaches” (p. 26) and to put forward some novel suggestions.

Though I cannot concur with all aspects of Calvo’s research, her claim concerning the possibility of *thou* and *you* having a discourse marking function is certainly attractive, at least for dramatic dialogue. In particular, I would suggest that certain pronominal shifts taking place in asides or soliloquies could perhaps be explained by reference to that discursal function of the second person pronouns. Consider, for instance, the pronominal shifts in the following passages from Shakespeare’s *Richard III*. The first is from the opening scene of the play, where Richard uses *you* to Clarence; but, as soon as Clarence goes off, Richard switches to *thou* in soliloquy. In the second passage, Buckingham converses politely with Hastings, using *you*, but changes to *thou* in a contemptuous aside:

(4) 1597 Shakespeare *Richard III* I.i.111-121:

GLOUCESTER: [...] this deep disgrace in brotherhood
 Touches me deeper than *you* can imagine.
 CLARENCE: I know it pleaseth neither of us well.
 GLOUCESTER: Well, *your* imprisonment shall not be long,
 I will deliver *you*, or else lie for *you*.
 Mean time, have patience.
 CLARENCE: I must perforce. Farewell.
Exit Clarence with Brakenbury and Guard.
 GLOUCESTER: Go tread the path that *thou* shalt ne’er return:
 Simple plain Clarence, I do love *thee* so
 That I will shortly send *thy* soul to heaven,
 If heaven will take the present at our hands.
 But who comes here? the new-delivered Hastings?

(5) 1597 Shakespeare *Richard III* III.ii.118-124:

HASTINGS: [...] What, go *you* to the Tower?
 BUCKINGHAM: I do, my lord, but long I cannot stay there.
 I shall return before *your* lordship thence.
 HASTINGS: Nay, like enough, for I stay dinner there.
 BUCKINGHAM [*Aside.*]: And supper too, although *thou* know’st it not.-
 Come, will *you* go?
 HASTINGS: I’ll wait upon *your* lordship.

For most scholars, such changes “may occur when a character is being hypocritical, and then reveals his true feelings in an aside or a soliloquy” (Barber 1981: 170). But it is tempting to see these and similar switches as dramatic clues, that is, as ways of clearly indicating to the audience that the lines in question are meant as asides, or as material that the speaker shares only with the audience, and with no one else. To borrow Calvo’s words (1992: 26) once more, the change of pronoun would serve “to mark the boundary between two distinct sections in a dramatic dialogue [...] it would help to establish the structural organisation of the discourse.”

To conclude this brief review of recent literature on the pronouns of address in Early Modern English, let me now turn to Hope (1993, 1994). Both papers are closely related, to the extent that Hope (1994) is in fact merely a shorter version of his 1993 study. From the outset, Hope challenges (1994: 142) the traditional view that literary dramatic dialogue represents our closest source to spoken Early Modern English. He points out that Shakespeare’s dramatic usage of the pronouns, “if it bears any relation to ‘real’ Early Modern usage at all” (*ibid.*: 148), may well

preserve uses of *thou* and *you* which had long disappeared from everyday, non-literary speech.¹ Hence his analysis of the pronouns of address departs from all prior research in being based not on literary language, but, instead, on a collection of court records held at Durham University. The records, which date back to the second half of the sixteenth century, consist of depositions, that is, statements given orally by a deponent or litigant, and written down by a court clerk. They thus have an intimate relationship with actual speech, though, as Hope acknowledges (1993: 84), “the quality of the evidence for spoken language features provided by the depositions depends to a large degree on the ability of the scribe, and the conventions and constraints he worked under”.

In all, Hope’s collection of depositions contains transcriptions of 89 conversations, in which there are 377 individual occurrences of the second person pronouns (namely, 185 *thou* vs. 192 *you*; cf. 1993: 97). These figures constitute, I would say, a very limited body of evidence, as will be clear if we consider that, according to Barber’s count (1981: 286-287), in Shakespeare’s *Richard III* there are 568 examples of *thou* as against some 491 of singular *you*. In other words, Hope’s total instances of the pronouns of address would roughly amount to just one third of those likely to occur in an Elizabethan or Jacobean play. This is a serious limitation to which I will return later in this lecture.

With regard to Hope’s main findings, these can be summarised as follows:

a) The court records confirm the existence of “socially-pragmatic usages encoding differentials of status” (1994: 146), and they also “give strong support for the non-socially pragmatic, emotional usage of the forms” (1993: 92).

b) Certain usages predicted by the power and solidarity model of Brown and Gilman (1960, 1989) are not found. Most notably, Hope calls attention (1993: 94) to the fact that a mutual lower class *thou*, as postulated by Brown and Gilman and by most other accounts of Early Modern English pronominal usage, is absent; in other words, *you* is the dominant form for address in the depositions, even among lower class characters.

c) Even more interestingly, Hope further contends (1993: 93) that the sex-patterning of the forms predicted by the power and solidarity model is not corroborated by his material. In other words, according to Brown and Gilman’s principles, we would expect male to female address to favour *thou*, and female to male address to favour *you*, but this does not occur in the depositions that Hope has examined, where *you* is apparently the more usual pronoun in exchanges between the sexes. From this he argues (1993: 98, note 8) that the failure of the sex variable to pattern as predicted by the power and solidarity norm “confirms in a historical context Lesley Milroy’s suggestions that sex and class should be held separate in models of sociolinguistic variation (1992)”.

d) Hope’s fourth and last important finding concerns the time at which *thou* becomes the marked form in English. In connection with this, Barber points out (1981: 286-287) that in Shakespeare’s works as a whole “there is no enormous difference in frequency between *Thou* and singular *You*”, so that, according to him, it can by no means be said that *you* was the usual, or unmarked, form in Shakespeare, and “*Thou* merely an occasional variant used on special occasions” (cf. for a similar view Kielkiewicz-Janowiak 1995). Hope, however, finds (1994: 148) that “the situation is very different in the court records. Here *thou* is unquestionably the marked form -and this is in only 1560. There is no doubt that for these speakers, *you* is the default, or neutral form, and *thou*, when it is used, is almost always motivated in some obvious way”.² For

¹ Cf. also in this connection Barber (1981: 287): “we do not have to assume that usage in Shakespeare’s plays exactly reflects the usages of the society around them. It would be perfectly possible for *Thou* to play a relatively small role in real life, while in drama, because of its concentration of emotional tension and its tendency to present scenes of confrontation, *Thou* appeared much more frequently. Even when we are more certain, therefore, about the significance of usages in Shakespeare’s plays, we shall need to use caution in drawing conclusions about usage in Shakespeare’s society.”

² Here and elsewhere, Hope gives 1560 as the date of his depositions; cf. (1993: 97) and specially (1994: 142, “depositions made to the Durham ecclesiastical court in the north-east of England in the 1560s”). Yet we learn

Hope, the strong implication of this is “that Shakespeare’s dramatic usage, if it bears any relation to ‘real’ Early Modern usage at all, preserves modes of usage which have long disappeared from everyday speech” (*ibid.*). He ends up by suggesting that probably *thou* and *you* lead separate lives in the written and spoken mediums.

From this brief review of some of the existing literature on the English pronouns of address, there emerge a number of findings which seem to be largely unquestionable. The most obvious is, as repeatedly noted, that *thou* and *you* had both socially motivated uses and micro-pragmatic, or emotionally motivated, ones. What is less clear, however, is whether these two kinds of uses should be interpreted as norm and deviations from that norm, as postulated by Brown and Gilman (1960, 1989), or, rather, as complementary functions resulting from two different pragmatic principles, one social in nature, the other contextual. In addition, it seems highly probable, though I do not think that this has yet been demonstrated, that, in the course of time, and specially as *thou* gradually became the marked form in the spoken language, the pronouns of address developed a number of ‘literary’ uses which could be effectively exploited by literary authors. Here I would place, for instance, the use of *thou* and *you* as discourse markers, as discussed by Calvo (1992). Finally, it is also undeniable that there still remain pronominal shifts that simply cannot be explained on the basis of any of the parameters just mentioned, as variously noted by Barber (1987: 282), Brown and Gilman (1989: 178), Calvo (1992) or Bolton (1992: 194-195). Confronted with this fact, we may draw the conclusion that the alternation between *thou* and *you* in Early Modern English represents one type of linguistic variation that was not orderly, or at least not completely so, but random. This, however, is hard to believe; anyone who works within the framework of sociohistorical variation analysis, as is my own case, proceeds on the assumption that linguistic variants are rarely in free distribution; their choice correlates either with intralinguistic factors, or with extralinguistic ones (i.e., social status, ethnic group, sex, age, etc.), or with both at the same time. The alternation between *thou* and *you* must also have been of this type, that is, orderly and systematic; if we have not yet managed to identify all the factors controlling it, this can probably be put down to the fact that more work is still needed on the topic. In other words, it seems to me that one problem with most of the existing approaches to the English pronouns of address is that they are all based on partial, insufficient evidence, that is, on corpora which are neither large enough for the purpose, nor representative of all levels of usage. We have to bear in mind that recent studies of similar variational paradigms have made use of huge corpora comprising, in some cases, several million words; cases in point are, for instance, Stein’s research (1985, 1987, 1990) on the alternation between the *-(e)s* and *-(e)th* endings of the third person present singular of verbs (i.e., *he writes* vs. *he writeth*) in Early Modern English, or, more recently, my own analysis (1996) of the variation between infinitives and gerunds in object position, for which I examined well over two million words.

By comparison, the samples used in practically all of the research on *thou* and *you* are disappointingly limited: thus, Barber (1981) is based solely on Shakespeare’s *Richard III*, McIntosh (1963), Calvo (1992) and Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1995) on *As You Like It*, Mulholland (1967) on *Much Ado About Nothing* and *King Lear*, Hope (1993, 1994) on a small collection of court records. With corpora of this size, it is not surprising that the conclusions reached in these various studies should at times be contradictory. In what follows, in order to better illustrate the dangers of analysing linguistic variants like *thou/you* on the basis of insufficient evidence, I will briefly report the results of a pilot investigation which I carried out while I was preparing this lecture. Since I wished to observe for myself how the pronouns of address patterned, I selected a batch of family letters dating back to the 16th and 17th centuries and comprising about 50, 000

from the list of references (p. 99) in the 1993 paper that the records cover, in fact, a thirty-year span (from 1565 to 1595).

words.¹ I also examined some 44,000 words of trial proceedings, but these proved of considerably less interest, so I will not refer to them in the discussion that follows.

With respect to the authors of the letters, they belong either to the gentry, or to the professions, that is, clergy, lawyers, administrative officers, doctors, etc.² The lower classes, therefore, are not represented in my corpus, which would be, of course, an important limitation if I had meant my collection of letters to be representative of Early Modern English society, as was not the case.

As regards the sex variable, both men and women were included among the letter writers in my sample, though letters written by men (= 60 in number) slightly outnumbered those written by females (= 52 in all). Finally, the correspondents were related either by blood, or by marriage: there were letters from husband to wife, from father to daughter or son, and from mother to daughter or son, and also the other way round, that is, from wife to husband, from son or daughter to father, from son or daughter to mother, and even from daughter-in-law to mother-in-law.

If I had to summarise second person pronoun usage as observed in this limited collection of letters, the following aspects would deserve mention:

a) Among the ranks of society represented in the sample, *you* is the unmarked form, even in first half of the 16th century; *thou*, whenever it occurs, is motivated in some more or less obvious way. Note in this connection, for instance, example (6) below; though *you* is the usual form of address from Sir Thomas More to his daughter Margaret Roper, he switches to *thou* when addressing her with the endearing nickname *Megge*:

- (6) 1534 *Correspondence of Sir Thomas More* (More to his daughter Margaret Roper) 546: Surely Megge a fainter hearte than *thy* fraile father hath, canst *thou* not have. And yet I verely trust in the great mercye of God, that he shall of his goodnesse so staye me with his holy hand, that he shall not finally suffer me to fall wretchedlie from his fauour. And the lyke trust (deare doughter) in his high goodnes I verely conceue of *you*.

Thus, the apparently marked status of *thou* from so early in the period largely agrees with Hope's findings (1993, 1994) in this respect, but contradicts the claims of scholars like Barber (1981) or, more recently, Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1995) that, as late as Shakespeare's time, neither of the two pronouns of address can be identified as unambiguously marked.

b) As might have been expected, there is abundant evidence for the power variable; that is, the pronouns are used to encode differences in status. This is apparent in the fact that instances of *thou* occur only from a technically superior correspondent to a technically inferior one. More specifically, *thou* is only found from mother to son, from father to daughter and, finally, from husband to wife. Clearly, however, its most frequent and regular use is in this last case, that is, from husband to wife; in this context, the use of *thou* can be observed from the early 16th century to the late 17th, which suggests that the sex variable was in fact a very important one as far as pronominal choice was concerned, contrary to the findings of Hope (1993: 93), as detailed earlier in this lecture. Obviously, it could be argued that occurrences of *thou* from husband to wife are not manifestations of the power model, but rather, of the micro-pragmatic, or emotional, use of the pronouns. This is, to some extent, true, as can be inferred from an example like the following:

¹ The selection of this particular text type can be justified on the grounds that private letters are widely recognised to come much closer to oral communication than most other genres (cf. Markus 1988). For instance, they encode many of the pragmatic features of dialogue: forms of address to the reader (listener), speech acts (such as questions and commands) that only make communicative sense if there is somebody to respond, and, even more importantly, the use of second person pronouns. As regards the specific letters examined for this lecture, they comprise all of those included in the Early Modern English section of The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts (Kytö, Rissanen et al. 1991). These total 35,370 words, which I supplemented with a second sample of about 14,000 words taken from other letter collections of the period.

² On the stratification of Early Modern English society cf. Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg (1989).

- (7) 1621 *Knyvett Letters* (Thomas Knyvett to his wife) 55: My deere Harte/ the cause of my not writing to *thee* the last week was becaus I thought to haue been at home with *the* before my letter, and therefore I cannot chose but condemne *y^r* to rashe censure of my forgettfullnes; which although it proceeds from *y^r* infinite love, yet the assured testimonies of my affection to *you* haue bene such as showld rather have layd the fault vpon something else, for I protest to god I love nothing but onely *thee*, and so rest assured.

Here *thou* indeed denotes intimacy and affection, but these feelings interact with the power principle, as is clear from the fact that in my collection of letters wives are often very affectionate to their husbands, and yet they invariably address them with *you*. The possibility exists, of course, that this marked difference between husbands and wives as regards pronominal choice may just have been a convention observed in letter writing, and not in actual speech. Be that as it may, what is specially noteworthy is that my data concerning the influence of the sex variable on pronominal usage are just the opposite of Hope's (1993), and this reflects, I think, the extent to which one's conclusions on the *thou/you* variation in Early Modern English can be crucially determined by the type of supporting evidence used.

c) Also according to expectation, my collection of letters contains pronominal shifts which appear to be unmotivated; consider, for instance, the forms typed in capitals in the passages below:

- (8) 1621 *Knyvett Letters* (Thomas Knyvett to his wife) 56: Sweet harte I am forst yet to send the shaddowe of my selfe, the true affection of a substance that loves *you* aboue all the world./ My busines I hope wilbe effectually dispatcht presently and god willing I will be with *THE* before *YOU* are aware. I haue been to look for stufe for *y^r* bedde and haue sent downe paternes for *you* to choose which *you* like best. They are the neerest to the patourne that wee can finde./ If *you* lack anything accept [= except] my company *you* are to blame not to lett me knowe of it, for my selfe being only *yours* the rest doe followe. Thus in hast Intreating *the* to be merry and the more merry to think *thou* hast him in *thy* armes that had rather be with *YOU* then in any place vnder heaven; and so I rest/ *Thy* dear loving husband [...]
- (9) 1624? *Correspondence of Lady Katherine Paston* (Lady Katherine to her son William) 65: [...] I thanke *THE* for *THY* kinde token sent me in *YOUR* first letter: and allso I haue received two other letters this last by Iohnsons. by whom I did not wright, because this mesenger will be with *you* sooner than he: /in all which of *thy* most louinge letters I haue *thy* faithefull promises redubled. wherfor I haue no doupt of the parformanc of them seinge they be allwas in *thy* minde: /*YOUR* father comende him to *THE* and doe acsepet kindly of the token *YOU* sent him, he sends *you* this 10 s for a remembranc of his Love
- (10) 1662 *Oxinden and Peyton Letters* (Henry Oxinden to his wife) no. 178, p. 275: [...] as the case now stands I know no way under heaven so effectually probable as for *THEE* to send to my brother Richard or my Cozin Dalison to lay out the 16^l adventured with my Cozin George to my best advantage and in case *YOU* do not pay it them againe in good time, they to have the benfit of it. /Surely, surely, without considerable monie nothing can considerably be done.
- (11) *Ibid.* no. 179, p. 277: [...] *You* have advised mee well in being my own secretarie; howsoever I think Sir Robt Hales, Mr. Hannington and Ch. N. are some of our truest friends. Mr. Hannington and I were a Sunday last and heard a sermon at White Hall before the King. Dr. Bolton preached and that *YOU* may know

that Mr. Hannington is of no ordinary esteeme, I will assure *THEE* hee had such a presence with him as though a stranger to every one in the Church,

In order to account for such shifts, one option would be to say, as is partly suggested by Calvo (1992: 26), that “it is not the use of one particular pronominal form or another in a precise context that is meaningful but rather the *shift* from one pronoun to the other”. In other words, in examples like (8)-(11) it would be the shift itself, and not each pronominal form individually, that would be indicative of, for instance, the degree of intimacy existing between the two correspondents involved in each case. This sounds plausible, but, of course, it needs to be confirmed by further statistical data.

Finally, it seems to me quite certain that at least some of the variation between the English pronouns of address must have been controlled by grammatical factors of various kinds.¹ And, in fact, aspects like the type of verb (i.e., closed-class versus open-class, *thou* being said to be more readily associated with the former than with the latter) or the lexical context have been mentioned from time to time in the relevant literature as conditioning the occurrence of *you* and *thou* (cf. Mulholland 1967; Barber 1981: 285-286). But suggestions of this kind have never proved completely convincing because, without exception, they have been based on insufficient evidence. And it is here, as I have pointed out earlier in this lecture, where I think the heart of the problem lies as far as the study of the *thou/you* variation in Early Modern English is concerned.

REFERENCES

- Barber, Ch. 1976: *Early Modern English*. London, Deutsch.
- Barber, Ch. 1981: *You and Thou in Shakespeare's Richard III*. *Leeds Studies in English*, New Series, 12: 273-289.
- Blake, N. 1992: The Literary Language. *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Vol. II: 1066-1476 ed. by N. Blake, 500-541. Cambridge, CUP.
- Blakemore Evans, G. ed. 1974: *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Bolton, W. F. 1992: *Shakespeare's English. Language in the history plays*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. 1960: The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. *Style in Language* ed. by T. A. Sebeok, 253-276. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. 1989: Politeness Theory and Shakespeare's Four Major Tragedies. *Language in Society* 18: 159-212.
- Calvo, C. 1992: Pronouns of Address and Social Negotiation in *As You Like It*. *Language and Literature* 1: 5-27.
- Calvo, C. 1996: *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke* and the Pronouns of Address: Q1 (1603) versus Q2 (1604/5). *Sederi* 7: this volume.
- Fanego, T. 1996: The Development of Gerunds as Objects of Subject-Control Verbs in English (1400-1760). *Diachronica* 13: 29-63.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1985: *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London, Edward Arnold. [2nd rev. ed.: 1994]

¹ Two recent studies exploring this topic are Martín Miguel & Fernández-Corugedo (1996, this volume) and Kielkiewicz-Janowiak (1995). This latter concludes, on the basis of a computational analysis of Shakespeare's *As You Like It*, that there is little evidence for the linguistically conditioned occurrence of the pronouns.

- Hargrave, F. ed. 1730: *A Complete Collection of State-Trials and Proceedings for High-Treason, and Other Crimes and Misdemeanours; from the Reign of King Richard II.* London, J. Walthoe Sen.
- Hope, J. 1993: Second Person Singular Pronouns in Records of Early Modern 'Spoken' English. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 94: 83-100.
- Hope, J. 1994: The Use of *Thou* and *You* in Early Modern Spoken English: Evidence from depositions in the Durham ecclesiastical court records. *Studies in Early Modern English* ed. by D. Kastovsky, 141-151. Berlin & New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kielkiewicz-Janowiak, A. 1995: Sociolinguistics and the Computer: Pronominal address in Shakespeare. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 29: 49-56.
- Kytö, M., Rissanen, M., et al. 1991: *The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts.* Helsinki, Department of English, University of Helsinki.
- Lass, R. 1996: Morphology. *The Cambridge History of the English Language.* Vol. III: 1476-1776 ed. by R. Lass. Cambridge, CUP (to appear).
- Markus, M. 1988: Middle English and Early Modern English Letters as the Basis of a Linguistic Corpus. *Historical English. On the occasion of Karl Brunner's 100th birthday* ed. by M. Markus, 167-185. Innsbruck, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft (Anglistische Reihe Band 1).
- Martín Miguel F. & Fernández-Corugedo, S. G. 1996: Addressing Formulae and Politeness in *The Shepherds Calender.* *Sederi* 7: this volume.
- Mausch, H. 1991-1993: Democratic *You* and Paradigm. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 25 / 27: 143-53.
- McIntosh, A. 1963: *As You Like It:* A Grammatical clue to character. *Review of English Literature* 4: 68-81.
- Milroy, L. 1992: New Perspectives on the Analysis of Sex Differentiation in Language. *Sociolinguistics Today: International perspectives* ed. by K. Bolton & H. Kwok, 163-179. London, Routledge.
- Mossé, F. 1952: *A Handbook of Middle English,* tr. J.A. Walker. Baltimore, MD, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mulholland, J. 1967: 'Thou' and 'You' in Shakespeare: A study in the second person pronoun. *English Studies* 48: 1-9.
- Mustanoja, T. F. 1960: *A Middle English Syntax.* I. Helsinki, Société Néophilologique.
- Nevalainen, T., & Raumolin-Brunberg, H., 1989: A Corpus of Early Modern Standard English in a Socio-Historical Perspective. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 90: 67-110.
- Stein, D. 1985: Discourse Markers in Early Modern English. *Papers from the 4th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, Amsterdam, 10-13 April, 1985* ed. by R. Eaton et al., 283-302. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Stein, D. 1987: At the Crossroads of Philology, Linguistics and Semiotics: Notes on the replacement of *th* by *s* in the third person sing. in English. *English Studies* 68: 406-431.
- Stein, D. 1990: Functional Differentiation in the Emerging English Standard Language: The evolution of a morphological discourse and style marker. *Historical Linguistics 1987. Papers from the 8th International Conference on Historical Linguistics (Lille, 31 August-4 September 1987)* ed. by H. Andersen & K. Koerner, 489-498. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Strang, B. 1970: *A History of English.* London, Methuen & Co. Ltd.

Wales, K. M. 1983: *Thou* and *You* in Early Modern English: Brown and Gilman re-appraised. *Studia Linguistica* 37: 107-125.

* * *

The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke
and the Pronouns of Address: Q1 (1603) versus Q2 (1604/5)

Clara Calvo

UNIVERSIDAD DE MURCIA

This paper originated in a double interest in *you* and *thou*, the pronouns of address in Early Modern English. On the one hand, it was born out of a desire to test if those Shakespearean plays which have been preserved in two or more early texts could cast any light on the uses of the pronouns of address. This could be, precisely, the case of *Hamlet*, which survives in three early texts: the Quarto of 1603, the Quarto of 1604/5 and the First Folio of 1623. On the other hand, this paper grew from a dissatisfaction with the way in which theories on the Early Modern English pronouns of address have been used to explain the use of *you* and *thou* in Shakespeare's plays.

As far as I know, the body of knowledge which we possess about the history of the textual transmission of Shakespeare's plays has been consistently ignored by studies of the pronouns of address in Early Modern English. It is not surprising that Shakespearean scholars interested in the pronouns of address have so far ignored the existence of Quartos and Folios and have based their research of the uses of these pronouns on a single text: after all, editorial tradition has often assumed that Shakespeare produced a perfect manuscript when he wrote each of his plays and the text of that manuscript has suffered successive manipulations and corruptions. Within this tradition, the task of the editor has been to retrieve, as best she can, that pristine quality of the lost Shakespearean original.

It is more surprising that those who are not - or not only - interested in the plays of Shakespeare as literary works, but who are interested in the language of the English Renaissance and historical linguistics or in sociolinguistics and the study of Style, have equally neglected the abundant data which can be obtained from a simple collation between the First Folio version of one of Shakespeare's plays and an earlier version (such as a so-called 'bad' Quarto) of the same play. Although there are many Shakespearean plays of which we only possess the version preserved in the First Folio, we are lucky to have a play such as *Hamlet*, for which no less than three early texts have been preserved.

The so called 'bad' Quarto (1603), is a non-authoritative edition which is believed not to have a direct link with Shakespeare's autograph. It is supposed to be a reported text, that is, the result of memorial reconstruction, and diverse theories have been put forward to account for its existence: it may have been the work of the player who took the part of Marcellus, or it may have been put together by a company of players that was on tour and did not have the 'Booke', or it may have been taken down in successive performances by a hired stenographer. None of these theories have been sufficiently proved and it has even been suggested that Q1 could represent an earlier version of the play which Shakespeare later revised (Urkowitz 1986). The second edition of the play, the 'good' Quarto of 1604 / 1605, is held to descend directly from Shakespeare's own 'foul papers' or autograph and since Dover Wilson published his old Cambridge edition of the play in 1934, it is supposed to be the nearest we can get to Shakespeare's first thoughts. Finally, the First Folio version of 1623, is believed to bear traces of the 'prompt-book' kept in Shakespeare's playhouse and it is assumed that it preserves the play as it was performed in the Globe. Most contemporary editors of the play conflate Q2 and F, so that no line Shakespeare wrote is lost. Recently, some editors have given priority to Q2, like H. Jenkins in his edition for the Arden Series (1982) and

some editors have done the same with F: Edwards in his New Cambridge edition (1985) puts square brackets around Q2-only lines and G. R. Hibbard, in his Oxford edition (1987), removes these lines from the main text and places them in an appendix.

These three texts vary in length: Q1 is the shortest, being almost half the size of Q2, which is the longest. Q2 and F differ sometimes only in matters such as punctuation and single word variants but there are also more substantial differences between the two texts, since there are lines in Q2 which do not appear in F, and *vice versa*, there are lines which appear in F and which are absent from Q2. Given these differences between Q2 and F, it is remarkable that these two authoritative texts present few, if any, different readings when it comes to the pronouns of address. Q1 and Q2, however, differ on a number of occasions, partly because Q1, being considerably shorter than Q2, has less instances of pronouns, but it is possible to find lines which are present in both texts and which are identical except for the choice of pronoun.

The occurrence of either pronoun in exactly the same line, in exactly the same dramatic context, is something which Brown and Gilman's famous theory of the pronouns of power and solidarity (Brown and Gilman 1960) cannot deal with easily. Brown and Gilman's theories on the pronouns of address still seems to have a currency which is no longer deserved: the work of Quirk (1971) and Wales (1983) on *you* and *thou* has shown that Brown and Gilman's model of the pronouns of power and solidarity cannot account for the complex use of the pronouns of address in Early Modern English dramatic texts. Brown and Gilman (1960;1989) assume that *you* and *thou* function in Renaissance plays more or less like other European V-pronouns and T-pronouns, that is, like *vous* and *tu* in French, *du* and *Sie* in German and *tu* and *usted* in Spanish. The use of pronoun is then regulated by relations of superiority and inferiority or by the degree of intimacy existing between the speakers. The only difference is that there are cases in which dramatic characters shift from *you* to *thou* or from *thou* to *you* momentarily and this is due to an 'expressive' or 'emotional' use of the pronominal system: the switch from one pronoun to the other indicates that the speaker is moved or emotionally aroused, so an alteration in the expected pattern of address indicates the expression of transient feelings or affective moods.

Quirk (1971) and Wales (1983) have suggested instead that at the end of the 16th century the use of the pronouns of address in Early Modern English differed considerably from their equivalents in other European languages. In Shakespeare's English, *you* had become already the most frequently used pronoun of address between members of most social classes, at least in London and the Court. Wales (1983: 121) has shown that contemporary grammarians thought this to be the case. Together with this increasing predominance of *you*, there were residual uses of *thou* which we may or may not be able to account for: *thou* was still used in a variety of contexts and situations (such as religious language and dialects), but whenever it was used, it would contrast with *you*: in other words, whenever *thou* was selected, it would be selected for a reason. Equally, if *thou* had been selected and the speaker suddenly reverted to the use of *you*, this contrast would also be meaningful: 'Although *you* is the general unmarked form beside which the use of *thou* is conspicuous, the position is that in a relationship where *thou* is expected, *you* can likewise be in contrast and conspicuous.' (Quirk 1971: 71). Wales has also pointed out (1983: 115), that despite the existence of this contrast between *you* and *thou*, in some cases, the semantic content of the Early Modern English pronouns of address must have been almost identical, since this would explain the apparently incomprehensible fluctuation and the eventual disappearance of *thou*, which had begun to become redundant.

Generations of Shakespearean scholars and linguists (myself included, I must admit) have spent time elucidating the meanings and contextual nuances of *you* and *thou* in Shakespeare's plays¹ and it is often difficult to accept that there may be cases in which the contrast between the two pronouns of address is meaningless, that is, that perhaps both pronouns could be equally

¹ See, for instance, Abbot, E. A. (1869), Brown, R. and A. Gilman (1960), Brown, R. and A. Gilman (1989), Byrne, St. G. (1936), Calvo, C. (1992), Calvo, C. (1994), Hope, J. (1994), McIntosh, A. (1963), Muir, K. and S. Schoenbaum (1971), Quirk, R. (1971), Sebeok, T. A. (1960), Wales, K. (1983), Wales, K. ed (1994).

selected at a given point in discourse. The choice of *you* or *thou* in a particular context may have been dictated only by the speaker's own idiolect. In the case of dramatic texts, the choice of pronoun may have been an artistic choice, a literary device, but even in the context of artistic creation, the choice may have been entirely a matter of personal preference between two pronouns which denoted second person singular reference and did not connote much. The existence of the first and second Quartos of *Hamlet* offers a good chance to observe how either pronoun could equally be used in exactly the same utterance or in a very similar context.¹

In Act II, scene ii, when Polonius reports to the King and Queen how he has admonished his daughter Ophelia to reject Hamlet's advances, Q1 and Q2 present a different pronoun of address in a line which is otherwise identical:

Q1

COR. Now when I saw this letter, thus I bespake my maiden:
Lord Hamlet is a Prince out of your starre,
 And one that is vnequall for your loue:
 Therefore I did commaund her refuse his letters, (D4;ll.800-803)

Q2

POL. And my young Mistris thus I did bespeake,
Lord Hamlet is a Prince out of thy star,
 This must not be: and then I prescripts gaued her (E4v;LTN 1169-1171)

This could be taken to indicate that the 'pirates' who produced Q1, ignorant as we must necessarily pose them, bent on pecuniary profit and nothing else, were careless enough to fail to notice the nuances of the *thou* of affection which Polonius has for Ophelia in Q2 and, due to their incompetence, memorially reconstructed this line as '*your starre*'. There is a problem, however, with constructing explanations such as this one, based on artistic merit and on the superior literary talent of William Shakespeare: we are inevitably doomed to find evidence to the contrary sooner or later. Towards the end of the 'closet scene', when Hamlet has seen his father's ghost and Gertrude begins to suspect that his son is mad, it is Q2 the text which selects the neutral *you* and Q1 the text which prefers the non-neutral *thou* of supposedly emotional overtones and superior literary achievement:

Q1

QUEENE. Alas, it is the weakenesse of thy braine,
 Which makes thy tongue to blazon thy hearts grieffe: (G3; ll.1580-1581)

Q2

GERTR. This is the very coynage of your braine,
 This bodilesse creation extacie is very cunning in. (I4; LTN 2520-2521)

The choice of pronoun has been reversed here and Q1 has *thou* where Q2 has *you*. If we accept our earlier explanation for the *thou* of Polonius to Ophelia, we are now forced to grant that the pirates improved Shakespeare's choice of pronoun, since in Q1 the Queen, who has not seen the Ghost, addresses Hamlet with a pronoun which shows her emotional state, her confusion when she hears her son holding a conversation with the air, her sadness when she suspects her son might be after all really insane.

¹ Quotations from Q1 and Q2 *Hamlet* have been taken from the parallel text edition of the three-text *Hamlet* in Bertram and Kliman 1991.

When Hamlet meets the players earlier in the play, there is another occasion in which the pirates seem to have ‘improved’ Shakespeare’s text, if the use of *thou* is explained as the *thou* of affection:

Q2

HAM. Follow him friends, weele heare a play to morrowe; dost *thou* heare me old friend, can *you* play the murther of *Gonzago*?

PLAY. I my Lord.

HAM. Weele hate to morrowe night, *you could for neede study a speech of some dosen lines, or sixteene lines*, which I would set downe and insert in’t, could *you* not?

PLAY. I my Lord. (F4v; LTN 1576-1583)

Q1

HAM. Come hither maisters, can *you* not play the murder of *Gonsago*?

PLAYERS. Yes my Lord.

HAM. *And could’st not thou for a neede study me*

Some dozen or sixteene lines,

Which I would set downe and insert?

PLAYERS. Yes very easily my good Lord. (E4v; ll.1120-1126)

Like in the ‘closet scene’, Q1 has *thou* in a context in which Q2 has *you*. We are again forced to grant that Q1 improves Q2’s choice of pronoun, since in Q1 Hamlet addresses one of the players with the *thou* of affection and conspiratorial intimacy: ‘And could’st not *thou* for a neede study me / Some dozen or sixteene lines, / Which I would set downe and insert?’ Hamlet is addressing here the player whom he wants to enlist as his ally to test the King’s guilt while the Court watches the play within the play. With his pronominal choice, Hamlet acknowledges that he is asking a favour of this player. If this analysis is right, on this particular occasion then, the text of Q1 is, on artistic grounds, better than the text of Q2. Not many would agree, though, with the suggestion that the pirates, the thieves who stole the text of *Hamlet* and memorially reconstructed it, actually improved Shakespeare’s text.¹

Later in the play, when Hamlet meets the player again to give him the speech and the instructions on how to perform it, we find that the reported text has a pronoun shift from *thou* to *you*. This is one of those single pronominal shifts which when it is thought to come from Shakespeare’s pen is attributed to his mastery at expressing temporary or ‘fleeting’ moods. Q2, said to represent Shakespeare’s intentions directly from his foul papers, shows no pronominal shift:

Q2

HAM. *Speake the speech I pray you as I pronoun’d it to you, trippingly on the tongue, but if you mouth it as many of our Players do, I had as liue the towne*

¹ There is of course something else which has to be taken into account: Q1 looks as if it has not been set carefully at this point, because Hamlet is using the second person singular pronoun *thou* and the text assigns the answer to Hamlet’s question to the plural ‘players’. This could be a compositor’s error, since just before setting this speech tag, the compositor has set the same speech tag a couple of lines earlier to introduce the players’ answer to Hamlet’s question: ‘Come hither maisters, can *you* not play the murder of *Gonsago*?’ Later in Q1 the compositor seems to have made the same mistake, since the same speech-tag ‘players’ appears again before a line obviously intended for just one player: ‘I warrant you my Lord’ (Q1 F2; l.1230). So perhaps in this occasion the *thou* of affection is simply a compositorial error, a possibility not altogether remote given that the meanings of *you* and *thou* were becoming less and less distinct at the turn of the 17th century.

cryer spoke my lines, nor doe not say the ayre too much with your hand thus, but vse all gently, for in the very torrent tempest, and as I may say, whirlwind of your passion, *you* must acquire a beget a temperance, that may giue it smoothnesse, (G3v; LTN 1849-1855)

Q1

HAM. Pronounce me this speech trippingly a the tongue

as I taught thee,

Mary and you mouth it, as a many of your players do

I'de rather heare a towne bull bellow,

Then such a fellow speake my lines.

Nor do not saw the aire thus with your hands,

But giue euery thing his action with temperance. (F2; ll.1206-1212)

Here again, either we accept that the pirates improved Shakespeare's text, or we blame the compositor who set the text of Q2 for the press, or failing this, we may have to accept that in some cases, free variation and the vagaries of speaker's idiolect is at the origin of the choice between *you* or *thou*. There is, of course, another option which is to suggest that between the printer's copy for Q1 and the printer's copy for Q2, Shakespeare revised - or enlarged as the title-page for Q2 says - the play we now call simply *Hamlet*. This option would probably meet with more trenchant opposition and perhaps some would prefer to accept after all the idea that the pirates, possibly out of a stroke of luck, improved Shakespeare's text. A third option, of course, is to question the importance of the *thou* of affection.

It seems to me that the lesson waiting to be learned from a comparison of the use of the pronouns of address in Q1 and Q2 is that the swift shifts of pronominal choice which we have been bent on deciphering and explaining as the expression of transient feeling could perhaps be, in some cases, the result of meaningless free-variation between the two pronouns of address or the product of corruption in the process of textual transmission.

I have tried to show how anyone looking into the mechanics of the pronouns of address in Early Modern English from a sociolinguistic angle may ignore the evidence contained in some renaissance plays which have been preserved in different Quartos, and if they choose to do so, they will do it at their own risk. Yet, it seems to me, Shakespearean scholars working on the pronouns of address cannot afford to ignore the rich data which can be obtained from the multiple-text condition of some of Shakespeare's plays.

REFERENCES

- Abbot, E. A. 1869: *A Shakespeare Grammar*. London.
- Bertram, P. and B. W. Kliman. eds. 1991: *The Three-Text Hamlet: Parallel Texts of the First and Second Quartos and First Folio*. New York: AMS Press (AMS Studies in the Renaissance, 30).
- Brown, R. and A. Gilman. 1960: The pronouns of power and solidarity. > Sebeok, T. 1960: 253-276.
- Brown, R. and A. Gilman. 1989: Politeness theory and Shakespeare's four major tragedies. *Language in Society* 18 (2): 159-212.
- Byrne, St. G. 1970[1936]: *Shakespeare's Use of the Pronouns of Address: its Significance in Characterization and Motivation*. New York, Haskell House.

- Calvo, C. 1992: Pronouns of address and social negotiation in *As You Like It*. *Language and Literature* 1 (1): 5-27.
- Calvo, C. 1994: In Defence of Celia: Discourse Analysis and Women's Discourse in *As You Like It*. Wales, K. ed. 1994: 91-115.
- Hope, J. 1994: *The Authorship of Shakespeare's Plays: A Sociolinguistic Study*. Cambridge: CUP.
- McIntosh, A. 1963. *As You Like It*: A Gramatical Clue to Character. *Review of English Literature* 4: 68-81.
- Muir, K. and S. Schoenbaum. 1971: *A New Companion to Shakespeare Studies*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Quirk, R. 1971: Shakespeare and the English Language. Muir, K. and S. Schoenbaum. 1971: 67-82.
- Sebeok, T. A. 1960: *Style in Language*. New York: The MIT Press and John Wiley.
- Urkowitz, S. 1986: "Well-sayd olde Mole": Burying Three *Hamlets* in Modern Editions. Ziegler, G. ed. 1986: 37-70.
- Wales, K. 1983: 'Thou' and 'you' in Early Modern English: Brown and Gilman re-appraised. *Studia Linguistica* 37 (2): 107-125.
- Wales, K. ed. 1994: *Feminist Linguistics in Literary Criticism*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer and The English Association (Essays and Studies 1994).
- Ziegler, G. ed. 1986: *Shakespeare Study Today: The Horace Howard Furness Memorial Lectures*. New York: AMS Press (AMS Studies in the Renaissance, no.13).

* * *

Addressing Formulæ and Politeness in *The Shepherds Calender*

Francisco Martín Miguel & Santiago González

UNIVERSITY OF A CORUÑA

INTRODUCTION

In the framework of contemporary linguistics, it has become widely acknowledged among those who favour the study of language from a social or anthropological point of view that verbal communication is not simply a means of conveying information, but also an equally outstanding means of establishing, maintaining, and even terminating social relationships with other people.

Linguistic theory cannot restrict its attention to the study of the linguistic code in itself and ignore the general social communicative conduct, since they have been proved to be closely interrelated in a variety of ways. The rules of politeness, that is rules which determine appropriate behaviour, are one of the aspects of culture which are clearly reflected in language. The relationship of the interactants, their age, the specific situation, and so on, will directly affect their language use to degrees determined by the culture.

It is commonly accepted (Baugh & Cable 1993[1958], Pyles & Algeo 1993[1964], Görlach 1991) that the sixteenth century witnessed the establishment of the personal pronoun in the form that it has had ever since. One of the most remarkable phenomena in the period is the use -and change in use- of the pronouns *thou/you*. Much has been argued about the second person pronoun system of Renaissance English, as Crystal (1995: 71) points out, “not simply because the forms provide an obvious point of contrast with Modern English, but because they perform a central role in the expression of personal relationships, and are thus crucial to any study of contemporary drama.”

Within the socio-pragmatic approach to the study of language outlined above at least two social characteristics play a significant role in determining linguistic use. Following Brown & Levinson (1978: 79), these variables are: i) the social distance (D) between the participants; and ii) the relative power (P) between them. The notions of power and solidarity provide, according to Hope (1994: 141), an explicative (even arguably a predictive) model for the pronoun usages, namely the use of *thou* and *you*, encountered in dramatic texts:

characters ‘+power’ (monarchs, the rich, men, parents, masters and mistresses) can be expected to give *thou* and receive *you* when interacting with those ‘-power’ (subjects, the poor, women, children, servants). Theoretically under this model we expect characters of equal power, or social class, to exchange reciprocal *you* if they are upper class, and *thou* if they are lower.

What follows is part of an ongoing research project, some results of which have already been put forward in González (1994 & in press). There the author examined a singular corpus that

included all Spenser's Dedicatory Sonnets¹ from the point of view of their formulæ of address and tentatively established a comparison with similar formulæ in other works by the same poet. In the past, several scholars have carried out analogous studies of sixteenth century texts on the basis of corpora which, in our opinion, have revealed themselves to be insufficient for the kind of results obtained from them. In addition, we think that these corpora do not contain the significant number of data so as to being able to arrive at tenable conclusions. This is true, in our opinion, of some influential studies, such as, for instance, that found in Barber (1976) dealing with the use of *thou/you*: too small data bases and biased texts have been employed as the starting point of such analyses.

Our main endeavour in this paper is to revise such data and our main claim is that the methodological procedures used to analyse such data are to be changed. Our intention is to sift through computer text files and produce a large and exhaustive number of data in the future that have to be interpreted correctly. For the modelling of this we have selected Spenser's *The Shepherds Calender* because, as a poet, he seems to represent the more educated layers of late sixteenth century sociolects.²

As regards computer implementation, we have used a computer program called *Conc. A Concordance Generator*, version 1.70beta (Antworth 1992). *Conc* is a program designed to facilitate the intensive study of a flat text or an interlinear text by producing a list of all the words occurring in it, with a short section of the context preceding and following each occurrence of a word. In many fields of study such a list is called a concordance. *Conc* can also produce a more conventional index, consisting of a list of the (distinct) words in a document, each with a list of the places where it occurs. It can also do some simple statistical studies of a text, such as counting the number of occurrences of words that match a given pattern.

METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

First of all, we suggest considering the quantitative evidence from *The Shepherds Calender*. Using *Conc* we have analysed all forms of the following words: *thou*, *thee*, *thy*, *ye*, *you* and *your*. The quantitative results are shown in Table 1 and the full list of concordances can be found in Annex I: there is a total of 286 th-forms, whereas there are just 120 y-forms. At first sight these figures might indicate that the characters mainly belong to the same social class,³ since th-forms are more than double the number of y-forms: the level of familiarity between the shepherds is reflected in the use of the th-forms, which are significantly abundant. We will not discuss here whether these shepherds are real shepherds or not, as for our purpose, if they are not real shepherds, they are at least literary impersonations of characters of a similar social rank, and this implies both upper and lower classes.

TABLE 1

¹ *Id est*, all sonnets by Spenser —or attributed to him— addressed to —usually— important persons (the Queen, noblemen, patrons, etc.) appearing either before his own poems, or, as in *The Faerie Queene*, postponed to it, in which the author 'dedicates' the work in the expectation that the importance or fame of the prospective protector may help the poet and the advancement of his work.

² The basic text chosen for the selection of data is that printed in the *Shepherd's Calender* copy at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, item 4.F2(11) Arts Bs, and converted into a machine-readable text by means of keyboard input into an ASCII text file, containing 33,317 words —*id est* sets of characters separated by a blank space. We have used a microfilm provided by the Bodleian Reprographic Service, checking it against the original copy. This text has also been collated with J. C. Smith & E. de Selincourt's Oxford Standard Authors version (we use the one volume edition as printed in 1970, although the text originally appeared in 1912), the *Variorum* text (C. G. Osgood & al. 1943), and the *Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser* (W. A. Oram & al. 1989). Collation has been both traditional and computer based, using in this case P. Robinson's program *Collate 2* (see P. Robinson 1994). All page references to *The Shepherds Calender* in this article refer to Smith & De Selincourt's edition, as above.

³ Theoretically a 'lower' class, as sixteenth-century real shepherds should be considered. However, these 'lower' characters tend to be 'feigned' shepherds rather than real ones. For further discussion, see, for instance, H. Cooper 1977.

286:	th-forms	y-forms	: 120
thou	112	ye	23
thee	54	you	47
thy	120	your	50

In order to develop a coherent detailed analysis of all the occurrences of the forms in Table 1, we have chosen to apply the syntactic criteria listed in Table 2. They comprise the identification of the forms above as functioning in subject or object position on the one hand, or else as vocatives on the other. Within each category, we have thought it relevant to check whether the pronouns are followed by an appositive structure or not. We have also been careful to register whether the pronouns function as subjects of a verb in the indicative, subjunctive or imperative mood, whether the word order is subject+verb or, on the contrary, a process of subject-verb inversion (SVI) takes place. Finally we have considered it appropriate to include analyses of the type [NP, XP], that is, the so-called small clauses.

TABLE 2

Syntactic criteria	:
Subject	
Subject: Apposition	
Subject: Indicative	
Subject: Indicative: SVI	
Subject: Indicative: Apposition	
Subject: Indicative: Apposition: SVI	
Subject: Imperative: SVI	
Subject: Subjunctive	
Subject: Subjunctive: Apposition	
Subject: Small-clause analysis	
Object	
Object: Apposition	
Vocative: Apposition	
Vocative: Imperative: Apposition	

The next step in the process entails classifying, analysing and discussing every single occurrence of the forms. Annex II contains the classification and the analyses of the occurrences in Annex I. It is beyond the scope of this paper to delve into every case at length. However, we will mark out and comment on some cases which, in our view, pose problems from the point of view of syntax. They are shown in Table 3.¹

TABLE 3

1) in heauens hight. I see	thee blessed soule, I see, Walke in	(November 177-179)
2) Submitting me to	you good sufferance, And praying to	(February 187-188)
3) lette me in your folds	ye lock, Ere the breme Winter breede	(December 147-148)
4) hem emong, All for	thy casten too much of worlds care	(September 113-114)

¹ For some individual references of the examples in our tables (with concordance line and edition page), see our annex II.

The first concordance under consideration includes the second person singular form of the personal pronoun in accusative/dative case, *thee*. It may be easily analysed as the direct object of the transitive verb *see* followed by an appositive NP, *blessed soule*. However, as can be seen in Annex II, of the five occurrences of *thee* followed by an apposition, only this one shows a non-personal appositive NP (*blessed soule*), whereas the others contain personal referents (*shepherd, Hobbinoll, poore Orphane, Diggon*). An alternative analysis is possible if we take into account the following occurrences:

Wil. so cleaues	thy soule a sonder: Per. Or as Dame (August 88-89)
for shame hold vp	thy heauye head, And let vs cast with (October 1-2)
kydst not ene to cure	thy sore hart roote, Whose ranckling (December 93-94)

Analogically, it would not be illegitimate to suggest that *thee blessed soule* is in fact meant to be *thy blessed soule*. In the first case, *soule* is used in combination with *thy* in a genitive+noun construction; in the second and third cases the structure is of the type genitive+adjective+body part, similar to *thee blessed soule*. Besides, phonetic reasons might support this use of *thee/thy*: the Northern pronunciation /ɪ/ could also be an argument for the case.

Much of the same could be said of the second concordance, which illustrates a similar problem. The second person plural form of the personal pronoun in accusative case, *you*, with a singular, polite meaning, is followed by the adjective+noun combination. It is somewhat difficult to interpret this adjective+noun construction as the apposition to the pronoun due to the nature of its semantic reference (*good sufferance*). Whenever a similar structure is found in the text (*you*+apposition), the semantics of the apposition is mainly human or human-like, as the following concordances indicate:

Whose cause I pray	you Sir, yf Enuie shall stur vp any (Epistle §5)
yt is already donne.	You naked trees, whose shady leaues (January 310-31)
my request: And eke	you Virgins, that on Parnasse dwell (April 40-41)

We believe that the most logical interpretation for *you good sufferance* is a structure of genitive+adjective+noun, that is, *your good sufferance*, by analogy with cases such as:

defend with	your mighty Rhetorick and other your (Epistle §5)
can, and shield with	your good wil, as you ought, against (Epistle §5)
that vpon sight of	your speciall frends and fellow Poets (Epistle §6)
But I be relieved by	your beastly head. I am a poore (May 265-266)

The third problematic concordance is special in the sense that it is the only occurrence in which the pronoun *ye* appears in object position. Out of the 23 occurrences of the form *ye*, we believe that the only syntactic and semantic interpretation of this form is as the object of the transitive verb *lock*. The context is:

Gather ye together my little flocke,
 My little flock, that was to me so lief:
 Let me, ah lette me in your folds ye lock,
 Ere the breme Winter breede you greater grieffe.
 Winter is come, that blowes the balefull breath,
 And after Winter commeth timely death. (December 145-150)

As can be checked in Annex II, the other 22 occurrences of the form *ye* function as the subject of several syntactic structures, mainly indicative and imperative sentences.

Finally, it is important to note that going through computer files has a clear advantage: to enable us to spot transcription mistakes. This is what happens with concordance number 4 in Table 3:

hem emong, All for thy casten too much of worlds care (September 113-114)

The form *thy* raises problems as far as its syntactic analysis is concerned, since a noun is expected to head an NP construction containing a genitive word. However, *casten* is a third person plural present indicative verb form of *cast*. *Thy* does not seem to be the appropriate subject form of the verb. It was thanks to the computer implementation that it was possible to locate a transcription mistake in the computerized text: *thy* is a misprint for *they*. This particular problem of misprints and alterations is apparently seldom taken into account by scholars doing research by means of computer quantitative analysis. The correct concordance should then read as follows:

hem emong, All for *they* casten too much of worlds care (September 113-114)

So far we have focussed our analysis on the nominative and accusative forms of the second person pronouns in *The Shepherds Calender*. In order to address a pragmatic study of the differences in use of the second person pronouns in the sixteenth century, and thus try to draw some conclusions concerning the reasons for the change, a thorough analysis of the genitive pronouns *thy/your* is needed. We have searched for the anaphoric referents of such pronouns within a general sociological approach centered on politeness formulæ. The complete analyses of these forms, together with those of the forms *ye* and *you*, are shown in Annex II: the speaker is written before the arrow; the addressee appears after the arrow. Table 4 and Table 5 contain the different speaker-addressee relationships attested with the forms *thy* and *your*, together with the number of times each relationship occurs in the text.

TABLE 4

thy

3	(XX) -> the president of noblesse and of cheualree		
1	Colin -> Pan	4	Colin -> barrein ground
2	Colin -> feeble flocke	4	Colin -> Hobbinol
13	Cuddie -> Thenot	4	Thenot -> Cuddie
1	Thenot -> my soueraigne, Lord of creatures all		
3	Willye -> Thomalin	1	Thomalin -> Willye
5	Thenot -> Hobbinol	2	Thenot -> Cynthia
3	Palinode -> Piers	10	Piers -> Kidde
8	Hobbinol -> Colin	1	Colin -> Menalcas
2	Morrell -> Thomalin	1	Morrell -> shepheardes
1	Thomalin -> sheepe		
5	Willye -> Perigot	2	Willye -> Bellibone
1	Cuddie -> Fayth of my soule		
1	Perigot -> Colin		
4	Hobbinol -> Diggon	4	Diggon -> Hobbinol
5	Piers -> Cuddie	2	Cuddie -> Piers
7	Thenot -> Colin	2	Colin -> Thenot
1	Piers -> pierlesse Poesye		
2	Colin -> Lobbin	1	Colin -> my Muse
1	Thenot -> francke shepheard		
1	Piers -> (impersonal reference)		
1	Cuddie -> (impersonal reference)		
2	(narrator) -> Pan		
2	(narrator) -> Colin		
1	(narrator) -> (reader)		
5	[gloss]		
1	[misprint]		
		Total:	120

TABLE 5

your	
12	E.K. -> Maister Haruey
1	Colin -> Gods of Love
4	Colin -> naked trees
4	Thenot -> heardgroomes
3	Thenot -> my liege Lord, the God of my life
2	Thenot -> my soueraigne, Lord of creatures all
2	Hobbinol -> daynte Nymphs
1	Hobbinol -> Elisa
3	Hobbinol -> ye shepheards daughters
1	Hobbinol -> ye daintie Damsells
4	Piers -> Kidd (=good young maister)
1	Collin -> ye gentle shepheards
1	Collin -> shepheards
1	Colin -> ye shepheards daughters
1	Colin -> ye shepheards boyes
1	Hobbinol -> Colin
1	Cuddie -> Willy & Perigot
2	Cuddie -> birds
1	Cuddie -> shepherds
1	Cuddie -> Nightingale
1	Collin -> my little flock
2	[gloss]
Total: 50	

In view of these pragmatic data, one should emphasize a striking fact: some characters apparently employ at random *thy* and *your* to refer to the same addressee.¹ Thenot addresses the “Lord of creatures all” a total of 3 times in the whole text, twice using the polite form *you*, once employing *thy*. Likewise Piers uses *thy* 10 times and *your* 4 times to refer to Kid. Finally, Hobbinol basically treats Colin as of equal rank (*thy*), but there is one case in which he employs the polite mode (*your*). All these data are summarized in Table 6.

TABLE 6

	Total	<i>thy</i>	<i>your</i>
Thenot -> my soueraigne, Lord of creatures all	3	1	2
Piers -> Kidde	14	10	4
Hobbinol -> Colin	9	8	1

¹ ‘Apparently’, because there may be pragmatic (at least) reasons for some of the uses of *thy* and *your*. See C. Calvo (1992 and this volume), T. Fanego (this volume), and also S. González (forthcoming).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

It seems prudent at present to show but some provisional results. Table 7 is a more complete and improved version of Table 1. It contains quantitative data of the occurrences of the second person singular, plural and polite forms of the personal pronoun system in Spenser's *The Shepherds Calender*. However, these quantitative data, as demonstrated, have been submitted to a qualitative 'old style' analysis as we proposed in our methodological approach. We would particularly like to highlight one of the figures in the Table: out of the 50 occurrences of *your*, 23 correspond to polite, singular uses. Of these 23 cases, 12 refer to Gabriel Haruey (prefatory letter), 5 to the 'soueraigne Lord', 1 to Elisa, and 1 to Colin.

TABLE 7

T H - F O R M S			Y - F O R M S			TOTAL	TH	Y
PLURAL			POLITE				%	
NOM.	THOU	112	YE	23	1	135	82	18
ACC.	THEE	54	YOU	47	24	101	54	46
GEN.	THY	120	YOUR	50	23	170	70	30

We believe that we have demonstrated that applying a quantitative/qualitative methodology in the study of texts is needed if we want to obtain more reliable data than those used so far by many scholars that have dealt with Middle and Modern English texts. Besides, computer assistance forces us to face evidence that, by following different methodological strategies, might have escaped our notice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Antworth, E. 1992: *Conc. A Concordance Generator*, Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Barber, C. 1976: *Early Modern English*. London: Deutsch.
- Baugh, A. C. & Cable, T. 1993[1958]: *A History of the English Language*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. 1978: Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. Goody, E. N. ed. 1978: *Questions and politeness: strategies in social interaction*. Cambridge: CUP. 56-310.
- Calvo, C. 1992: Pronouns of address and social negotiation in *As You Like It*. *Language and Literature* 1: 5-27.
- Calvo, C. 1996: *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke* and the Pronouns of Address: Q1 (1603) versus Q2 (1604/5). *Sederi* 7: this volume.
- Cooper, H. 1977: *Pastoral. Medieval into Renaissance*. Ipswich: D. S. Brewer.
- Crystal, D. 1995: *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Fanego, T. 1996: English in transition 1500-1700: On Variation in Second Person Singular Pronoun Usage. *Sederi* 7: this volume.
- González, S. 1994: Problemas de traducción del *Calendario de los Pastores*. Eguíluz, F. et al. eds. 1994: *Transvases culturales: Literatura, cine, traducción*. Vitoria: UPV 199-210.
- González S. (forth.): Spenser's Dedicatory Sonnets: a Reappraisal. *Actas del V Congreso de la Sociedad Española de Estudios Renacentistas Ingleses*. León: Universidad de León.
- Görlach, M. 1991: *Introduction to Early Modern English*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Hope, J. 1994: The use of *thou* and *you* in Early Modern spoken English: evidence from depositions in the Durham ecclesiastical court records. Kastovsky, D. ed. 1994: *Studies in Early Modern English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 141-151.
- Oram, W. A., Bjorvand, E., Bond, R., Cain, Th. H., Dunlop, A. & Schell, R. 1989: *Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Osgood, C. G., Lotspeich, H. G. [assisted by D. E. Mason] 1943: *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition. Volume I: The Minor Poems*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Pyles, T. & Algeo, J. 1993[1964]: *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Robinson, P. 1994: *Collate 2*. Oxford University Computing Services, Oxford.
- Smith, J. C. & Selincourt, E. de eds. 1977[1912]: *Spenser: Poetical Works*. Oxford: OUP.
- Wales, K. 1983: 'Thou' and 'you' in Early Modern English: Brown and Gilman re-appraised. *Studia Linguistica* 37 (2): 107-125.

* * *

ANNEX I: A LIST OF FORMS AND THEIR CONTEXT (SAMPLES)¹*THOU*

1.	aske thy name, Say	thou wert base begot with blame: For
2.	blame: For thy thereof	thou takest shame. And when thou art
3.	shame. And when	thou art past ieopardie, Come tell
	ETC.	
112.	as spring doth ryse.	Thou kenst not Percie howe the ryme

THEE

1.	if that Enuie barke at	thee, As sure it will, for succoure
2.	wing, And asked, who	thee forth did bring, A shepheards
3.	swaine saye did	thee sing, All as his straying flocke
	ETC.	
54.	watch and ward: I	thee beseche (so be thou deigne to

THY

1.	Goe little booke:	thy self present, As child whose
2.	But if that any aske	thy name, Say thou wert base begot
3.	begot with blame: For	thy thereof thou takest shame. And
	ETC.	
120.	of some iouisauce?	Thy Muse to long slombreth in

YE

1.	yeare. But eft, when	ye count you freed from feare, Comes
2.	Violet. Tell me, haue	ye seene her angelick face, Like
3.	royall aray: And now	ye daintie Damsells may depart
	ETC.	
23.	oftentimes resound:	Ye carelesse byrds are priuie to my

YOU

1.	flew Theocritus, as	you may perceiue he was all ready
2.	or profitable, be	you iudge, mine own good Maister
3.	Whose cause I pray	you Sir, yf Enuie shall stur vp any
	ETC.	
47.	bewray least part)	You heare all night, when nature

YOUR

1.	both in respect of	your worthinesse generally, and
2.	defend with	your mighty Rhetorick and other your
3.	Rhetorick and other	your rare gifts of learning, as you
	ETC.	
50.	English poemes of	yours, which lye hid, and bring them

ANNEX II: CASE ANALYSIS

*THOU**A. Subject: Indicative*

1.	aske thy name, Say	thou wert base begot with blame: For
2.	blame: For thy thereof	thou takest shame. And when thou art
3.	shame. And when	thou art past ieopardie, Come tell
	ETC.	
112.	as spring doth ryse.	Thou kenst not Percie howe the ryme
	TOTAL: 59 cases	

B. Subject: Indicative: SVI

14.	downe, So semest	thou like good fryday to frowne. But
23.	Willye. How kenst	thou, that he is awoke? Or hast thy
26.	so sweete? Or art	thou of thy loued lasse forlorne? Or

¹ The full range of data is excessively long to be reproduced in full here, hence that a sampling of each list is offered. Actually, there are 286 TH- forms and 120 Y- forms, totalling 406 2nd person pronominal forms.

ETC.	
99. wound? Why dyest TOTAL: 12 cases	thou stil, and yet aliue art founde
<i>C. Subject: Indicative: Apposition</i>	
10. most I would: And	thou vn lucky Muse, that wontst to
19. there (quoth he)	thou brutish blocke? Nor for fruit
101. thy selfe didst proue.	Thou barrein ground, whome winters
102. the ysicles depend.	Thou feeble flocke, whose fleece is
110. wont to make a part: TOTAL: 5 cases	Thou pleasaunt spring hast luld me
<i>D. Subject: Indicative: Apposition: SVI</i>	
12. Lewdly complainest TOTAL: 1 case	thou laesie ladde, Of Winters wracke
<i>E. Subject: Subjunctive</i>	
8. pype, albee rude Pan	thou please, Yet for thou pleasest not
11. yet canst not, when	thou should; Both pype and Muse
13. No marueile Thenot, if ETC.	thou can beare Cherefully the
97. I thee beseche (so be TOTAL: 16 cases)	thou deigne to heare, Rude ditties
<i>F. Subject: Subjunctive: Apposition</i>	
57. Herdgrome, I feare me, TOTAL: 1 case	thou haue a squint eye: Agreede
<i>G. Subject: Indicative/Subjunctive</i>	
15. my budding braunch	thou wouldest cropp: But were thy
48. vpon a hyll, (as now	thou wouldest me: But I am taught by
59. Fayth of my soule,	thou shalt ycrowned be In Colins
88. gyfts for guerdon	thou shalt gayne, Then Kidde or
104. thy lasses gloue. TOTAL: 5 cases	Thou wouldest thou pype of Phyllis
<i>H. Subject: Indicative/Subjunctive: SVI</i>	
16. encline. Tho wouldest	thou learne to carroll of Loue, And
17. gloue. Thou wouldest	thou pype of Phyllis prayse: But
92. of myrth now shalt TOTAL: 3 cases	thou haue no more. For dead shee is
<i>I. Subject: Indicative/Subjunctive: Apposition</i>	
40. so deadly spight. And TOTAL: 1 case	thou Menalcas, that by trecheree
<i>J. Subject: Small-clause analysis</i>	
7. Thou weake, I wanne:	thou leane, I quite forlorne: With
103. ouercome with care. TOTAL: 2 casew	Thou weake, I wanne: thou leane, I
<i>K. Vocative: Apposition</i>	
89. Then vp I say,	thou iolly shepeheard swayne, Let
91. Vp then Melpomene	thou mournefulst Muse of nyne, Such
93. O carefull verse. O	thou greate shepheard Lobbin, how
95. O soueraigne Pan	thou God of shepheards all, Which of
106. Lord of creatures all, TOTAL: 5 cases	Thou placer of plants both humble
<i>L. Vocative: Imperative: Apposition</i>	
4. dittie. And Pan	thou shepheards God, that once didst
41. Morrell. What ho, TOTAL: 1 case	thou iollye shepheards swayne, come

THEE

A. Object

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | if that Entuie barke at
wing, And asked, who | thee, As sure it will, for succoure
thee forth did bring, A shepheards |
| 3. | swaine saye did
ETC. | thee sing, All as his straying flocke |
| 54. | watch and ward: I
TOTAL: 43 cases | thee beseche (so be thou deigne to |

B. Object: Apposition

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 12. | Cvddie. Now I pray | thee shepherd, tel it not forth: Here |
| 15. | so trimly dight, I pray | thee Hobbinoll, recorde some one: The |
| 18. | did creepe) God blesse | thee poore Orphane, as he mought me |
| 33. | Hobbinoll. Fye on | thee Diggon, and all thy foule leasing |
| 52. | in heauens hight. I see
TOTAL: 5 casew | thee blessed soule, I see, Walke in |

C. "Methinks" constructions

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------------------------------------|
| 13. | tale I tasted. Hye | thee home shepherd, the day is nigh |
| 23. | ouerture. But if | thee lust, to holden chat with seely |
| 27. | Willy: then sitte | thee downe swayne: Sike a song |
| 41. | wars, of giusts, Turne | thee to those, that weld the awful |
| 42. | fayre Elisa rest, Or if | thee please in bigger notes to sing |
| 46. | aye remaine, Whether
TOTAL: 6 cases | thee list thy loued lasse aduance, Or |

THY

- | | | |
|------|--|--|
| 1. | Goe little booke:
<i>XX --> the president of noblesse and of cheualree (p. 416, Epistle)</i> | thy self present, As child whose |
| 2. | But if that any aske
<i>XX --> the president of noblesse and of cheualree (p. 416, Epistle)</i> | thy name, Say thou wert base begot |
| 3. | begot with blame: For
<i>XX --> the president of noblesse and of cheualree (p. 416, Epistle)</i>
ETC. | thy thereof thou takest shame. And |
| 76. | hem emong, All for
<i>MISPRINT --> All for they casten... (p. 453, September 114)</i>
ETC. | thy casten too much of worlds care |
| 83. | with pleasaunce of
<i>Piers --> IMPERSONAL REFERENCE (p. 457, October 23)</i> | thy vaine, Whereto thou list their |
| 84. | as thou gynst to sette
<i>Piers --> Cuddie (p. 457, October 25)</i> | thy notes in frame, O how the rurall |
| 85. | him ere the more for
<i>Cuddie --> IMPERSONAL REFERENCE (p. 457, October 33)</i>
ETC. | thy? Or feedes him once the fuller by |
| 104. | pleasaunce mought
<i>[NARRATOR] --> Pan (p. 464, December 16)</i> | thy fancie feede) Hearken awhile |
| 105. | Hearken awhile from
<i>[NARRATOR] --> Pan (p. 464, December 17)</i> | thy greene cabinet, The rurall song of |
| 106. | kydst not ene to cure
<i>[NARRATOR] --> Colin (p. 465, December 93)</i> | thy sore hart roote, Whose ranckling |
| 107. | thou stil, and yet hast
<i>[NARRATOR] --> Colin (p. 465, December 95)</i> | thy deathes wound? Why dyest thou |
| 108. | Dare not to match
<i>[NARRATOR] --> Reader? (p. 467, December Gloss)</i> | thy pype with Tityrus hys styl, Nor |
| 109. | and after hasted
<i>Colin --> barrein ground (p. 421, January 22)</i> | Thy sommer prowde with |
| 120. | of some iouisaunce?
<i>Thenot --> Colin (p. 460, November 3)</i>
TOTAL: 120 cases | Thy Muse to long slombreth in |

YE

A. Subject: Indicative

- | | | |
|----|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. | yeare. But eft, when | ye count you freed from feare, Comes |
| 5. | Cuddie. Gynne, when | ye lyst, ye iolly shepheards twayne |
| 7. | pypes as ruthful, as | ye may. Ye wastefull woodes beare |
| 9. | my nightly cryes: : | ye heare apart, Let breake your |

B. Subject: Indicative: SVI

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 2. | Violet. Tell me, haue | ye seene her angelick face, Like |
|----|-----------------------|----------------------------------|

C. Subject: Indicative: Apposition

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. | royall aray: And now | ye daintie Damsells may depart |
| 22. | as ruthful, as ye may. | Ye wastefull woodes beare witnessse |
| 23. | oftentimes resound: | Ye carelesse byrds are priuie to my |

D. Subject: Imperative: SVI

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| 10. | downes abyde, Waile | ye this wofull waste of natures |
|-----|---------------------|---------------------------------|

E. Object

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 15. | lette me in your folds | ye lock, Ere the breme Winter breede |
|-----|------------------------|--------------------------------------|

F. Vocative: Apposition

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| 16. | loued sheepe, Adieu | ye Woodes that oft my witnessse |
|-----|---------------------|---------------------------------|

G. Vocative: Imperative: Apposition

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 4. | to goe: Then ryse | ye blessed flocks, and home apace |
| 6. | Gynne, when ye lyst, | ye iolly shepheards twayne: Sike a |
| 8. | woe: Helpe me, | ye banefull byrds, whose shrieking |
| 11. | dust ygoe. Sing now | ye shepheards daughters, sing no moe |
| 12. | herse, Make hast | ye shepheards, thether to reuert, O |
| 13. | ouercast. Now leaue | ye shepheards boyes your merry glee |
| 14. | does hast. Gather | ye together my little flocke, My |
| 17. | shepe there fedde. | Ye Gods of loue, that pitie louers |
| 18. | vnto the Waters fall. | Ye daynty Nymphs, that in this |
| 19. | bene principall. | Ye shepheards daughters, that dwell |
| 21. | not, as I wish I were, | Ye gentle shepheards, which your |

H. Gloss

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|--|
| 20. | of a Queenes roialty. | Ye daintie) is, as it were an Exordium |
|-----|-----------------------|--|

Referents

- | | | |
|-----|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1. | yeare. But eft, when
<i>Thenot -> heardgroomes (p. 424, February 42)</i> | ye count you freed from feare, Comes |
| 2. | Violet. Tell me, haue
<i>Hobbinol -> daynty Nymphs (p. 432, April 64)</i> | ye seene her angelick face, Like |
| 3. | royall aray: And now
<i>Hobbinol -> daintie Damsells (p. 433, April 147)</i> | ye daintie Damsells may depart |
| 4. | to goe: Then ryse
<i>Hobbinol -> blessed flocks (p. 442, June 118)</i> | ye blessed flocks, and home apace |
| 5. | Cuddie. Gynne, when
<i>Cuddie -> ye iolly shepheards twayne (p. 449, August 51)</i> | ye lyst, ye iolly shepheards twayne |
| 6. | Gynne, when ye lyst,
<i>Cuddie -> ye iolly shepheards twayne (p. 449, August 51)</i> | ye iolly shepheards twayne: Sike a |
| 7. | pypes as ruthful, as
<i>Cuddie -> Willy, Perigot (p. 450, August 150)</i> | ye may. Ye wastefull woodes beare |
| 8. | woe: Helpe me,
<i>Cuddie -> banefull byrds (p. 450, August 173)</i> | ye banefull byrds, whose shrieking |
| 9. | my nightly cryes: :
<i>Cuddie -> Nightingale (p. 450, August 188)</i> | ye heare apart, Let breake your |
| 10. | downes abyde, Waile
<i>Colin -> Shepheards (p. 461, November 64)</i> | ye this wofull waste of natures |
| 11. | dust ygoe. Sing now
<i>Colin -> shepheards daughters (p. 461, November 77)</i> | ye shepheards daughters, sing no moe |
| 12. | herse, Make hast
<i>Colin -> shepheards (p. 462, November 191)</i> | ye shepheards, thether to reuert, O |

13. ouercast. Now leaue ye shepheards boyes your merry glee
Colin -> shepheards boyes (p. 466, December 139)
14. does hast. Gather ye together my little flocke, My
Colin -> my little flocke (p. 466, December 145)
15. lette me in your folds ye lock, Ere the breme Winter breede
Colin -> my little flocke (p. 466, December 147)
16. loued sheepe, Adieu ye Woodes that oft my wisse
Colin -> Woodes (p. 466, December 154)
17. shepe there fedde. Ye Gods of loue, that pitie louers
Colin -> Gods of loue (p. 421, January 13)
18. vnto the Waters fall. Ye daynty Nymphs, that in this
Hobbinol -> daynty Nymphs (p. 432, April 38)
19. bene principall. Ye shepheards daughters, that dwell
Hobbinol -> shepheards daughters (p. 433, April 129)
20. of a Queenes roialty. Ye daintie is, as it were an Exordium
[Gloss]
21. not, as I wish I were, Ye gentle shepheards, which your
Colin -> gentle shepheards (p. 442, June 106)
22. as ruthful, as ye may. Ye wastefull woodes beare wisse
Cuddie -> wastefull woodes (p. 450, August 151)
23. oftentimes resound: Ye carelesse byrds are priuie to my
Cuddie -> carelesse byrds (p. 450, August 153)

YOU

A. Subject

1. flew Theocritus, as you may perceiue he was all ready
 4. gifts of learning, as you can, and shield with your good
 5. with your good wil, as you ought, against the malice and
 ETC.
 47. bewray least part) You heare all night, when nature
 TOTAL: 23 casew

B. Subject: Apposition

15. So loytring liue you little heardgroomes, Keeping

C. Subject: Imperative: SVI

2. or profitable, be you iudge, mine own good Maister

D. Subject: Small-clause analysis

14. With mourning pyne I, you with pyning mourne. A thousand

E. Object

6. the Author vnto you, as vnto his most special good
 7. and my selfe vnto you both, as one making singuler
 8. so choise frends, I bid you both most hartely farwel, and
 ETC.
 42. breme Winter breede you greater grieffe. Winter is come
 TOTAL: 16 cases

F. Object: Apposition

3. Whose cause I pray you Sir, yf Enuie shall stur vp any

G. Vocative: Apposition

24. on the greene, hye you there apace: Let none come there
 43. yt is already done. You naked trees, whose shady leaues

H. Vocative: Imperative: Apposition

21. my request: And eke you Virgins, that on Parnasse dwell

???

19. Submitting me to you good sufferance, And praying to

Referents

1. flew Theocritus, as
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle) you may perceiue he was all ready
2. or profitable, be
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle) you iudge, mine own good Maister
3. Whose cause I pray
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle) you Sir, yf Enuie shall stur vp any
4. gifts of learning, as
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle) you can, and shield with your good
5. with your good wil, as
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle) you ought, against the malice and
6. the Author vnto
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle) you, as vnto his most special good
7. and my selfe vnto
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle) you both, as one making singuler
8. so choise frends, I bid
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle) you both most hartely farwel, and
9. farwel, and commit
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle) you and your most commendable
10. the garlond, which to
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 419, Epistle) you alone is dewe, you will be
11. to you alone is dewe,
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 419, Epistle) you will be perswaded to pluck out of
12. light. Truste me
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 419, Epistle) you doe both them great wroong, in
13. from aboue, where
Colin -> Gods of loue (p. 421, January 15) you in ioyes remaine, And bowe your
14. With mourning pyne I,
Colin -> feeble flocke (p. 422, January 48) you with pyning mourne. A thousand
15. So loytring liue
Thenot -> litle heardgroomes (p. 424, February 35) you little heardgroomes, Keeping
16. eft, when ye count
Thenot -> litle heardgroomes (p. 424, February 42) you freed from feare, Comes the
17. annoied. Then paye
Thenot -> litle heardgroomes (p. 424, February 49) you the price of your surquedrie
18. of my life, Pleaseth
Thenot -> my liege Lord (p. 425, February 151) you ponder your Suppliants plaint
19. Submitting me to
Thenot -> my soueraigne (p. 425, February 187) you good sufferance, And praying to
20. is he for a Ladde,
Thenot -> Hobbinol (p. 431, April 17) you so lament? Ys loue such pinching
21. my request: And eke
Hobbinol -> Virgins (p. 432, April 41) you Virgins, that on Parnasse dwell
22. her princely grace can
Hobbinol -> daynty Nymphs (p. 432, April 67) you well compare? The Redde rose
23. Maiestie, Where haue
Hobbinol -> daynty Nymphs (p. 432, April 72) you seene the like, but there? I sawe
24. on the greene, hye
Hobbinol -> shepheards daughters (p. 433, April 128) you there apace: Let none come there
25. her grace. And when
Hobbinol -> shepheards daughters (p. 433, April 131) you come, whereas shee is in place
26. rudenesse doe not
Hobbinol -> shepheards daughters (p. 433, April 132) you disgrace: Binde your fillets faste
27. Let dame Eliza thanke
Hobbinol -> daintie Damsells (p. 433, April 150) you for her song. And if you come
28. for her song. And if
Hobbinol -> Eliza (p. 433, April 151) you come hether, When Damsines I
29. I will part them all
Hobbinol -> Eliza (p. 433, April 153) you among. Thenot. And was thilk
30. I am very sybbe to
Piers -> Kidd (p. 438, May 269) you: So be your goodlihead doe not
31. and fauour then I
Piers -> Kidd (p. 438, May 269) you pray, With your ayd to forstall
32. stealing steppes doe
Hobbinol -> blessed flocks (p. 442, June 119) you forsloe, And wett your tender

33. Lambes, that by you trace. Colins Embleme. Gia
Hobbinol -> blessed flocks (p. 442, June 120)
34. my thought: Wil. so you may buye gold to deare. Per. But
Willye -> Perigot (p. 449, August 108)
35. be the priefe. Per. And you, that sawe it, simple shepe, Wil
Perigot -> simple shepe (p. 450, August 117)
36. Colin made, ylke can I you rehearse. Perigot. Now say it
Cuddie -> shepheards (p. 450, August 142)
37. bred her woe: And you that feele now owe, : : when as
Cuddie -> Nightingale (p. 450, August 187)
38. pypes shepheards, til you be at home: The night nigheth
Cuddie -> shepheards (p. 451, August 194)
39. shepheards swayne you cannot wel ken, But it be by his
Diggon -> IMPERSONAL REFERENCE (p. 453, September 42)
40. For such encheason, If you goe nye, Fewe chymneis reeking
Diggon -> IMPERSONAL REFERENCE (p. 453, September 116)
41. chymneis reeking you shall espye: The fatte Oxe, that
Diggon -> IMPERSONAL REFERENCE (p. 453, September 117)
42. brene Winter breede you greater grieffe. Winter is come
Colin -> my little flocke (p. 466, December 148)
43. yt is already donne. You naked trees, whose shady leaues
Colin -> naked trees (p. 422, January 31)
44. sunne laugheth once, You deemen, the Spring is come
Thenot -> heardgroomes (p. 424, February 38)
45. made of greene corne, You thincken to be Lords of the yeare
Thenot -> heardgroomes (p. 424, February 41)
46. suggestion. Embleme You remember, that in the fyrst
 [Gloss]
47. bewray least part You heare all night, when nature
Cuddie -> banefull byrds (p. 450, August 177)

YOUR

1. both in respect of your worthinesse generally, and
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle)
2. defend with your mighty Rhetorick and other your
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle)
3. Rhetorick and other your rare gifts of learning, as you
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle)
4. can, and shield with your good wil, as you ought, against
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle)
5. and commit you and your most commendable studies to
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle)
6. that vpon sight of your speciall frends and fellow Poets
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle)
7. sonne, and also your selfe, in smothering your
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle)
8. selfe, in smothering your deserued prayses, and all men
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle)
9. might conceiue of your gallant English verses, as they
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle)
10. haue already doen of your Latine Poemes, which in my
E.K. -> Maister Haruey (p. 418, Epistle)
11. remaine, And bowe your eares vnto my dolefull dittie
Colin -> Gods of Love (p. 421, January 16)
12. ... ossomes, wherewith your buds did flowre: I see your
Colin -> naked trees (p. 422, January 34)
13. buds did flowre: I see your teares, that from your boughes
Colin -> naked trees (p. 422, January 35)
14. your teares, that from your boughes doe raine, Whose drops
Colin -> naked trees (p. 422, January 35)
15. teares descend, As on your boughes the ysicles depend
Colin -> naked trees (p. 422, January 42)
16. ... ardgroomes, Keeping your beastes in the budded broomes

- Thenot* -> *heardgroomes* (p. 424, February 36)
 17. the harte. Then is your carelesse corage accoied, Your
Thenot -> *heardgroomes* (p. 424, February 47)
 18. paye you the price of your surquedrie, With weeping, and
Thenot -> *heardgroomes* (p. 424), February 49
 19. Pleaseth you ponder your Suppliants plaint, Caused of
Thenot -> *my liege Lord, the God of my life* (p. 425, February 151)
 20. constraint, Which I your poore Vassall dayly endure: And
Thenot -> *my liege Lord, the God of my life* (p. 425, February 153)
 21. dayly endure: And but your godnes the same recure, Am like
Thenot -> *my liege Lord, the God of my life* (p. 425, February 154)
 22. That bene the honor of your Coronall. And oft he lets his
Thenot -> *my soueraigne, Lord of creatures all* (p. 425, February 178)
 23. such outrage, Crauing your goodlihead to aswage The
Thenot -> *my soueraigne, Lord of creatures all* (p. 425, February 184)
 24. Brooke doe bathe your brest, Forsake your watry
Hobbinol -> *daynte Nymphs* (p. 432, April 39)
 25. your brest, Forsake your watry bowres, and hether looke
Hobbinol -> *daynte Nymphs* (p. 432, April 40)
 26. Of fayre Elisa be your siluer song, that blessed wight
Hobbinol -> *Elisa* (p. 432, April 48)
 27. is in place, See, that your rudenesse doe not you disgrace
Hobbinol -> *ye shepheards daughters* (p. 433, April 132)
 28. you disgrace: Binde your fillets faste, And gird in your
Hobbinol -> *ye shepheards daughters* (p. 433, April 133)
 29. faste, And gird in your waste, For more finesse, with a
Hobbinol -> *ye shepheards daughters* (p. 433, April 134)
 30. feare, I haue troubled your troupes to longe: Let dame Eliza
Hobbinol -> *ye daintie Damsells* (p. 433, April 149)
 31. studies. Binde your) Spoken rudely, and according to
 [Gloss]
 32. I espye, And keepe your corpse from the carefull
Piers -> *good young maister (=Kidd)* (p. 438, May 257)
 33. But I be relieued by your beastlyhead. I am a poore
Piers -> *Kidd* (p. 438, May 265)
 34. sybbe to you: So be your goodlihead doe not disdayne The
Piers -> *Kidd* (p. 438, May 270)
 35. then I you pray, With your ayd to forstall my neere decay
Piers -> *Kidd* (p. 438, May 273)
 36. shepheards, which your flocks do feede, Whether on
Collin -> *ye gentle shepheards* (p. 442, June 106)
 37. you forsloe, And wett your tender Lambes, that by you
Hobbinol -> *Collin* (p. 442, June 120)
 38. heauy laye, And tune your pypes as ruthful, as ye may. Ye
Cuddie -> *Willy, Perigot* (p. 450, August 150)
 39. to my cryes, Which in your songs were wont to make a part
Cuddie -> *birds* (p. 450, August 154)
 40. Increase, so let your yrksome yells augment. Thus all
Cuddie -> *birds* (p. 450, August 178)
 41. apart, Let breake your sounder sleepe: : and pitie
Cuddie -> *Nightingale* (p. 450, August 189)
 42. Shepheards, that by your flocks on Kentish downes abyde
Colin -> *shepheards* (p. 461, November 63)
 43. into weeping turne your wanton layes, O heauiie herse
Colin -> *ye shepheards daughters* (p. 461, November 79)
 44. ye shepheards boyes your merry glee, My Muse is hoarse
Colin -> *ye shepheards boyes* (p. 466, December 139)
 45. Let me, ah lette me in your folds ye lock, Ere the breme
Colin -> *my little flock* (p. 466, December 147)
 46. of the greatest. Your owne assuredly to be
E.K. -> *Maister Haruey* (p. 418, Epistle)
 47. corage accoied, Your carefull heards with cold bene
Thenot -> *heardgroomes* (p. 424, February 48)
 48. Ladies of learning. Your siluer song) seemeth to imitate

[Gloss]

49. should it not yshend
Cuddie -> *shepherds* (p. 450, August 140)

50. English poemes of
E.K. -> *Maister Haruey* (p. 419, Epistle)

Your roundels fresh, to heare a

yours, which lye hid, and bring them

* * *

Continental English Books and the Standardization of the English Language in the Early Sixteenth Century: 1525-1540

José S. Gómez Soliño

UNIVERSIDAD DE LA LAGUNA

In the long process of normalization undergone by the English language in the early modern period the printing press is generally considered to have been a highly influential contributing factor. Most of the early presses were set up in Westminster-London and they printed mainly books in the vernacular at comparatively affordable prices. By so doing, they added to the recognition and diffusion of the incipient national standard based on the mixed language of the capital. Albert Baugh and Thomas Cable summarize the linguistic impact of the printing press in the following terms “A powerful force thus existed for promoting a standard, uniform language, and the means were now available for spreading that language throughout the territory in which it was understood.” (1978: 200)

The early printers, however, were not linguistic reformers and the study of the texts they produced shows them on the whole not to be above their most enlightened contemporaries as far as variation in language is concerned (Scragg 1974, Gómez Soliño 1984, 1985, 1986). Early Modern Standard English was far from being a uniform variety and, though to a lesser degree than manuscripts, the printed books of that period are not exempt from variant spellings, often phonologically motivated and thus ultimately dialectal in origin (Wylde 1920, Dobson 1955).

Another contributing factor to linguistic normalization, though one less commented upon by the authors of standard textbooks, was the Protestant Reformation. One of the points in the reformers' agenda was the biblical and liturgical use of the vernacular. The eventual implementation of that program represented again a significant step in the recognition and diffusion of the London-based standard language. The initial phases of the English Reformation were in addition marked by intense polemical and theological debate, which resulted in an outpouring of books and pamphlets eagerly read and contested by the parties concerned (Elton 1977).

In the beginning, however, the advocates of reform were forced to conduct their publishing activities in exile. Thus, the father of the English Reformation, William Tyndale, thought it safer and more convenient to leave England in order to carry out his biblical translations and write his books in defense of Protestantism. He was not the only early reformer to make his way to the Continent. Other leaders of the first generation of English protestants, such as George Joye, William Roye, Robert Barnes, Jerome Barlow, John Frith, and Miles Coverdale, also took advantage of the comparatively milder conditions and better publishing opportunities prevailing in some parts of Germany and the Low Countries. The writings of these and other English protestant exiles have been studied by Anthea Hume (1961a), who has also published (1961b) an annotated bibliography of the English protestant books printed on the Continent from 1525 to 1535.

Anthea Hume's research, however, wasn't primarily concerned with the linguistic make up of the texts in question, although an analysis of their language would certainly throw light on the role and contributions of the different people who had a hand in the production of those books. It is the purpose of this paper, therefore, to offer a first approximation to the language of the early English

protestant books printed abroad and here we will mainly concentrate our attention on their position in relation to the process of linguistic standardization as reflected by contemporary insular chancery documents and printed texts.

As an illustrative case we can mention to begin with a small octavo volume of the New Testament in English printed in 1535, a copy of which can be consulted at Cambridge University Library.¹ The place and printer of this book are unknown. Some information is however given by its second title, which reads: “The newe Testament dylygently corrected and compared with the Greke by Willyam Tindale and fynessed in the yere of oure Lorde God A. M. D. and. xxxv.” The wording of this title repeats almost exactly that of a slightly earlier edition of Tyndale’s revised version of the New Testament printed at Antwerp in November 1534 by Martin Keyser, alias “Martin Emperowr”. From a linguistic point of view the 1535 anonymous reprint is interesting because of its peculiar orthography, specially the frequent use of digraphs involving the use of the letter *e* after (or before) another vowel. Francis Fry (1878: 63-65; cf. also Table 1 below) published a representative list of the most peculiar variants together with the corresponding forms used in the earlier edition dated in November 1534. Fry points out that “some words, *Faether* and *Moether*, for example, are almost always so spelled; (...) some words will be found peculiarly spelled but once or twice; and (...) the frequency of the use of the words as given in the List will be found to vary greatly between these extremes” (65).

How should we then interpret those unusual spellings? In the nineteenth century some people (Roach 1881) advanced the view that the peculiar orthography shown by the Cambridge 1535 copy of Tyndale’s revised edition of the New Testament reflected provincial spellings typical of the South West. Tyndale would thus be fulfilling the promise made in his early days at Little Sodbury that, if God spared his life, he would cause ploughboys to know more of the Scripture than some learned men (Foxe 1563: cf. Daniel 1994: 79). Had Tyndale put out an edition in his local dialect “in earnest pity for the ploughboy and husbandmen of Gloucestershire?” (Anderson, as quoted by Fry 65).

When this hypothesis was put forward little was known about the Gloucestershire dialect in the late and early postmedieval periods. No evidence could be produced to show that those spellings were provincialisms. None of the 19th century scholars involved in the study of Tyndale’s biography and works were aware that “*oe* (= open/close o) is a Worcestershire and Gloucestershire spelling of great frequency in Middle English, and that *ae* (as in a word like *made*) is found, though more rarely, in Worcestershire and Herefordshire; *ie* = *i* is also found in Worcestershire.” (M.L. Samuels, personal communication). So at first sight it seems that the “provincial spelling theory” cannot in principle be dismissed or disproved.

There are however several reasons why the dialectal character of those spellings should be dismissed. The first objection has to do with their varying frequency. The use of those digraphs varies from almost complete regularity (in a few cases) to almost complete exceptionality. If that orthography was adopted with a fixed design, why was it not used regularly throughout the book? (cf. Fry 1878: 65). A second argument against the provincialism of those spellings lies in the fact that they seem to obey no discernible rule. Both long and short vocalic sounds, in either stressed or unstressed² syllabic positions, are liable to be expressed by them. Those spellings are, moreover, inconsistently used, as witness variants such as *naedeth* and *neade* for NEED-, or *haeth* and *heath* for HATH.

But if the unequal distribution, unsystematic character and inconsistent use shown by those variants were not enough to render them suspect, we yet have a more decisive argument against their provincial value. *The Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English* (LALME) offers an extensive repertoire of all the variants registered in late medieval texts, so that it is possible for us

¹ Imperfect copies of this edition are also kept at the British Library and Exeter College, Oxford.

² Cf. *accompaeynye*, *captaeyne*, *certaeyne*, *counsael*, *desolaete*, *fountaeyne*, *mountaeyns*, ... etc. Some of the syllables where the redundant <e> is used can be interpreted as stressed if we assume a Frenchified pronunciation.

now to interpret those spellings in the light of the evidence uncovered by the Atlas. Table 1 below offers a list of some of the peculiar realizations found in the 1535 reprint. Those spellings can be compared with their counterparts in the earlier 1534 edition of Tyndale's translation. They can also be compared with the dialectal preferences for those variables found in the southern part of Gloucestershire, especially in the vicinity of Berkeley, where Tyndale was most probably born and where he worked for a while after his graduation from Oxford (Daniel 1994). Finally, another column gives us information about the status of those variants according to the large inventory of forms offered in the fourth volume of LALME. Table 1 shows that most of the unusual spellings examined not only do not match the forms that prevailed in southern Gloucestershire, but are also unattested anywhere in England in the 15th c.

If the provincial spelling theory can be confidently dismissed, how can we then account for that idiosyncratic orthography? For an adequate answer to this question we must turn our attention to the conditions under which the printing of the CUL misspelt copy was carried out. Tyndale's revised translation of the New Testament was printed in November 1534. In the months that followed its publication there appeared several piratical reprints which, according with the testimony of George Joye, had not been properly supervised by a native English speaker and, as a consequence, show an unusual number of mistakes and false readings. We must remember that the printing of English translations of biblical texts was then a semi-clandestine affair, that their printers often concealed their names and whereabouts, and that Tyndale himself could not leave the privileged Merchant's House at Antwerp without risking being arrested and sent to prison on a charge of heresy, something that finally happened in May 1535. In those circumstances, engaging the services of competent and trustworthy native English proof-readers wasn't always easy and would in any case increase the final price of the product.

The idiosyncratic spellings we have been discussing constitute an extreme and exceptional case. For a better picture of the linguistic practice shown by continental English books we must examine texts that were adequately proofread. This is the case of the three Tyndale texts whose linguistic behaviour is illustrated in Table 2. For comparative purposes I include a list of the forms favoured by the contemporary chancery and London-printed texts, together with an additional column showing the typical South-Gloucestershire forms.¹

Table 2 shows that Tyndale's printed works exhibit well established variants, such as *hir*, *soche*, *each*, *thorow(e)*, *awne* and *silfe/sylfe*, which are distinctly avoided by the Chancery and the contemporary London printers alike. In some variables, the texts seem to show a change in the direction of the standard form (*hit* > *it*, *eny* > *any*), but in other cases there is still a marked fluctuation (*her* / *hir*, *selfe* / *silfe*, *soche* / *suche*). In most cases the variants in Tyndale's works can be related to the linguistic realizations in Southern Gloucestershire. The only exceptions to that pattern are *awne* and *each*.

Although Tyndale was executed well before he could complete his translation of the whole Bible, the biblical books that he translated were on the whole incorporated into the full versions published after his death. This could be the reason why the early editions of the English Bible printed on the continent still retain most of the linguistic preferences shown by Tyndale's printed works. Table 3 shows the variants exhibited by three different continental editions of the English Bible. The first column to the left corresponds to the first printed edition of the Bible translated by Miles Coverdale and printed at Zurich by Christopher Froschouer in 1535. The second column offers the variants used in Thomas Matthew's translation printed at Antwerp in 1537. The next column lists the forms found in Coverdale's revision of Matthew's Bible. This is usually called the Great Bible and was printed in 1539 partly in Paris and partly in London. Finally, the righthandside column gives us the variants used in Richard Taverner's version printed by John Byddell in London also in 1539. Richard Taverner was a clerk of the Signet. For this reason, and

¹ The variants listed in Tables 2-3-4 are based on an examination of extensive samples of the titles/editions mentioned. Since this paper presents a preliminary report of research in progress, no details will here be given as to the sections examined. The author is however convinced that the selection of the samples both in terms of length and distribution warrants the representativeness of the linguistic profiles obtained.

also because his version of the Bible was printed in London, the forms used in this text exhibit the standard realizations at the time and can therefore be used to gauge the degree of linguistic standardization shown by the continental versions. As table 3 shows, the continental editions are on the whole more hesitant in their choice of variants and exhibit significant departures (*hyr, soche, eache, eny, thorow, awne*) from the standard forms.

Not all the English books printed on the Continent in the early sixteenth century were biblical texts. Some were also pieces of polemical writing and propaganda or doctrinal treatises defending protestant views. In order to illustrate the linguistic behaviour of this type of texts we must finally turn to table 4. Here we find the linguistic profile of four texts written by different authors and printed in four different workshops. Although these texts exhibit a less homogeneous practice when compared with the previous ones, we still find in most of them the same range of variants favoured by biblical translations but frowned upon by the chancery scribes and the London printers. Robert Barnes's *Supplication to Henry VIII* is of particular interest in this context since its London reprint of 1534 can be used to illustrate not only the standard forms once again, but also the linguistic nonconformism of the texts printed on the Continent. I must point out in this connection that the present-day spelling of the word EACH appears earlier in the continental books than in their contemporary London printed texts and chancery documents.

So, from the data I have marshalled so far the following conclusions can be tentatively derived:

1. In the early sixteenth century the Chancery seems to still have been a leading factor in the process of linguistic standardization, since chancery documents are on the whole more homogeneous and formally more modern than other types of text.
2. The London printed books generally agree with the Chancery texts and show on the whole a more restricted set of acceptable variants than most other types of text, handwritten or (continentally) printed.
3. The English books printed on the Continent show more internal fluctuation and/or they are linguistically more liberal in their choice of forms than London printed texts.
4. As far as the protestant literature is concerned, the linguistic make up of English biblical, doctrinal or polemical books printed on the Continent seems to have been influenced by William Tyndale's linguistic preferences.
5. And, finally, Baugh and Cable's view that the printing press was a powerful force promoting a standard uniform language must be qualified. On the whole, the continental English books we have been discussing promoted confusion rather than uniformity of spelling.

I must again stress the tentative character of these conclusions. Obviously, more research is needed before their general validity can be firmly established.

REFERENCES

- Baugh, A. C. & Th. Cable. 1978. *A History of the English Language*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Daniel, D. 1994. *William Tyndale: A Biography*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Dobson, E. 1955. Early Modern Standard English. *Transactions of the Philological Society*. 25-54.
- Elton, G. R. 1977. *Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558*. London, Edward Arnold.

- Fry, F. 1878. *A Bibliographical Description of the Editions of the New Testament, Tyndale's version, in English*. London.
- Gómez Soliño, J. S. 1984. *Variación y estandarización en el Inglés Moderno Temprano: 1470-1540*. PhD thesis, University of Oviedo.
- Gómez Soliño, J. S. 1985. William Caxton y la Estandarización de la Lengua Inglesa en el Siglo XV. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 10: 95-118.
- Gómez Soliño, J. S. 1986. La Normalización Lingüística en la Época de Enrique VIII. > Onega, S. 1986: 19-44.
- Hume, A. 1961. *A Study of the Writings of the English Protestant Exiles, 1525-35*. PhD thesis, University of London.
- Hume, A. 1973. English Protestant Books Printed Abroad, 1525-1535: An Annotated Bibliography. *The Complete Works of St. Thomas More*, vol. 8, part II. App. B: 1065-1091.
- McIntosh, A., M. L. Samuels, & M. Benskin. 1986. *A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English*. Aberdeen, Aberdeen University Press.
- Onega, S. ed. 1986. *Estudios Literarios Ingleses: Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid, Cátedra.
- Roach, T. 1881. Tyndale's New Testament and the Gloucestershire Dialect. *Gloucestershire Notes and Queries*. 402: 408-9.
- Scragg, D. G. 1974. *A History of English Spelling*. Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Wyld, H. C. 1920. *A History of Modern Colloquial English*. London, Fisher Unwin.

* * *

TABLE 1. IDIOSYNCRATIC SPELLINGS IN CONTEXT OF CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
1535 REPRINT OF TYNDALE'S REVISED TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

VARIABLE	1535	LALME vol. IV	Southern GLOUCS.	1534
2. THESE	theese	acceptable	□ es(e) / □ eos(e)	these
16. MUCH	moeche	(very rare)	muche / moche	moche
17. ARE	eare	unattested	be□ / bu□ / beo□	are
22. SHALL	shaell	unattested	schal / shal	shall
23. SHOULD	shoeld	unattested	scholde	should*
25. WOULD	woeld	unattested	wold(e)	would*
37. AGAIN	agaeyne	unattested	a≠e(n) / a≠eyn	ageyne
	theare	unattested		
51. THERE	theere	(acceptable)	□ ar(e) / □ er(e)	there
	whiare	unattested	whar(e) / wher(e)	
52. WHERE	woere	unattested	war(e)	where
54. THROUGH	thoorow	unattested	□ orou≠ / □ urgh / □ orw	thorow
	boethe	(very rare)		
85. BOTH	booth	(acceptable)	bo□ e	bothe
93. CALL	caelingē	unattested	[clepe(n)]	callynge
99. COULD	coelde	unattested	cou□ (e)	colde

101. <i>DAYES</i>	daeis	<i>unattested</i>	dawes / daies / dayes	dayes
104. <i>DOES</i>	doeth	(acceptable)	do□	doth
137. <i>GAVE</i>	gaeve	<i>unattested</i>	≠af	gave
142. <i>HAVE</i>	haeve	<i>unattested</i>	habbe / haue	have
210. <i>SAY</i>	sae	<i>unattested</i>	sygge / segge / say	say

* The predominant variants in Tyndale's printed texts are *shulde* and *wolde*.

TABLE 2. VARIANTS IN THREE OF TYNDALE'S WORKS PRINTED ON THE CONTINENT IN COMPARISON WITH THEIR STANDARD AND DIALECTAL COUNTERPARTS

VARIABLE	S-GLOUCS.	NT: 1526	OBED.: 1528	NT: 1534	CHANCERY	LONDON-PRS
5. HER	HUR(E, her(e, hir(e	HER, (hyr)	HER / HIR, hyr	HER / HIR, (hyr)	HER	HER (hyr, hir, here)
6. IT	HIT, hyt	IT / HIT (yt, itt, hitt, hyt, hytt, ytt)	IT	IT, (yt)	IT / YT	IT (yt, hit)
10. SUCH	SUCHE, soche	SUCHE, soche	SOCH	SOCHE, suche	SUCH(SUCH(E (siche, sych)
12. EACH	ECHE ENY	eche, eache ENY	— — — ANY	ECHE, eache ANY	— — — ANY (eny)	ECH(E (yche, iche) ANY, eny, (ony)
15. ANY			(anye, ani, eny)			
16. MUCH	MUCHE, MOCHE	MOCHE	MOCH	MOCHE	MOCH(E, muche	MOCH(E, (myche, miche, muche)
54. THROUGH	□OROUÁ, □urgh, □orw, □orew	THOROW(E, through, (throwe, thorewe, thoro)	THOROW(e (throw, throu)	THOROW, thorowe (through)	THROUGH, (through)	THROUGH(e, thruh(e, thorow(e, thro- rugh, (thorough, throw[e, thurgh, throwgh, troughthor- ought)
98. CHURCH	CHIRCHE, CHURCHE, CHERCHE	— — —	CHURCH (chyrch, chruch)	CHURCH (churche)	CHURCHE	CHURCH(E, chyrche, (chirche, cyrche)
202. OWN	OWNE, OWEN	AWNE, (owne)	AWNE	AWNE	OWN(E	OWN(E
213. SELF	SYLF, SILF, SELF, SULF	SILF(E, sylfe, (selfe, sylffe, silve)	SELFE (silfe)	SELFE / SILFE, SYLFE (sylffe)	SELF(E (selfe)	SELF(E

NT: 1526 = *The New Testament*, 1st ed., printed by Peter Schoeffer, Worms 1526.

OBED: 1528 = *The Obedience of a Christian Man*, printed by J. Hoochstraten, Antwerp 1528.

NT: 1534 = *The New Testament*, 2nd ed., printed by Martin de Keyser, Antwerp 1534.

TABLE 3. VARIANTS IN THREE EARLY EDITIONS OF
THE ENGLISH BIBLE PRINTED ON THE CONTINENT

VARIABLE	BIBLE: 1535 ZURICH	BIBLE: 1537 ANTWERP	BIBLE: 1539 PARIS & LONDON	BIBLE: 1539 LONDON
5. HER	HER, hir	HER / HYR	HER / HYR, hir	HER
6. IT	IT	IT	IT	IT
10. SUCH	SOCH(E) (such[e])	SOCH(E) (such[e])	SOCH(e) / SUCH	SUCHE
12. EACH	ech(e)	eche / eache	eche / each	ECH(E)
15. ANY	ENY, (any)	ENY / ANY	ENY / ANY	ANY
16. MUCH	MOCH(E)	MOCH(E)	MOCH(E)	MOCHE
54. THROUGH	THOROW(e) (through)	THOROW(e) through	THOROW(e) through	THROUGH(E)
98. CHURCH	CHURCH	church	— — —	churche
202. OWN	AWNE / OWNE	AWNE, (owne)	AWNE, (owne)	OWNE
213. SELF	SELF(E, (sylfe)	SELFE	SELFE	SELF(E)

TABLE 4. VARIANTS IN FOUR ENGLISH PROTESTANT WORKS
PRINTED ON THE CONTINENT

VARIABLE	REDE ME & BE NOT WROTH Barlowe: 1528 STRASBOURG	SUPPLICACYON FOR THE BEGGERS Fish: 1529 ANTWERP-1	A PROPER DYALOGUE Barlowe: 1530 ANTWERP-2	SUPPLICATYON TO HENRY VIII Barnes: 1531 ANTWERP-3	SUPPLICATION TO HENRY VIII Barnes: 1534 LONDON
5. HER	HER	her	her	HYR, (her, hir)	HER
6. IT	IT (itt, yt)	IT, (yt, hit)	IT, (yt)	YT, it	IT
10. SUCH	SOCHE, (suche)	SUCHE	SOCHE, (suche)	such(e)	SUCHE
12. EACH	EACHE	eche / eache	eche / each	————	————
15. ANY	ENY, (any)	ENY, ANY	ANY	ANY	ANY
16. MUCH	MOCHE	MOCHE	MOCH(E) (muche)	muche	MOCHE
54. THROUGH	THOROW(e) through (throw[e, through])	thorough	THROUGH (thorough thourough)	THOROW	THROUGH
98. CHURCH	CHURCHE	churche	CHIRCHE (chyrche, church[e])	CHURCHE	CHURCHE
202. OWN	OWNE, (own)	OWNE	OWNE, (oune)	AWNE	OWNE
213. SELF	silfe (selve, selfe)	SILF(e)	SELFE	SELF(E) (selue)	SELFE

* * *

Internal Relations in Double-headed Noun Phrases

María de la Cruz Expósito González

UNIVERSIDAD DE LA LAGUNA

One of the major problems in the analysis of the English noun phrase is related to the internal structure of its head. Among all the possible nuclear categories, nouns take a greater variety of contexts, and constitute the predominating class in the majority of them. The combination of noun+noun implies certain categorization difficulties. The relations established between the elements concerned might be of modification and/or apposition on the one hand, coordination (including for previous historical stages such as the fifteenth century studied here doublet patterns), and compounding, on the other. Those relations viewed from a historical perspective present certain categorization problems that affect the general structural conception of the noun phrase.

Therefore, the impossibility to distinguish the actual function of these units in the structure of the noun phrase is among the greater inconveniences. This is due to the fact that the pattern noun+noun might be interpreted as a double-head nuclear structure, or as a modification (pre-/post-) structure. In the fifteenth century Chancery documents analysed for this paper, nouns constitute the preferred premodifier category in the noun phrase after adjectives, as postmodifiers their value is also considerable, though not so high. However, the frequency of these structures seems to be historically determined, and a fluctuation can be appreciated between the data of the fifteenth and the sixteenth century. These divergencies can be explained both historically and stylistically.

The structure of the nominal head of a noun phrase is one of the most troublesome aspects when dealing with a syntactic-structural description of this linguistic unit, particularly in reference to historical periods such as the middle and early modern stages of the English language. The problems that might be met with are mostly related to the analysis of three main phenomena: apposition, coordination and composition. Besides, other structural components of the noun phrase such as premodifying and postmodifying elements are also involved, since their fundamental status will not be clear in many specific examples found in the corpus analysed for this paper. The latter (the modifiers) will be controversial mostly in relation to their classification and distinction as opposed to composite heads, be they compound, coordinated, juxtaposed or appositive. Furthermore, the degree of lexicalization, so difficult to discern and measure even nowadays, is part of the most helpful criteria in discerning which case we are facing, but it is also controversial in itself, even more so when we are dealing with other historical periods, as the 15th century Chancery documents used as a primary source for this paper. These texts from the first half of the century serve as the linguistic model for the study of the pre-standardised English language of the period.

Of a total number of 4397 noun heads in the corpus of Chancery documents analysed, 407 show double head structures, either due to the coordination of elements proper or by the introduction of other types of relation. Three of those combinations coordinate two nouns, one of them in the genitive, and two a noun and a deverbal nominalization in *-ing*. The other 402 cases include two or more nouns in the nuclear slot. Among them, there are some 141 cases formed by a title + noun sequence, with a relationship that, from different grammatical perspectives, has been classified as an apposition. The remnant are either coordinated properly speaking, that is, the union of two elements of the same rank, fulfilling the same function by means of a conjunction (although

there are also examples of asyndetic coordination), with a different referential value, or doublets¹, that is, coordinated elements that share partially or fully their referentiality or denotation.

The combinations of nouns are more frequent in the Chancery texts (9.25% of the total number of noun heads) than in the results offered for a century later by Raumolin-Brunberg (1991) in her analyses of the writings of Thomas More; however, the fact that Raumolin-Brunberg (1991) includes compound-nouns and all other sequences of noun + noun (with the sole exception of the sequences title + noun) in the same group should be borne in mind when considering these results.

The ultimate origin of this syntactic structure that implies the use of repetitive or synonymous words is found in the process through which the speakers of English intended to adequate their language to official and cultural levels that up to then were generally restricted to Latin or French in Late Middle English. This adequation is manifested mainly in the use of loanwords and neologisms primarily through the means of text translation. It is, primarily, a typical feature of the curial style.

Burnley (1986: 593-4) includes the use of lexical doublets and triplets among the characteristic features of the Latin and French curial style, together with “certain anaphoric cohesive devices and extensive clausal qualifiers”. This style, natural to official and administrative documents is frequently more concerned with the establishment of pragmatic factors (“mutual attitudes or relative status”) than with information content. Even though clarity was one of the features most desired for in the original curial style, in English, throughout the fourteenth century, it was abandoned in favour of syntactic elaboration.

Clause structures and clause relationships are therefore correspondingly less important in establishing the coherence of the text than is the clear specification of the meaning of groups or phrases and the relationships between them in terms of reference. Both nominal and verbal groups frequently have pairs or triplets of mutually defining near-synonyms so as to clarify their significance. In addition, in the case of referring expressions (nominal groups), such pairs, or even short lists, function to make explicit or exhaustive their range of reference (Burnley 1986: 596).

The genesis of this usage is, nevertheless, a controversial matter. Burnley (1992: 462ff) relates the existence of this type of syntactic construct to the first English glosses produced in the 13th century in the Worcester *scriptorium*. In general, translation is an activity that may have contributed to the existence and familiarity of the pattern, which is mostly used in texts intended to give an appearance of stylistic elaboration, since *elocutio* (as a component of the Latin classical rhetoric) represented the highest ideal of knowledge (Jones 1953: 6), and it motivated “an attempt to gain eloquence through the introduction of only slightly disguised classical words”. This practice reached its highest peaks in the 16th and 17th centuries, with divergent tendencies in the latter, when the term is even identified with literary value.

However, this was probably not the reason in the original Latin and French curial styles, which presented this same linguistic feature as well. Burnley (1986: 602ff) mentions examples such as: *homage et ligeaunce, ordener et charger, maux et damages, hommages, foiautez et ligeaunces, sci-evaunt et poent, Duresses et Charges, soeffre et ad suffert, bienz et bountezz, eide et remedie, trecter et counseiller, protectionem et defensionem*, etc.

In the 14th and early 15th centuries there are other factors related to the existence of this pattern (Burnley 1992: 462), on the one hand the lexical and orthographical variation of the period, together with a linguistic instability that not only ascribed different forms to the same term, but which also impregnated one single form with many different meanings. Homonymy was particularly difficult to deal with in translations, so it was only through contextuality and collocation that the specific denotations of the word in question could be decided. This is explicitly

¹ The term doublet has been frequently employed to refer to a multiplicity of phenomena whose nature might be either phonetic (phonemic, lexical or syntactical). In this paper I am dealing with the lexico-stylistic structure typical of late middle and early modern English.

stated by a lollard author in 1415 in a concordance to the late version of the Wycliffite Bible (Kuhn 1968: 272, in Burnley 1992: 463):

wordis equiuouse, □ at is, whanne oon word ha□ manye significaciouns or bitokenyngis. As, □ is word *kynde* bitokene□ *nature*, and also such a man clepen we *kynde* which is a free-hertid man & □ at gladly wole rewarde what □ at men don for hym. An instrument wherwi□ we hewen, clepen we an *axe*, & I *axe* God mercy of synnes □ at I haue don. Such wordis in □ is concordance ben maad knowen bi sum word addid to hem, wherby it may be wist whanne □ ei ben taken in oon significacioun & whanne in a-no□ ir.

According to Blake (1992: 516) the genesis of this type of structure is related to the change undergone by the English language from a synthetic to an analytic typological status and to the fact that the linguistic configuration of the early moments of the period, with the coexistence of three languages that could serve as vehicles of communication in the country, favoured the existence of a greater lexical variability:

The literary language in the Early Middle English period is characterised by showing few signs of a policy of upgrading by borrowing foreign words, by introducing new compounds, or by adapting unusual syntactic patterns. Some element of archaic vocabulary is certainly present, though it becomes less noticeable as the period progresses. Old English compounds and variation are replaced by a heavier reliance on modification and on the grouping of words into parallel units such as doublets.

The use of doublets or multiple-head structures with an identical referentiality is presented in all its stages in relation to different categorial and syntactical ranks and it affects nouns, verbs, adjectives, noun and verb phrases, etc. This pattern can be found in Chaucer's texts as a means to enrich the English text, so it is not just the need to make clear the sense of the text (as it could have been in origin) that moves the authors to use this pairs of synonyms, but it is redefined as a stylistic resource¹.

The semantic evolution of many of the terms, originally coreferential, included in this structure, would tend to be divergent in many cases, in order to set in specific and/or specialised aspects or concrete registers. In the 15th century it is difficult to decide whether the referentiality of both elements is total or partial. In many cases, even if we are not facing a complete semantic coincidence, there will probably be a contextual, referential one. In many of the examples analysed we find clear cases of pure coordination, in the sense that distinct semantic segments are designated; in others, of a smaller number, the referential identity between the words seems to be similar. Nonetheless, there are cases in which both terms are coreferential only partially; the semantic equivalence of most of these show different degrees of identification, and it is certainly difficult to decide whether and to what degree this is the case or not.

Contextuality, collocations and pragmatic values for each specific period should be taken into account when considering the degree of referential identity between words. Thus, Burnley (1984: 203ff) shows that context might be more important in providing referential identity to two different terms than the proper semantic signification of the words. This is the case of Chaucer's use of *lady* and *lemman* in the *Manciples Tale*, and the same happens with Chaucer's *Boece*, in which the terms *ferme*, *stable*, and *stedfast*, are used contextually as "substantial" synonyms (Burnley 1979: 72-3), since there was a clear semantic association among the three of them. And these associations in the minds of the speaker's are frequently the reason why some terms, which are not essentially synonymous, are included in doublet or triplet structures.

¹ This tendency will progressively disappear in time, particularly throughout the second half of the 16th and the 17th centuries, when the emphasis will be exerted upon stylistic and logical-semantic clarity: "Syntax becomes significant for the development of style in the sixteenth and seventeenth (sic) centuries, if primacy is given to grammatical features that aid the meaning. In Elizabethan English, to borrow the words of Abbot, '(a) clearness was preferred to grammatical correctness, and (b) brevity both to correctness and clearness. Hence it was common to place words in the order in which they came uppermost in the mind.' (A. C. Partridge 1969: 40)

The frequency of this construction in the Chancery documents is higher (+5%) than the one it will achieve a century later, since in the language of Thomas More doublets reach a 3% of the total number of noun heads. This is not surprising, since it is to be expected that in the 15th century and in texts that are rather formal and epistolary in nature, most of them clearly resembling the Latin and French curial style from which this pattern is a characteristic feature, doublets should be clearly connected to them. It should be borne in mind that the first half of the 15th century might not have seen yet the greatest profusion of this construction in official documents.

The examples included below, as has been mentioned before, might pose problems in relation to their classification as doublets, partial doublets or coordinations properly speaking, since it is both their collocations and their contextual, situational or pragmatic value that most clearly might allow us to envisage their similarity, and much of that has been lost throughout time. Some of them are clearly referring to two or more entities.

-27.9 to \square e saide william and Margerie -33.5 for \square e Priour and Conuent of \square e Priorie of Seint Oswoldes of Gloucestre -47.7 \square e same william: william: and Richard -57.13 \square ees oure lettres and copies closed \square erin¹ -63.12 yn suche fourme and nombre as is necessarie and vaylable for him -69.32 nouthre be land ner water -69.35 yaire vessell and marchandes -81.30 heire and Regent of \square e Rewme of ffrance -107.10 to the Lieutenant and Soudeours of the Towne of Calays

There are also noun phrases in which the information content of the coordinated elements is clearly the same. In general, they might have a different origin, they might be specific to different registers or there might be a later specialisation of meaning that separates them.

-1.6 full feith and credence -69.15 in oure good grace et beniuolence -79.6 al \square ese and faouour \square at ye may goodely -86.10 vpon his title and possession that he hath now / or elles of newe -107.6 vrgent case & necessite -32.11 our will and desire -64.14 \square aire attornes or doers yn Court spirituel or temporel -65.4 right and lawe -84.3 grocier and marchant of oure Cite of London -87.3 oure will and entente -87.8 after \square estatut & ordennances maad \square ervpon -96.5 \square e ouersighte and gouernance -105.5 any grond or land -107.7 workemen or laborenis -109.4 other charge or comaundement -113.54 with outen ony parcialtee or faouour -117.15 in his gracioux protection and keping -119.6 an hool aduis and counsail of alle \square estates of oure parlement -125.12 to \square e consolacion and comfort of oure trewe subgettes \square ere. -82.4 of certain grete wronges and griefs doon vnto hym -110.5 be \square e credible reportes and writings maad vn to vs and to our said counsail fro tyme to tyme of \square e singulier diligence & \square e fulnotable and laborious seruice \square at [...] -113.42 \square e prosperitee and welfare of oure souerain Lord and of alle \square estatys of \square is land. -118.6 auctorite and power of \square e kyng oure saide souerain lord.

In many examples, however, the identity of the referents is not complete, and there is just a partial assimilation of one of the coordinated elements in the sphere of meaning of the other, that is, their meanings would share a common space, while they would also keep another one as their own, or one of the elements would be included in the meaning of the other, being a part or subclass of it.

-14.2 in oure ambassiat and seruice -wi \square alle \square e ryghtes and appurtennances \square erof -27.7 al her goodis and catels. to vs for \square e same cause forfait and beyng in oure handes² -39.5 by lawe and conscience -44.8 no more compleinte ne poursuite maad vnto vs on \square is side \square e see -60.5 to his trewth and discrecion -63.5 son and heire to william Roos of hamelak \square at helde of vs in chief \square e day he deyed on -73.6 by lawe conscience and reson -5.7 yn greet disese and preiudice of \square e forseide

¹ This example could also be considered a partial doublet, since the *designatum* is the same for both members of the coordination, even though the reference is partially different.

² This pair of words can also be considered a doublet, since in this period the term *catel* could refer to ‘cattle’ specifically, or to ‘possessions’ in general.

Priour and Couent. -39.4 al □ e fauour and ese □ at may be don -58.7 boothe / right and equite¹ -65.6 for □ e suggestions or appechementes of him □ at calleth hym self person of wortham -67.5 by oure progenitours and predecessours -67.4 for confirmacion of alle □ e yiftes grantes / priuileges / franchises and liberteed graunted vnto oure saide hows by oure progenitours and predecessours -67.14 of □ e yifte or grant of oure progenitours and predecessours. -2.8 after □ effect and pourport of owr said grante -6.4 after yowre good auis and discrecion -26.6 for diuerses dimes and quin#imes -39.7 yn Reste and quiete -41.3 oure welbeloued seruant and squier -46.4 so hasty and Iuste Remede / restitution and reparacion vpon suche attempted doon by oure sugettes in conseruacion of oure trewes / □ at noman haue cause hereafter to compleine in suche wyse as thai doon for defaute of right doying. -57.4 □ e seurtees and prouisions ordeined afore □ is time for □ e cours of marchandise 63.3 by □ expresse and especiale avyse and consent of oure Ri#t trusty and welbeloued vncle □ e Duc of Excestre / to whome we had granted by oure lettres patentes □ e keping of [...] -71.6 □ e better to oure entencion and desir / the whiche been □ ees □ at for the seuretee and conseruacion of oure saide contree we wol and desire □ at [...] -84.8 by right and Reson -87.7 wi#oute brocage or fauour of persones -102.6 after □ e lawes and coustumes of oure Rewme of England -103.5 vnto oure yifte and disposicion at this tyme -110.5 be □ e effecte and euidence of your werkes -113.45 □ e good Reste and pees of □ is land -128.2 keper and filacer of your Recordes in thoffice of youre priue seal -130.34 □ e rumor and noyse -130.54 □ e noyse and Rumor □ at was in □ e halle

Quirk et al. (1300ss) define apposition as a specific kind of relationship that is established between noun phrases. This relationship has to take place necessarily between elements that are inserted in a specific context. Therefore, those units that are in apposition must share their referential value, they must be coreferential, and at the same time, the reference of one of the units must be inserted in the other's, this is to say, one of the referents must comprise the other. The nature of the relationship is defined by Quirk et al. as copular, and it is closely related to postmodification, specifically to non-restrictive WH postmodifiers. However, one of the fundamental restrictions is that both units must belong to the same rank.

In the same line, apposition can be either total or partial depending on whether each specific example meets all the requisites explicitly formulated as conforming this kind of relation or not (Quirk et al.: 1302):

- (i) Each of the appositives can be separately omitted without affecting the acceptability of the sentence.
- (ii) Each fulfils the same syntactic function in the resultant sentences.
- (iii) It can be assumed that there is no difference between the original sentence and either of the resultant sentences in extralinguistic reference.

Apposition, from a structural point of view, can also be classified as strict, if both units are noun phrases, that is NP + NP, or weak, when one of the members represents a different syntactic class in the same rank, for example NP + *-ing* Nom.

However, apposition is a linguistic feature whose nature is not clear at all, and it has, therefore, been considered from the perspective of many and greatly varied methodological and conceptual positions. Many authors acknowledge the close proximity between modification and

¹ As can be observed in this list of examples, the same word can be part of partial or complete doublets in combination with different elements. Thus, one term is associated with some or other words depending on which aspect of its meaning is being emphasised. In fact, 'right' and 'law' coincide totally in their meaning in the doublet *right and law*, while 'equity' is one of the most outstanding features of 'right', therefore *right and equite*.

appositive structures¹, both from a syntactic point of view and from a semantic perspective. This similarity, in many cases, has posed many problems when deciding about the position that should be assigned to any particular nominal specimen in the Chancery.

Acuña Fariña (1994: 418ss) emphasises several factors that might facilitate the conception of apposition as a type of modification. They are mostly related to the similarities that, from the point of view of their internal structure, appositive structures share with non-restrictive postmodification. Above all, they are defined in terms of the hierarchical projections that are drawn in a tree diagram, in which the projection of the non-restrictive modifier would be sister of the maximal projection that represents the first element of the apposition.

This conception of apposition as a form of modification is also supported by the configuration of the message and its content, both from the perceptual and communicative point of view, since the second element of the apposition adds new information about the first, thus “modifying” and explaining the denotation and referentiality of the first²; and this is further confirmed by the position itself adopted by both elements, since non-restrictive modifiers in general are preceded by their heads. As regards apposition, it is always the first element the one that governs the agreement with the rest of the clausal and sentence constituents, or so it seems, and not the second, so it is to be expected that the latter, more than fulfilling the same function as the first, will be inserted in the maximal level of projection of the first, and its function will be mostly that of modification.

In fact, in the process of analyses of the Chancery corpus used here, some of the problems that were met with were related to the establishment of boundaries between modification and appositive structures. The apposition and coordination of noun heads is problematic mostly in those cases in which each head does not incorporate its own phrasal structure. When a noun carries its own restrictors, it is analysed as an independent noun phrase. When they are used by themselves, they are considered to be part of a syntagmatic structure with a double head.

The sequences of elements such as title + noun are also considered as a single noun phrase with a double head, even though one of the elements, either the first or the second, does not stand by itself in a substitution or ellision test. The consideration of these constructions as appositive structures, just as apposition itself, is controversial; however, they are classified among them in this paper in order to allow the comparability with other studies of a similar configuration.

The following are examples of appositive structures extracted from the 15th century texts.

- 142.1 youre pouere seruiteur Thomas Haseley on of □ e Clerkes of youre Corone
- 142.7 Thomas Payn of Glamorganshire Walsshman that brak □ e Tour of London nowe beyng in Neugate sumtyme Clerk and Chief conseilour to sir Iohn Oldecastell Traitour atteint to your seid gracoius ffader The sequences of title + noun show structures that are peculiar inside apposition itself.
- 11.4 Richard harowedon monk of Westmins...
- 15.4 hugh ffastolfs knyght
- 19.5 Iohn hohon

¹ In fact, one of the examples introduced by Quirk et al. (1302) as a partial apposition (“*Norman Jones, at one time a law student, wrote several best sellers*”) is very close to a non-restrictive postmodifier. Thus, if it was extraposed to initial position, it would immediately acquire an adverbial value; that is something that typically occurs with non-restrictive postmodifiers, which are difficult to be distinguish from adverbial complementation.

² Dik (1989: 264) speaks of extracausal constituents that “are not part of the clause proper, but more loosely associated with it in ways which can most adequately be described in terms of pragmatic functionality”. From this perspective, it would be possible to postulate a correlation at a phrasal or syntagmatic level, with the existence of elements more loosely associated to nouns, whose pragmatic function would be serving as “comments” on the clause [term] proper’ (p.265). In this line, we could find elements traditionally classified as appositons and all kinds of non-restrictive postmodifications, since they would fit perfectly well all the general properties ascribed to them (265): “-They may precede, interrupt, or follow the clause proper; / -They are typically “bracketed off” from the clause by pause-like inflections in the intonation pattern; / -They are not sensitive to the clause-internal grammatical rules, though they may entertain relations of coreference, parallelism (e.g. same case marking), or antithesis (e.g. negative Tag with positive clause) with the clause they are associated with. / -They are not essential to the integrity of the internal structure of the clause: when they are left out, the remaining clause structure is complete and grammatical.”

knight -20.5 maister Thomas Bolton [bringer of □ is □ e same prebende. -25.3 Maistre Iohan Cruche Comenceour and licenced in diuinitee. -25.7 to Thomas ffeltewell preest -28.3 oure maistre mason -31.3 Robert haburgeham Sqwyer berynge heere in oure seruice on □ is syde of □ e See in □ e compaignie of our trusty and wel beloued □ e lord ffiϑhugh oure Chamberlein -35.3 maistre henri ware. Elit to □ e Bysshopriche of Chichestre. -43.7 Duc Iohan of Baire -45.3 oure welbeloued squier Iohan Ascow -52.2 vnto oure Welbeloued clerck Iohn Hethe -61.2 vnto oure welbeloued seruant Piers Logge -72.3 sir Thomas Suthwell preste -73.3 by William Mynours. yeman -78.8 oure welbeloued clerck William Toly -63.5 vnto oure trusty and welbeloued Cousin Iohn.

Sequences of two nouns, other than those mentioned above, include the problem of the lexicalization of compounds as well. This is difficult enough to decide upon in present day English, in the case of 15th century English the subsequent addition of diachronicity should be taken into account. Thus, only those cases which pose no doubts in relation to their lexicalization at the time under scrutiny will be classified as such.

Raumolin-Brunberg (1991: 152) states that “all noun + noun sequences are treated as compounds” in her study of Thomas More’s language. The examples she classifies (186, nota 5) are: *algorisme stone*, *backe side*, *bede(s)-man*, *buttry bar*, *godchildren*, *handekercher*, *horeson*, *horseman*, *household*, *paryshe priest*, *play felowe* and *sterre chamber*. Even though some of these examples conform double-head structures of a nominal nature, others are evident lexicalizations, which implied a unique reference as early as the 16th century, such are *godchildren*, *horseman* or *household*.

This is not the type we should be looking for in a structural study of the syntactic patterns of the noun phrase, but the first one, the one that implies the combination of two or more units that are semantically and syntactically distinct. In many cases it is difficult to discern to which degree the lexicalization of both units has taken place completely or only partially, that is the reason why I have decided to treat the majority of the examples in these frequencies as premodifying or postmodifying nouns.

Some examples, as the ones that follow, might be considered unequivocal cases of lexicalization in the 15th century:

-115.5 □ e hors Shoo -150.31 the chirche yerd -107.7 of workemen or laborenis -
96.5 □ e ouersight and gouernance

The difference between these lexical units and premodifying and postmodifying structures is mainly related to the degree of lexicalization that characterises them. There are other aspects to be taken into account. These might be of a prosodic or semantic nature and are difficult to apply to this corpus. In relation to premodification, nouns are the second most frequent category, after adjectives. From the semantic point of view, nominal modification is fundamentally restrictive, while adjectives tend to introduce a non-restrictive modification (Warren 1993: 59-60). This fact could explain the phonological and syntactic differences (which concern fundamentally differences of accentuation and of possible combinations in the premodifier structure) between both categories in this function. There are 18 items fulfilling this function in my corpus: *fee*, *estat*, *North*, *hors*, *feod*, *midsomer*, *gold*, *sergeant*, *cheker*, *cession*, *knight*, *dower*, *liege*, *wolle*, *Christmass*, *halewyn*, *sheriff* and *teithe*.

Noun postmodifiers are more frequently found with noun heads (73.52%) than with deverbal nominalizations (17.64%) or pronouns (8.82%). The syntactic configuration of those structures in which we find two nouns together is not clear at all, as has been mentioned in relation to premodifying nouns, appositive or juxtaposed constructions in which both elements share the same syntag-

matic structure, and it can also be observed of postmodifying nouns¹. The greatest problem in most of the cases is discerning which element modifies and which one functions as head. In some examples the greater specificity of the first element leads us to believe it is the one that sustains the structure.

-19.8 Maude somtyme wife of Pierres Mauley knight -75.3 oure seruant Iohn Bayll barbour

Other examples are interpreted as postmodifiers, either because they represent structures that originally, in Old English, were carried out by oblique cases, or because nowadays they might be paraphrased by prepositional phrases.

-50.5 of .iiij. d (□ e day) granted vnto hym by certein lettres patentes / confemred by vs -50.4 on □ is side □ e see -61.4 paiement of al □ at is behinde and due vnto him of vj. d a day / by □ e handes of □ e visconte of Wilton -107.11 his felship marchantes -139.7 vj d a day -143.14 on oure lady even □ assumpcion

In the case of temporal/adverbial constructions, it is clear that the second noun or phrase specifies the reference of the first, therefore becoming the postmodifier.

-93.12 to morwe here day -106.7 fro □ e feest of Seynt Michel. the yere of oure Regne xv<the>. -135.1 □ e xxviij day of April □ e xvij ye of □ e kyng -143.13 on Cristemasse even

Other nouns, however, show a greater ambiguity in this respect, and so it must be the speaker's intuition that has to be invoked, but never as definitive criteria.

-28.3 oure maistre mason as maistre Steven was -127.2 sergeant porter in youre worshipfull houshold

Some nominal premodifiers show a structure that is quite similar to the apposition title + noun, even though they are not so. These are mainly those that refer to professions and specific job-categories performed by individuals:

-109.12 Be ꝥowre powre liege² Iohn Cappe -89.3 oure seruant Iohan Hertishille -127.1 vnto youre contynuell seruant Iohn Stok -143.3 your most humble liege man

A surprising structure is found in the 1437 petition (SC8/27/1305: Fisher et al. n°. 201) where a noun phrase is structured like a sequence of title + noun, although that is not what it represents:

-154.26 y 36 The said william Pulle Rauyshour

Other examples of premodification by nouns which clearly do not resemble signs of lexicalization and whose referential identity is marked precisely is found in the explicitation of dates or in references to the kind of material out of which certain objects are made:

-69.4 vn to Alhalwen tyde -120.27 by mydsomer day. next folowyng -120.29 in gold l -121.24 the seide Mary Magdelyn day -143.13 on Cristemasse even -143.13 on Midsomer even -143.14 on alle halewyn even -150.20 ij yron broches -150.22 j bras morter with a pestell of yron

The examples that pose more problems in order to be classified as compounds or modifiers are those heads whose reference is specified by the premodifier noun in such a way the general denotation of the term is restricted to a class or subclass inside the general application of the noun.

-43.22 al □ e fee fauor and chere / □ at may be doon yn goodly wyse. -50.6 of □ e fee ferme of oure Cite of Canterbury. -107.11 his felship marchantes -130.1 in the

¹ In this corpus, as opposed to the data analysed by Raumolin-Brunberg (192 y 239), premodifier nouns are less frequent (18 cases) than postmodifiers (32 examples) showing practically the inverse proportion (34 phrases vs. 13 phrases in Raumolin-Brunberg's corpus).

² *Liege* is very close to lexicalization when it is combined with *man*, *loured*, etc.

Sterre Chambre -130.43 vpon the Cheker borde □ e which borde stode a fore □ e benche. -130.93 at □ e cession tyme -131.37 by knyght Ceruice -136.13 in dower terme of yeres -142.48 with wolle cloth -142.23 in □ e conseil chambre of □ e seid parlement -150.31 the teithe hay

Postmodification by nouns might also introduce structures that show similarities to the sequences of title + noun; in certain cases the second element seems to be the one that implies the meaning of position, rank or occupation:

-1.4 our Comissaries berers herof -25.3 Maistre Iohan Cruche Comenceour and licenced in diuinitee

Again, dates and temporal specification seem particularly prone to be postmodified by nouns.

-50.5 of .iiij. d (□ e day) granted vnto hym by certein lettres patentes / conferred by vs -93.12 to morwe here day¹ -139.7 vj d a day -142.31 xl li a yere -143.14 on oure lady even □ assumpcion²

The rest of the noun heads that are postmodified by other nouns show constructions inherited from Old English. Among these we may find those units that govern a partitive genitive, measure genitive and the defining genitive in the anglo-saxon construction; in those the construction in *of* is used in late Old English. In relation to the genitive of definition, the construction introduced by *manner* is present in the Chancery texts. Kisbye (1972: 65-66) states that French loanwords *manner* and *sort* “in many respects took the syntax of *kin(d)*”; in these cases, however, as opposed to what had happened with *kind*, which around 1400 had acquired an adjectival sense, the nominal value is preserved, since the constructions analysed in this corpus introduce structures that are not compatible with an adjectival nature of *manner*:

-5.9 of al such manere newe and wilfulle gouernance yn □ e matire forsaide. -151.6 alle manere proffites of alle manere plees within the saide Cite fines Amerciamentes forfaitures.

In the second example, the noun might be considered as a genitive, even though there is no sign that supports this idea. Mustanoja (1966: 86) defines the construction as an apposition since the 13th and 14th centuries, even though the periphrastic *of*-construction is also frequent during this period. He (1966: 84) also classifies some constructions with a genitive of measure as appositive constructions:

After words expressing measure (distance, length of time, weight, number, etc.) apposition occurs in many cases where one would naturally expect a partitive genitive [...]. In instances of this kind apposition instead of the partitive genitive is not uncommon in the 13th and 14th centuries. The competition of the periphrastic genitive with *of*, however, reduces its use drastically towards the end of the period and causes it largely to disappear.

Examples of this type are also found in the Chancery texts. Some are clear reminiscences of the genitive of measure, other cases, as the one that uses *side* as head seems to be the result of the diffusion of this structure to other contexts:

-41.5 on □ is side see -50.4 on □ is side □ e see -146.13 every pounde weighte -150.14 iij paire bedes of corall -150.15 j paire bedes of aumbor -150.15 j paire bedes of gete -150.19 j paire trostell -150.24 ij paire wightes for gold -150.24 .j. dial a bowe -150.23 xx lb wex -150.27 j payre wheles

¹ In this case the nominal structure *here day* can either be considered as an apposition to *to morwe* or as a postmodification in which the exact date is made explicit.

² This example is closely related to genitive premodifiers, but with an added difficulty, the fact that the phrase seems to represent a double genitive, *lady* and □ *assumpcion*, both without a case mark. In this sequence *lady* would modify □ *assumpcion*, and this would in turn modify *even*, despite being in a discontinuous sequence.

The internal structure of these heads is one very difficult aspect to deal with in this kind of analyses. Relations such as apposition, coordination (and doublets) and composition that are established between nouns inserted in the same phrase, show, in a historical study like this, categorization problems that affect their general structural conception. This is particularly true of pre- and postmodification structures. However, this type of double-head structure seems to be less frequent in our corpus than a century later, in Thomas More's writings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acuña Fariña, J. C. 1993: *On So Called Appositive Structures in English*. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, Tesis doctoral inédita.
- Blake, N. 1992: The Literary Language in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, vol.II. > Norman Blake, ed. CUP.
- Burnley, J. D. 1979: *Chaucer's Language and the Philosophers' Tradition*. Woodbridge, Brewer.
- Burnley, J. D. 1984: Picked Terms. *English Studies* 65: 195-204.
- Burnley, J. D. 1986: Curial Prose in Prose in English. *Speculum* 61/3: 593-614.
- Burnley, J. D. 1992: Lexis and Semantics in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, vol.II. > Norman Blake, ed. CUP.
- Jones, R. F. 1953: *The Triumph of the English Language*. Stanford, Stanford U. P.
- Kisbye, T. 1972: An Historical Outline of English Syntax. Tryk, Akademisk Boghandel.
- Mustanoja, T. F. 1960: *A Middle English Syntax. Part I*. Helsinki, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 23.
- Quirk, R. et al. 1985: *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, Longman.
- Raumolin-Brunberg, H. 1991: *The Noun Phrase in Early Sixteenth Century English*. Helsinki, Société Néophilologique.
- Warren, B. 1993: Nominal and Adjectival Modifiers of Nouns. > *The Noun Phrase in English. Its Structure and Variability*. Andreas Jucker, ed. Heidelberg, Universitätsverlag C. Winter: 57-68.

* * *

The choice of relativizers in Early Modern English: evidence from the Helsinki Corpus

Emma Lezcano

UNIVERSIDADE DA CORUÑA

As is well known, relative clauses in English are the site of a clear case of syntactic variation since it is possible to choose among three different options: a *WH-word*, *that* or *zero* when a relative clause is going to be produced. A number of scholars in the recent and not so recent past have been considerably attracted by this variation in the choice of relativizers. I have in mind, in particular, the studies of Ryden (1966), Romaine (1982), Dekeyser (1984) and Rissanen (1984), who explored this aspect from a diachronic perspective or, more recently, the synchronic studies of Guy and Bayley (1995) and Fox and Thompson (1990). In fact, the variational approach has gained a prominent position in sociolinguistic studies since it gives a clearer picture of the syntactic development of a language.

The present paper will be concerned with relative pronoun choice in relative clauses in a particular period of the English language, namely, EModE. The crucial difference between previous periods of the English Language and Early Modern English is not the number of relativizers - which has not changed since the 15th century - but the system that governs its distribution, which is of great interest because in many respects it differs markedly from present English usage. The aim of this paper is, therefore, to provide a numerical account of relativizers in the the 16th century and first half of the 17th century. I will show figures of their distribution according to different parameters of variation and when possible I will explore explanations for the evidence found. This study is part of an ongoing research project in which I examine six different types of texts comprising 150, 000 words from the whole EModE period of the English language. As this is just a preliminary approach to the data, it seems prudent at present to show but some provisional results, which can certainly give us some hints of the state of relativizer choice by that time, but never definite and final conclusions.

Before taking up the above mentioned account, a few words seem in order concerning the constraints that appear to have significant effects on the choice of relativizers in PE. According to Quirk *et al* (1985) these constraints are:

- (i) The relation of the relative clause to its antecedent: restrictive and non restrictive
- (ii) The gender type of the antecedent: personal or nonpersonal
- (iii) And the function of the relativizer as subject, object, etc.

These three variables will be considered in my study. Other factors such as the adjacency of the antecedent and the relativized element, the function of the matrix NP and the complexity of the antecedent NP will also be explored. I will try to see if PE constraints on the choice of relativizers do work at all in Early Modern, the period when the consolidation of most structures has taken place.

As a source of data, a computerized corpus, *The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*, has been used, as this may be representative of the formal and informal written language of the period. The EModE section of the corpus is divided into three subperiods. I have examined relative clauses

from two of these subperiods as illustrated in Table 1, which lists the total number of words investigated in each subperiod as well as the number of relative constructions found in them.

TABLE 1

	WORDS	RELATIVE CLAUSES	%
I. 1500-1570	12077	179	1.4 %
II. 1570-1640	10872	149	1.3 %
TOTALS	22949	328	

The total word count of period one was somewhat higher than that of period two. As can be seen in this table, there is quite an important number of occurrences, steadily distributed in the two periods. In view of these data we may presume that in Early Modern English relative constructions played a far more important role than in Present day English. In order to relate the relative clauses found in our corpus and style, a number of variables have been taken into account when selecting the material, namely, the type and register of writing, so as to obtain data representative of formal and informal settings.

Table 2 provides the breakdown of the types of texts that have been studied and the number of relative clauses in them. Private letters are informal and may reflect some of the characteristics of spoken language. On the contrary, educational treatises are formal, and bear no relationship to the spoken language.

TABLE 2

	<i>Private Letters</i>		<i>Educational Treatises</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Period I.	74	51, 39 %	105	57, 07 %
Period II.	70	48, 61 %	79	42, 93 %
TOTALS	144	43, 9 %	184	56, 1 %

As Table 2 shows, a larger percentage of relative clauses has been found in educational treatises, especially in the first period of our corpus. It would not be illegitimate to suggest that this fact may be largely due to the strong impact of Latin, especially if we take into account that the educational treatises under consideration are very formal and contain quotations and references from Latin and Greek authors. In Private letters, however, syntactic devices other than relative clauses seem to be preferred.

Table 3 shows an overall survey of relativizers in Early Modern English. This table reveals that *WH*-relative clauses are in expansion at this time: we can observe a sizeable increase in *WH*-relatives in the second period, entirely counterbalanced by a decline of the *that* strategy, much more popular in the first period, at least in view of our data. It is also during the second part of the Early Modern English period that the increase in the use of the pronoun deletion strategy takes place: I found five occurrences of zero relativizer and all five cases belong to period 2. My results coincide on the whole with those obtained by Ryden for the same period and with Dekeyser's survey of relativizers in a corpus of the 17th century.

TABLE 3

	THAT		WH-		ZERO	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Period I.	74	77,89 %	105	46,05 %	0	0,0 %
Period II.	21	22,11 %	123	53,95 %	5	100 %
TOTALS	95	28,96 %	228	69,51 %	5	1,52 %

If we break down the above mentioned figures according to the textual criterion, the results obtained will be those in Tables 4 and 5. We can see that *that* is much more frequent in private letters than in educational treatises. This is not surprising since it is well known that *that* is less common in formal texts than in colloquial ones. In the second period, though, there is a significant rise in the use of *WH* forms in private letters, as is proved by the fact that 51 out of the total 71 *wh*-relative clauses in private letters correspond to the second period. According to Rissanen (1984: 420) “the growing popularity of *wh*-forms is best accounted for through the load of functions given to *that*, which increased the risk of ambiguity”. The expansion of *who*, first recorded in the 15th century but which gained importance in the course of the 16th and 17th centuries may have also influenced these figures.

TABLE 4

	THAT		WH-		ZERO	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Private Letters I.	54	$\frac{72,97}{\%}$ 79,41 %	20	$\frac{27,03}{\%}$ 28,17 %	0	$\frac{0,0}{\%}$ 0,0 %
Private Letters II.	14	$\frac{20}{\%}$ 20,59 %	51	$\frac{72,86}{\%}$ 71,83 %	5	$\frac{7,14}{\%}$ 100 %
TOTALS	68	47,22 %	71	49,31 %	5	3,47 %

1: % EACH PERIOD — 2: % BOTH PERIODS

TABLE 5

	THAT		WH-		ZERO	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Educational Treatises I.	20	$\frac{19,05}{\%}$ 74,07 %	85	$\frac{80,95}{\%}$ 54,14 %	0	$\frac{0,0}{\%}$ 0,0 %
Educational Treatises II.	7	$\frac{8,86}{\%}$ 25,93 %	72	$\frac{91,14}{\%}$ 45,86 %	0	$\frac{0,0}{\%}$ 0,0 %
TOTALS	27	96,43 %	157	3,57 %	0	0,0 %

1: % EACH PERIOD — 2: % BOTH PERIODS

In the following tables (Tables 6 and 7) the different *WH*-relativizers are set out. This will give us a clearer picture of which *WH*-pronouns were on the decrease and which ones were favoured at the time. As may be noted, I have disregarded in my study *WH*-forms such as *where* or its compounds *wherein*, *whereof*, etc., but of course they have been included for the statistical count.

TABLE 6

	WHICH		THE WHICH		WHICHE		WHO		WHOM		WHOSE		WHOE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Period I.	29	25, 89 %	6	100 %	29	100 %	7	24, 14 %	14	77, 78 %	6	66, 67 %	0	0, 0 %
Period II.	83	74, 11 %	0	0, 0 %	0	0, 0 %	22	75, 86 %	4	22, 22 %	3	33, 33 %	2	100 %
TOTALS	112	54, 63 %	6	2, 93 %	29	14, 15 %	29	14, 15 %	18	8, 78 %	9	4, 39 %	2	0, 98 %

TABLE 7

	WHICH		THE WHICH		WHICHE		WHO		WHOM		WHOSE		WHOE	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Private Letters I, II	54	48, 21 %	6	100 %	0	0, 0 %	9	31, 03 %	2	11, 11 %	6	66, 67 %	2	100 %
Educational Treatises I, II.	58	51, 79 %	0	0, 0 %	29	100 %	20	68, 97 %	16	88, 89 %	3	33, 33 %	0	0, 0 %
TOTALS	112	54, 63 %	6	2, 93 %	29	14, 15 %	29	14, 15 %	18	8, 78 %	9	4, 39 %	2	0, 98 %

The above mentioned quantitative evidence pertains to restrictive and non-restrictive clauses alike. Since in PE the three strategies occur side by side only in restrictive clauses, it is interesting to split up frequencies according to clause type, which is what I did in table 8. Traugott (1972: 66) observes that the contrast between restrictive and non restrictive relative clauses must have existed from the earliest times since the distinction is in essence that of fundamental semantic relationships. But there is no difference in surface structure since the Present English constraint which virtually confines *that* to restrictive clauses does not apply in this period. Punctuation is not a reliable criterion, either. In fact, I have found two examples of NR relative clauses with no punctuation mark at all and 4 restrictive clauses with a comma. I have therefore relied exclusively on semantic and pragmatic criteria. Example (1) shows a non-punctuated NR clause and example (2) illustrates the case of a Restrictive Clause with a comma:

(1) Thy loving husband who loves the more then his owne life. (<B CEPRIV2>|QE2_XX_CORP_KNYVETT: sample 1)

(2) almost in halfe the time, which the other will require. (<B CEEDUC2A>|QE2_EX_EDUC_BRINSLEY: sample 2)

In Table 8 the overall distribution of restrictive and non restrictive clauses is presented:

TABLE 8

	THAT		WH-		ZERO		TOTALS	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
RESTRICTIVE	84	88,42 %	73	32,16 %	5	100 %	162	49,54 %
NON RESTRICTIVE	11	11,58 %	154	67,84 %	0	0,0 %	165	50,46 %

Although most of the occurrences with *that* are used restrictively, it can be said that the regularizing tendency of limiting the use of *that* to restrictive clauses was not established yet: eleven cases of *that* used non-restrictively were found as example (3) illustrate:

(3) I wold desire you to mark wel my letter, that I sent you by Mr. Oughtred; (<B CEPRIV1>|QE1_XX_CORP_RPLUMPT: sample 2)

Table 9 presents the distribution of restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses according to text-type in absolute terms.

TABLE 9

	Restrictive	Non-Restrictive
Private Letters I.	48	26
Private Letters II.	25	45
Educational Treatises I.	34	71
Educational Treatises II.	51	28

As can be seen, private letters and educational treatises of the first period serve to account for the normal tendency of using more restrictive clauses in informal types of texts and of favouring non restrictiveness in loose, descriptive and more formal writing. But on the second period the figures are reversed and surprisingly enough, there are more examples of non restrictive relative clauses in the informal kind of text than in the formal one. I cannot arrive at a tenable conclusion at this stage, but this is obviously an aspect which deserves further investigation and which will be contrasted and tackled in our larger project.

Before moving on to the next variable we should consider the use of *who* in restrictive and non-restrictive clauses. *Who* (still an innovation in the early 16th century) was first introduced in a non restrictive context. One century later, restrictive *who* was already established. The same trend can be deduced from our data. Our evidence shown in Table 10 confirms that all relative clauses with *who* in the first subperiod of the Early Modern Period were used non restrictively. However, in the second subperiod, we have 9 instances of *who* used in a restrictive environment, as example 4 in your handout illustrates:

(4) and to be imprinted in the memorie of every one who is desirous to get the best learning: (<B CEEDUC2A>|QE2_EX_EDUC_BRINSLEY: sample 2)

TABLE 10

WHO	Restrictive		Non-Restrictive		Totals
	No.	%	No.	%	
Period I.	0	0,0 %	7	100 %	7
Period II.	9	40,91 %	13	59,09 %	22

The following table, Table 11, shows the number of clauses which occur with each type of relativizer with human or non human antecedents.

TABLE 11

	WHICH		WHICHE		WHO		THAT		ZERO	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
HUMAN	10	8, 93 %	5	17, 24 %	29	100 %	27	28, 42 %	0	0, 0 %
NON-HUMAN	102	91, 07 %	24	82, 76 %	0	0, 0 %	68	71, 58 %	5	100 %
TOTALS	112	41, 48 %	29	10, 74 %	29	10, 74 %	95	35, 19 %	5	1, 85 %

As can be seen, the animacy of the antecedent has no determining effect in the choice of relativizer since, unlike Present-day English, there are instances of *which* and *whiche* used after human heads. It is also worthy of mention that all cases with *zero* relativizer are used with a non-human antecedent, but the figures are so low that it would be risky to make strong generalisations out of these results. As regards *whose*, not present in the table, there appears not to be a constraint on *whose* in terms of Human or non Human antecedents although non human *whose* is not frequent in this period: I did not record any examples at all. It seems, though, that the present-day use of personal relativizers (such as *who*) with personal antecedents is being established and all 29 occurrences of *who* have a personal head. At this point it is interesting to note that when the antecedent is a proper name (there are 16 instances in our corpus) the pronouns favoured are *who*, *whom* or *whose*. I found, though, two examples of *which* used with a proper name as antecedent, something impossible in PE. (5) below illustrates one of those cases:

(5) as dyd the emperour Nero, whiche all a longe somers day wolde sit in the Theatre, (<B CEEDUC1A>|QE1_IS/EX_EDUC_ELYOT: sample 1)

My data also support Ryden's claim that *who* is always used when the antecedent is a word denoting the Deity, especially in closing phrases in letters as illustrated under example (6):

(6) as Jesu knowes, who preserve you in health. (<B CEPRIV1>|QE1_XX-CORP_WPLUMPT: sample 2)

Table 12 can be referred to for the breakdown of figures according to the different types of text in the two periods.

TABLE 12

	WHICH		WHICHE		WHO		THAT		ZERO	
	H ⁺	H ⁻								
Private Letters I.	4	12	0	0	1	0	16	38	0	0
Private Letters II.	0	38	0	0	8	0	6	8	0	5
Educational Treatises I.	4	9	5	24	6	0	5	15	0	0
Educational Treatises II.	2	43	0	0	14	0	0	7	0	0

With regard to the syntactic function of relativizers, the general survey of data is shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13

AH	SU	OB	OBL	DET	SC
WHICH WHICHE THE WHICH	68	54	10	14	1
THAT	50	34	11	0	0
ZERO	0	3	2	0	0
WHO	29	0	0	0	0

In the same way as Romaine (1982) and Dekeyser (1984), I found quantitative evidence that the so-called Accessibility Hierarchy proposed by Keenan and Comrie (1977) worked nicely for Early Modern English. Their theory convincingly demonstrates that subjects are more more accessible to relativization than DO's, DO's more than indirect objects, indirect objects more than objects of preposition, Genitives and object of comparison. As far as essentials go, the distribution shown in Table 13, agrees with Keenan's accessibility hierarchy for PE. The number of clauses relativizing subjects is higher than the number of clauses relativizing objects, prepositional complements and determiners. I have found no examples of object of comparison, at the bottom of the list, but I recorded one instance of a subject complement. Table 14 shows a more detailed distribution of functions in the different periods and text-types. That Accessibility Hierarchy works is also true for each text-type independently. Also note that relativizer *who* is only used in subject position.

TABLE 14

	WHICH WHICHE THE WHICH				THAT				WHO			
	SU	OB	OBL	DET	SU	OB	OBL	DET	SU	OB	OBL	DET
Private Letters I.	5	6	3	2	25	22	7	0	1	0	0	0
Private Letters II.	13	16	5	4	10	3	1	0	8	0	0	0
Educational Treatises I.	32	7	1	5	11	7	2	0	6	0	0	0
Educational Treatises II.	18	25	1	3	4	2	1	0	14	0	0	0
TOTALS	68	54	10	14	50	34	11	0	29	0	0	0

The final table, Table 15, presents the results obtained after analysing the function of the matrix NP in each relative clause. The distribution of figures is not very significant as to the possible influence that this factor may have on the choice of relativizers. A larger corpus will probably yield more interesting and relevant results.

TABLE 15

Matrix NP	WHO	WHICH	WHICHE	WHOM	WHOSE	THAT	ZERO	WHERE
SU	5	12	10	6	3	23	3	2
OB	9	28	9	4	1	26	1	11

OP	12	38	6	6	5	34	1	13
----	----	----	---	---	---	----	---	----

There are other factors that may affect the choice of the relative marker that I have not included in the tables. These are: the distance between the relative clause and its antecedent and the complexity of the head NP. As for the former, my data revealed that 27 of the relative clauses under consideration had some kind of intervening material between the antecedent and the relativizer as happens in example (7):

(7) an auncient and sad matrone, attendynge on hym in his chambre, whiche shall nat haue any yonge woman in her company. (<B CEEDUC1A>|QE1_IS-/EX_EDUC_ELYOT: sample 1)

The relative marker preferred in these instances is *which* and its variants *whiche* and *the which* (11 cases). The text type where this relative clause is more common is Educational Treatises 1, which may prove that the more formal the text, the more distance between the head and relativizer we find.

With regard to NP complexity, it is remarkable that there are a few cases of antecedents with extended modification in the form of relative clauses as in example 8, where the head of the second relative clause is a NP which is itself postmodified by a relative clause.

(8) I thanke you for your letter which you sent me fromTuddington: which gaue me satisfaction of your being well, (<B CEPRIV2>|QE2_XX_CORP_HARLEY: sample 2)

I found 10 cases similar to the one in the example and all of them where NR relative clauses. Again, *WH-* forms are favoured here, probably because of their greater “carrying power”.

As a matter of fact, according to Rissanen (1984: 420) the basic factor influencing the choice of relative marker at the early stages of development was the tightness of the link between the head and the postmodifying clause: the tighter the link, the less risk of ambiguity there was and consequently the less need to use the newer and more emphatic *WH-*forms. This may well serve to prove the fact that *WH-* forms are preferred when the distance between the antecedent head noun and the relativizer is considerable and that conversely *that* is far more common than *which* when the antecedent is a pronoun (57 instances of pronoun antecedents were found in our corpus and 29 had *that* as a marker, whereas only five had *which*). It seems that the relative clause is more closely linked with a pronoun antecedent, possibly because of the vague semantic content of the pronouns. Obviously, the link seems to be particularly loose when the antecedent is a whole clause. In these cases, as example (9) seems to prove, *which* is also preferred. I found 25 instances in the corpus and all of them have *which* or *whiche* as markers.

(9) to deliuer the children of Israhell out of captiuitie, which he coulde nat haue done, if he had nat bene of suche pacience and charitie. (<B CEE-DUC1A>|QE1_IS-/EX_EDUC_ELYOT: sample 2)

Taking everything into account I would suggest by way of conclusion that there are no clear constraints on the choice of relativizers in this period. Obviously, the amount of variation tolerated in this period is considerably less than a couple of centuries earlier, yet it is much important than the variation available in Present day English, even though some of the syntactic changes already foreshadow the Present English grammar of relativizers.

This being a preliminary study, many questions remain unanswered and many assumptions are probably based on inadequate evidence. It is possible that the analysis of larger samples might modify our data and show a more regular picture for the distribution. Closer textual study, together with further inspection of data both backwards and forwards in time from the period studied for this paper, would certainly give a deeper insight into the development of this syntactic construction.

REFERENCES

- Dekeyser, X. 1984: *Relativisers in Early Modern English: A Dynamic Quantitative Study*. Fisiak, J. ed. 1984: *Historical Syntax*. Berlin, Mouton.
- Fox, B. A. & Thompson, S. A. 1990: A Discourse Explanation of the Grammar of Relative Clauses in English Conversation. *Language* 66/ 2: 297-316.
- Guy, G. R. & Bayley, R. 1995: On the choice of relative pronouns in English. *American Speech* 70/2: 148-162.
- Keenan, E. L. & Comrie, B. 1977: Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 63-99.
- Kytö, M. 1991: *Manual to the Diachronic Part of the Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Coding Conventions and List of Source Texts*. Helsinki, Helsinki University Press.
- Moessner, L. 1992: Relative Constructions and Functional Amalgamation in Early Modern English. In Rissanen, M., Ihalainen, O., Nevalainen, T. & Taavitsainen, I. eds. 1992: *History of Englishness. New Methods and Interpretations in Historical Linguistics*. Berlin, Mouton.
- Quirk, R. et al. 1985: *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, Longman.
- Rissanen, M. 1984: The Choice of Relative Pronouns in 17th century American English. In Fisiak, J. ed. 1984: *Historical Syntax*. Berlin, Mouton.
- Romaine, S. 1982: *Socio-historical Linguistics. Its Status and Methodology*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Ryden, M. 1966: *Relative Constructions in Early 16th Century English*. Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Traugott, E. C. 1972: *A History of English Syntax: A Transformational Approach to the History of English Sentence Structure*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

* * *

The House is Building: Active Progressive with Passive Meaning

Paloma Núñez Pertejo

UNIVERSIDAD DE SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper tries to account for the origin and historical development of the active progressive used with passive sense. It is a well-known fact that English made use of several different morphological devices to express the passive meaning in the progressive, at least until the ‘true’ progressive passive, *is being* + past participle, entered the language in the late Modern English period. An analysis of these different morphological devices will be provided in this paper, but with special reference to the so-called «covert passive» (Strang 1982: 440), of the type *the house is building*, in other words, active progressive with passive meaning, which apparently enjoyed its greatest popularity in the early Modern English period (eModE), but especially in the late 18th century. It took some time, however, to replace this construction with the genuine progressive passive of the type *the house is being built*, although the ‘new’ model was definitely established in the English language in the course of the 19th century and has been adopted as a recognised feature of verbal syntax.

2. *THE HOUSE IS BUILDING* (ACTIVE PROGRESSIVE WITH PASSIVE MEANING)

As has been stated above, a form such as *the house is building*, although not formally passive,¹ since there is no *be* + past participle, could be interpreted as conveying passive meaning, at least until it is replaced by the true progressive passive (*the house is being built*). According to Visser (1963-1973), constructions of this type were already in use in Old English (OE). Mitchell (1976), however, asserted that the equivalent of the idiom *the house is building* did not occur in OE, for it is difficult to interpret the nature of the present participle in those examples offered by Visser (§1875, pp 2008 ff).

Nehls (1988: 186-188) holds that after the loss of the OE auxiliary *weorðan* for the expression of the passive of action in the 12th century, the only auxiliary available for the formation of the passive in English was *be* (from OE *beon*).² Thenceforth, the context was the only means of establishing a formal distinction between the passive of action and the passive of state. Seemingly, at the beginning of the Middle English period (eME), the active form of the progressive was sometimes used to express an action in progress with a passive sense, although there are scholars who consider the existence of such pattern highly unlikely, at least until the beginning of the eModE period (cf. Raith 1951, and more explicitly, Denison 1993). The period in which this form seems to have enjoyed its greatest popularity was the 18th century, although active progressives

¹ Visser (1963-1973: 1872, §1872, p. 2005) finds the label ‘passive’ inappropriate to refer to this construction, since the passive form usually consists of the verb *to be* followed by the past participle of another verb. To account for the differences between a normal, active progressive and an active progressive with passive sense, he suggests the term ‘passival’ to refer to the second.

² OE *weorðan* + past participle was the usual way of expressing a passive of action, while passives of state were generally rendered by means of *beon/wesan* + past participle.

with passive meaning have been attested from the 16th to the 19th centuries. Even later, in Present-Day English (PE), we find a few stereotyped expressions which may give the impression of having become well-established idioms of the English language, such as *something is wanting* or *missing*, *dinner is cooking*, *the book is reprinting*, etc. These phrases constitute a kind of idiomatic substitute for *is wanted*, *is missed*, *is cooked* and so on, which, as a general rule, are not used in speech.

2.1. ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT

There seem to be two plausible sources in the origin of this construction: (i) a prepositional, also known as gerundial construction of the type *to be in/on doing* and (ii) the ordinary progressive. A mixed origin, which would result from the mixture or blending of these two sources, has also been suggested, with each source contributing to the development of the so-called «covert passive».

2.1.1. THE PREPOSITIONAL PATTERN

Jespersen (1933) maintains that a construction such as *the house is building* “is easily accounted for if we start from *is on (a) building*, which meant ‘is in (under) construction’” (p. 269). *On* and *an* seem to be the most common prepositions, since hardly any examples with *at* have been recorded.¹ The pattern with *in* is perhaps the most frequent one from 1300 onwards, apparently due to French influence. Instances with *under*, on the other hand, are extremely rare.

The final pattern is reached by means of the weakening of the preposition (*on*, *an*, *in*) to just *a* (*the house is abuilding*), and this *a* is finally lost through aphesis. The passive meaning derives from the fact that the noun in *-ing*, like other verbal nouns, is considered neither active nor passive in itself, so that *is on/in/a building* may mean both “is engaged in the act of building” (active) and “is being built” (passive).² Supporters of this theory are, among others, Jespersen (1933, 1909-1949: IV) and Dal (1952). Elsness (1994: 16) considers that this prepositional pattern lends itself better for the expression of passive meaning and also that it appears to have been closer to PE progressive meaning.

2.1.2. THE ORDINARY PROGRESSIVE

Mossé (1938), Nehls (1974) and Scheffer (1975), among other scholars, firmly believe that the origin of this construction cannot be derived from the prepositional or gerundial type, for the form in *-ing* is not a verbal noun, but a present participle. Moreover, those who defend this view take it for granted that the present participle with passive meaning was attested in all Germanic languages as well as English. Scheffer (1975: 254) goes further when he states that “the progressive, ..., was in existence before the other forms, also in its passive meaning.” He exaggerates, however, when he asserts that the active progressive with passive meaning was already found at the beginning of the Middle English period, around 1100 (390-391). Despite these opinions, it is generally agreed that both forms, i.e. the ordinary progressive and the prepositional pattern influenced each other during the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, with the logical conclusion that “the progressive coalesced with the other forms and replaced them” (Scheffer, 1975: 254).

2.1.3. THE ‘BLENDING’ THEORY

Both Åkerlund (1914) and Visser (1963-1973) argue that both sources made a contribution, although the latter considers the prepositional/gerundial construction more likely to have influenced the final pattern. If this source, i.e. the *on/in/a building* type, is adopted, the progressive passive would then get its meaning from the neutrality of the verbal noun and its form by the weakening

¹ Examples with *upon* have also been attested in later stages of language. They could be used to convey a normal, active progressive meaning or a *be going to do* meaning.

² Cf. Jespersen (1909-1949: IV, p. 205).

and disappearance of the preposition. If, on the contrary, the other source, i.e. the ordinary progressive, is adopted, two facts may account for its usage: one is the ‘ergative’ or ‘medio-passive’ use of the lexical verb, and the other is the ellipsis of the reflexive pronoun, such as *itself* in *the house is building itself*. Earlier grammarians postulated that the active progressive could have acquired its passive sense through the analogy of the expanded form with the ‘neutro’ or ‘pseudo-passive’ value of certain active verbs such as *sell* in *the book sells well*. Åkerlund (1914) considered that the problem had to do with the transitive or intransitive function of the lexical verb, because of the freedom of the English language to use the same verb in different contexts: reflexive, transitive, intransitive, causative, etc. From an example such as *the book is selling well*, in which a transitive verb is used in an intransitive way, the use of the progressive passive could extend to other cases even though the verb still had transitive force. Jespersen (1909-1949: IV), however, believes that this ‘neutro’ or ‘pseudo-passive’ use is not found in those verbs that most frequently occur in the passive progressive. The test is to check whether it is possible to use the verb intransitively outside the expanded forms or not. Although *the house is building* is frequent, *the house builds* is impossible to find, so that this explanation does only account for a few examples. Denison (1993: 392-393) also comments on the possibility that ergative verbs influenced this pattern and, concerning ‘medio-passive’ verbs, which he regards as a special use of ergative verbs, he states the following:

... this resembles the passival in requiring its subject NP to be non-agentive, but differs from it in perhaps implying that the subject makes a major contribution to the course or outcome of the action, (p. 392).

However, he considers it highly unlikely that the ‘medio-passive’ has influenced the passive progressive because of the examples included in Visser which seem to correspond to the ‘medio-passive’ (§ 168-169), only three occur before 1600. Jespersen (1909-1949: IV), despite admitting that this ‘medio-passive’ use may have influenced our pattern, thinks that it is unimportant compared with the importance of the prepositional model, which, for him, is the chief source of the construction (p. 234), and which had much to do with the growing use of continuous tenses in the 16th and 17th centuries.

In ME the coalescence of both types -the active progressive and the prepositional pattern- accounts for the increase in use of *the house is building*, especially after the process of weakening and dropping of the preposition had taken place, for the active progressive supersedes the other form in the expression of passive meaning. It took some time, however, to replace the *on/in/a* + verbal noun pattern by the active progressive, so that it was possible to find both forms alongside.

3. ALTERNATIVES FOR THE EXPRESSION OF PASSIVE, PROGRESSIVE MEANING

Apart from the «covert passive», i.e. active progressive with passive meaning of the type *the house is building*, there existed other different ways through which this passive progressive meaning could be conveyed, to wit:

a) The prepositional, gerundial construction *on/in/an/a* + verbal noun (type *to be in/on/an/ a doing*): this pattern has also been mentioned as a possible source in the origin and later development of the active progressive with passive meaning. Apparently, it was much more common for the progressive to convey passive meaning if the main verb was preceded by a preposition, or at least by a prepositional remnant. In the course of the 16th century, this preposition dropped out, and the resulting pattern was formally identical to that of a normal progressive. However, it was possible to find this “older” model along with the other types that were in use at that time (*the house is building*, *the house was built*). In the course of the 18th century, this prepositional pattern was already on the decline and tended to be obsolete.

The following is an example of a prepositional construction with a clear passive meaning:

(1) ... the kinges coronation, of which the time appointed then so nere approached, that the pageauntes and suttelties *were in making* day and night at westminster, and much vitale killed therefore, that afterward was cast away ...

(HE1, Thomas More, *The History of King Richard III*, pp 46-47, [Elsness 1994: 16]).

b) Ordinary, non-progressive passive: passive meaning may also be expressed by means of an ordinary, non-progressive passive, that is, a form of *to be* followed by the past participle of a lexical verb. This is the usual form, at least until the eModE period, where it occurs along with the type *the house is building*, which is more frequent thereafter, especially during the 18th century, as was noted earlier.

In the following example we can see how a passive progressive meaning is signalled without explicit progressive marking:

(2) ... he found that the coach had sunk greatly on one side, though it *was still dragged* forward by the horses; ... (1838-1839, Charles Dickens, *The Life and Adventures of Nicholas Nickleby*, v. 52.14, [Denison 1993: 389]).

4. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE *BEING* + PAST PARTICIPLE PATTERN

It seems likely that with the increasing frequency of the progressive from the late Middle English period (IME) onwards, the need for a more explicit form of progressive passive arose. According to Scheffer (1975: 262), this new pattern would not have been possible if the combination *being built* had not already been known. Before the final pattern was reached, he points out some intermediate stages which could have paved the way for the new construction:

- the pattern with *upon*: (3) ‘... He tells me that Mr. Shepley *is upon being turned away* from my Lord’s family” (March 1669, Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, [Scheffer 1975: 263]).
- the appositional progressive: (4) “... Sir Guy Carlton is four hours *being examined*” [Scheffer 1975: 261-262]. Nehls (1988: 187) quotes this very same example as the first instance of the passive type *something is being done*. The existence of this passive appositive participle seems to be a prerequisite for the evolution of the passive progressive, together with the passive gerund.
- the use of the passive gerund after *near*: (5) “... the little money I had was very near *being all exhausted*” (1776, O. Goldsmith, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, p. 226, [Scheffer 1975: 263]).

The ‘new’ form did not find an easy way to establish itself in the language. At first, grammarians began to object to it, since they believed it was a clumsy device, “an outrage upon English idiom, to be detested, abhorred, execrated” (Jespersen 1933: 269), especially the combination of *be* + *being*, which was felt heavy at times. One of the reasons adduced for the objection to this new form was, among other possible explanations, that the combination *is being* + a predicative adjective was not in use at that time. The combination of both progressive and passive aspects was also felt inadequate, at least until the eModE period.

At the beginning of the 19th century the use of this new model became more frequent, especially in colloquial speech and in private letters from the so-called young generation of writers (Southey, Coleridge, the Shelleys, Lamb, etc). Seemingly, the first example is attested in a letter by Southey:

(6) ... a fellow whose uppermost grinder *is being torn out* by the roots by a mutton-fisted barber ... (1795, C. C. Southey, *Life and Correspondence I*, p. 249.24, [Denison 1993: 428]).¹

¹ Elsness (1994: 15) notes a remarkably early instance of a progressive construction with passive syntax (nearly 200 years earlier than the example from Southey): “Also in what Coast or part of heauen, the Sunne, Moone, or any other starre *is* at any time *being mounted* about the Horizon, as whether it bee Southeast or Northeast, ...” (HE2, 1597 Blundevile, *A Brieffe Description*, ..., p. 155R). The example, however, seems difficult to classify, for it might well be a passive present participle or a passive gerund.

Despite its frequency, the new pattern was not unanimously welcome, and there was considerable opposition on the part of those who viewed the combination *is being* as highly problematic. Some scholars claimed that the old pattern, i.e. the active progressive, should be retained when the subject was inanimate, as in *the house is building*, but not when the subject was animate, as in *the lady is dressing*, for it could be interpreted either as active (*the lady is dressing herself*), or as passive (*the lady is being dressed*). This practice, however, was not followed by English writers. Another reason postulated to account for the difficulties this form had to overcome in order to establish itself in the language was the awkwardness of the compound tenses *-will have been being built, will be being built, shall/should be being built ...-* These forms, however, do not frequently occur in speech, for the active progressive is rarely required in other tenses than the present and the preterite, while in the passive they are even more rarely found.¹

A good illustration of the awkwardness of this new form and its possible combinations may be seen in the following dialogue between a young lady-teacher, and an old gentleman published in *Harper's Weekly* (January 1883):

Old Gentleman: Are there any houses *building* in your village?

Young Lady: No Sir, there is a new house *being built* for Mr. Smith, but it is the carpenters who *are building*.

Gentleman: True, I sit corrected. *To be building* is certainly a different thing from *to be being built*. And how long has Mr. Smith's house *been being built*?

Lady (looks puzzled for a moment, and then answers rather abruptly): Nearly a year.

Gentleman: How much longer do you think it *will be being built*?

Lady (explosive): Don't know.

Gentleman: I should think Mr. Smith would be annoyed by its *being so long being built*, for the house he now occupies being old, he must leave it, and the new one *being only being built*, instead of *being built* as he expected, ... (at this moment he notices that the lady has disappeared).²

Visser (1963-1973: § 1881) asserts that it is at the beginning of the 20th century that the new form is completely settled in the language, and not earlier, owing to the decline of the older models which, on the other hand, did not completely disappear. Denison (1993: 415) maintains that there is alternation between the already mentioned «covert passive» and the new type *is being* + past participle. In structural analogy to the type *something is being done*, the structure *is being silly* developed, at about the end of the 19th century, although its use remains very rare, even in PE, and can be replaced by *he is silly*.³ At about the same time the same construction, this time followed by an NP, is found (type *he is being a fool*).

5. CONCLUSION

The active/passive contrasts within the periphrastic system were deficiently shown, at least at early stages of language, for the mentioned system lacked such contrast of forms. Until the appearance, at the end of the 18th century, of the pattern *something is being done*, to express a passive progressive meaning of this kind, we had either to do without explicit progressive marking or to do without explicit passive marking. In the first case, a normal passive construction, i.e. a form of *to*

¹ Strang (1970: 99), however, finds these forms (*has/had been being* + past participle) quite normal, but contrary to what might be supposed, they belong more to spoken than to written English.

² This dialogue has been taken from Scheffer (1975: 267-268), who, in his turn, quotes it from J. Storm (1892), *Englische Philologie*, Leipzig.

³ *He is being silly*, however, expresses a moral or mental transitory state, something which is not permanent but particular of a certain moment or time. This transitoriness is not present in the ordinary *he is silly* pattern.

be + past participle, was used to convey this combination of passive, progressive meaning. In the second case, a most remarkable construction, the so-called «covert passive», that is, active progressive with passive meaning illustrated in *the house is building*, was defined as a passive without any formal marker. It was much more frequent for the «covert passive» to render passive meaning if the main verb was preceded by a preposition (*on, an, in*), or at least by a prepositional remnant (*a*), which was dropped in the course of the 16th century, so that there were no longer any formal differences between this prepositional pattern and the ordinary progressive. None of these constructions (the prepositional, the «covert passive» and the normal, non-progressive passive) disappeared immediately, but co-existed for a time until the true progressive passive entered the English language and ousted them all. Some of them are even kept in a few PE expressions (*wanting, missing, owing, cooking*). Later, and in structural analogy to the true progressive passive, combinations of *be* + predicative adjective and *be* + NP were found. However, more complex combinations involving perfect/modal, passive and progressive auxiliaries (types *had been being built, shall be being built, will be being built*) are not found until the 20th century, and even then they are very rarely found, although their appearance constitutes the generalisation of the auxiliary system in both progressive and passive aspects.

WORKS CITED

- Åkerlund, A. 1914: A Word on the Passive Definite Tenses. *Englische Studien* 47: 321-337.
- Anderson, J. ed. 1982: *Language From and Linguistic Variation. Papers dedicated to Angus McIntosh*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Dal, I. 1952: Zur Entstehung des Englischen Participium Praesentis auf -ing. *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 16: 5-116.
- Denison, D. 1993: *English Historical Syntax*. New York, Longman.
- Elsness, J. 1994: On the Progression of the Progressive in Early Modern English. *ICAME* 18: 5-25.
- Jespersen, O. 1933: *Essentials of English Grammar*. London, Allen and Unwin.
- Jespersen, O. 1909-1949: *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. Volume IV: *Syntax* (1931). London, Allen and Unwin.
- Klegraf, J. & Nehls, D. 1988: *Essays on the English Language and Applied Linguistics on the occasion of Gerhard Nickel's 60th Birthday*. Heildeberg, Julius Groos.
- Kytö, Merja et al. (compilers). 1991: *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts: Diachronic and Dialectal*. University of Helsinki.
- Mitchell, B. 1976: No *House is Building* in Old English. *English Studies* 57: 385-389.
- Mossé, F. 1938: *Histoire de la Forme Périphrastique 'Être + Participe Présent' en Germanique*. I et II Partie. Collection Linguistique. La Societé Linguistique de Paris 42 et 43, C. Klincksieck.
- Nehls, D. 1974: *Synchron-Diachrone Untersuchungen zur Expanded Form im Englischen: Eine Struktural-Funktionale Analyse*. Linguistische Reihe 19. München, Max Hueber.
- Nehls, D. 1988: On the Development of the Grammatical Category of Verbal Aspect in English. > Klegraf, J. and Nehls, D. eds. 1988: 173-198.
- Raith, J. 1951: *Untersuchungen zum Englischen Aspekt*. München, Max Hueber.
- Scheffer, J. 1975: *The Progressive in English*. Amsterdam, North-Holland.
- Strang, Barbara M. H. 1970: *A History of English*. London and New York, Methuen.
- Strang, Barbara M. H. 1982: Some Aspects of the History of the *Be + Ing* Construction. > Anderson, J. ed. 1982: 427-474.
- Visser, F. Th. 1963-1973: *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*. Leiden, E.J. Brill.

* * *

The interaction of polysemy and complementation: A case study¹

Isabel Verdaguer & Anna Poch

UNIVERSITY OF BARCELONA

The combination of a diachronic and a synchronic approach has proved to be very fruitful in recent linguistic research. Whereas until relatively recently historical studies had been ignored by the most prominent linguistic theories, such as Government and Binding (GB), Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG), and Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG), which carried out their analyses from an exclusively synchronic point of view, it is now accepted that only by reference to earlier historical periods can we find an explanation to the present state of the language. Sweetser, Traugott, Hopper and Bybee among others have emphasized the importance of diachronic studies. The need of a historical perspective is especially evident in the study of polysemy, because it can bring to light not only the interrelationship of the different subsenses, which are apparently unrelated from a synchronic point of view, but also the importance of the complementation in determining and disambiguating its main senses.

We will present a case study, the polysemous verb WATCH, and will show that its current meanings are connected in a motivated way and that its complementation can solve the ambiguity produced by its polysemy. The Renaissance was a crucial period in its historical development, since it was in this period that the complementation of the verb began to interact with its semantic features and gave rise to its main current sense. It was also then that the earliest meanings of the verb were lost, so the present meanings of WATCH took shape in this period.

At the end of the Middle English period and beginning of the Modern English period, WATCH still keeps its early, Old English, meanings, 'be or remain awake' and 'be on the alert', 'keep watch', which are intransitive:

For some must *watch*, while some must sleep (W. Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, III, ii)

Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us *watch* and be sober
(*Thessalonians*, 005: 006)

Watch thou, and wake when others be asleep (W. Shakespeare, *Henry the Sixth*,
Part II, I, i)

I will *watch* tonight (W. Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, I, i)

Constrained to *watch* in darkness, rain, and cold (W. Shakespeare, *Henry the Sixth*,
Part I, II, i)

As these examples illustrate, the meanings of WATCH do not have clear boundaries. 'Be or remain awake' is present in the sense 'keep watch'. In fact, if we analyse the semantic development of WATCH, we will become aware that it shows a logical succession of meanings. As we show in a forthcoming paper, a new sense appears when a new semantic component is added to and interacts with the old meaning. 'Remain awake' arises when a new semantic element,

¹. The authors acknowledge the support of DGICYT (research project PB92-0732).

‘intentionally’, is added to and interacts with the basic sense ‘be awake’. The addition of a new semantic component, ‘attention’, to ‘remain awake intentionally’ gives rise to ‘be on the alert’, ‘keep watch’.

The basic, original meaning of WATCH ‘be awake’ became obsolete in the seventeenth century, and in this sense of ‘wakefulness’ WATCH only survives in Present-day English in special cases: for purposes of devotion:

To fast or *watch* more than the rest is self-will and vain-glory (W. K. L., *Clarke Basil*, vi, 89)

or to sit up beside an ill person to render help or comfort (or a dead body):

He *watched* all night at the bedside of a sick child

I *watched* late with him [a brother on his deathbed] this night (J. Evelyn, *Diary*, 6 Mar. 1670)

At the end of the Middle English period WATCH arises as a transitive verb and, from that moment on, its complementation begins to have importance to conform the successive meanings. When the verb is transitive, its complementation interacts with its semantic features and gives rise to different subsenses, which occur in different structures. The different types of complementation that may follow help to give shape to the new meaning and to disambiguate the resultant polysemy. It is our aim to show that, once WATCH becomes a transitive verb, the different subsenses it acquires occur with a different complementation. The interaction between syntax and semantics thus comes to the foreground.

In the Middle English period WATCH as an activity verb can still be intransitive and appear without complementation, with the meaning ‘keep watch’ to take action at the right moment. However, it can also be transitive and appear with explicit complementation. The object is the focus of attention and within the visual control of the subject. Whereas the meaning of the intransitive verb ‘keep watch’ involves participation of all senses, in the transitive verb sight begins to have prominence over the other senses, since the object is within the visual scope of the subject.

And they *watched* the gates day and night to kill him (*Acts*, 009: 024)

Before the Middle English period, WATCH is intransitive and used in the sense of being alert for a real or hypothetical danger, and the subject is ready to take action. In ME the presence of the object may cause a shift of intention in the subject, which could then be attack or guard. At the beginning of the Modern English period it can also be used with the particle ‘over’, and, as the following examples show, we can have both senses in the same sentence:

Like I have *watched over* them, to pluck up, and to break down, and to throw down, to destroy, and to afflict; so I will *watch over* them to build and to plant, saith the Lord (*Jeremiah*, 031: 028)

I will *watch over* them for evil, and not for good (*Jeremiah*, 044: 027)

Wherefore a lion out of the forest shall slay them, and a wolf of the evenings shall spoil them, a leopard shall *watch over* their cities (*Jeremiah*, 005: 006)

As heerdmen ever *watchynge over* the flocke of our lorde Jesus (W. de W., *The Pilgrimage of Perfection*, 247b)

Therefore, the subject can have two different intentions with respect to the object: either do harm (negative attitude):

Hauing once this iuyce Ile *watch* Titania, when she is asleepe, And drop the liquor of it in her eyes (W. Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, II, i)

Saul also sent messengers unto David’s house, to *watch* him, and to slay him in the morning (*Samuel*, 019: 011)

or prevent harm (positive attitude):

But who would *watch* her with a mother's tenderness (M. Wollstonecraft, *Maria or the Wrongs of Woman*, Ch I)

This ambiguity, which is still present in the current meanings of WATCH, can only be solved by the extralinguistic context. The addressee's pragmatic knowledge of the real world will determine whether the verb is used in the sense of protection or surveillance in order to attack or do harm. For example, when we hear 'There is a policeman watching outside the house', we understand that he is looking for someone who is suspicious. But in the sentence 'She can't free herself of the idea that someone's watching her all the time', WATCH conveys the idea of danger or attack.

As we have just said, there is a point in the evolution of WATCH when the grammatical object is within the scope of vision of the subject and sight becomes more and more prominent. At the same time there may be weakening of the meaning 'keep watch', that is to say, 'surveillance'. At first, in early Modern English, the two semantic elements 'vision' and 'surveillance' are both present and closely linked, involving continuous control, as the following example shows. There is great ambiguity in the sense of WATCH.

And they *watched* him, whether he would heal him on the sabbath day; that they might accuse him (*Mark*, 003: 002)

Gradually the element 'surveillance' will disappear in the new subsense, 'keep in sight', 'keep somebody or something in view to observe any actions, movements or changes that may occur' (OED). The subject's intention is not to attack, or protect, but to know what is going on. In this sense WATCH is a verb of perception, and it is always transitive, since a grammatical object, either implicit or explicit, is required. This meaning, which is the last one to appear, is the core one in Present Day English:

I *watch* thee from the quiet shore;

Thy spirit up to mine can reach (A. Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, lxxxv)

In this example, the meaning 'keep under surveillance' has completely disappeared.

In a parallel way to the rise of the sense 'keep in sight' there is also a shift in the type of object. When the meaning of WATCH is 'keep watch, keep under surveillance', the object is a Noun Phrase which refers to an individual, a person or thing:

Than he *watched* your Chambre bryght,

With men of armes hardy and wyght (*The Squyr of lowe Degree*, 997)

However, when WATCH arises as a verb of perception, its complementation corresponds to what Dik (1991: 317) classifies as 'immediate perception of state of affairs' by an individual, that is to say, the subject perceives not the individual itself, but what is going on, something that the individual is doing or something that is happening, i.e. a state of affairs. For this reason, we generally have animate objects, or NP implying processes:

These two girls had been above an hour in the place, happily employed in visiting an opposite milliner, *watching* the sentinel on guard, and dressing a salad and cucumber (J. Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, Ch 39)

Thus long have we stood to *watch* the fearefull bending of thy knee (W. Shakespeare, *Richard II*, III, iii)

Gazing at the moon, and *watching* its motion (M. Wollstonecraft, *Maria or the Wrongs of Woman*, Ch II)

Therefore, WATCH cannot be used in the sense 'look at' with an inanimate object when there is no movement or expectation of state of affairs. This explains the ungrammaticality of sentences such as "Watch the pencil" or "He's watching the chair".

When WATCH is used as a perception verb, (but this is not the case when it is used with the meaning 'keep watch') there gradually appears an X Complement in the complementation (bare infinitive / present participle):

Mary *watched* the boatman leave the house (Mrs. Gaskell, *Mary Barton*, xxxi)

Lying upon my back, I *watched* the clouds forming (J. Tyndall, *The Glaciers of the Alps*, I. xxv)

The X Complement corresponds to Dik's 'state of affairs', and indicates what is going on (*the boatman leave the house, the clouds forming*). In this linguistic context WATCH is an object control verb since 'the boatman', which is the Subject of the X Complement, 'leave the house' in the first example is also the Object of the main verb. This construction with an object-controlled verb complement implies time overlap with the verb of perception. The states of affairs referred to in the complementation (*the boatman leave the house, the clouds forming*) have to be simultaneous with the activity *watch*, otherwise the X Complement cannot be used.

When WATCH has arisen as a verb of perception, and this is the only case when it can appear with an X Complement, it is followed by a bare infinitive, not the *to*-infinitive. When in the Middle English period the *to*-infinitive became the most frequent form, the verbs of perception, *see, feel, hear*, and even those borrowed from French, continued to appear with the bare infinitive, even though with most other verbs the bare infinitive clearly lost ground to the *to*-infinitive. According to Fischer (1992: 317), from Middle English on, the bare infinitive is found when the matrix verb is grammaticalised, that is to say, has little semantic content - the case of the modals, for example, and with verbs of perception. The verbs of perception keep their lexical meaning but normally take the bare infinitive. Fischer explains this exception to the general rule saying that this is because the actions expressed by the perception verb and the infinitive are simultaneous, there is identity of the tense domain. There must be time overlap between the observation of the event and the action that is observed.

After having become a verb of visual perception, the meaning of WATCH was metaphorically extended to that of mental perception. In this case, the meaning is then, not keep something physically in sight, but keep something in mental view:

He *watched* th'ideas rising in her mind (A. Pope, *Rape of the Lock*, III)

This metaphorical extension is frequent with verbs of vision. *See*, for example, is another verb of physical perception whose meaning has been metaphorically extended to mental activity. Consider, too, the abstract sense that we find in verbs such as *look down on, look up to, look forward to, oversee* or *foresee*. The basis for this metaphorical extension is probably the close relationship between the sense of sight and knowledge, that is to say, mental, intellectual vision is considered very similar to physical vision. There is also the fact that data are normally obtained through sight.

As a conclusion, we would like to lay emphasis on two things:

1. The core meaning of present-day WATCH, keep in sight, arose in the early Modern English period, (when a grammatical object was already present) with the interaction of new semantic components with the ones inherited from the Middle English period.
2. There has been a gradual change in the complementation as well as in the meaning of this verb, and these changes have been parallel and interconnected.

Originally, in Old English, WATCH, which had the meanings 'be, remain awake' and 'keep watch', was intransitive. At the end of the Middle English period, however, WATCH with the sense 'keep watch', 'keep a lookout' began to appear with an NP, which was the object of surveillance or protection, and consequently became a transitive verb. At the beginning of the ModE period, the original meaning 'be awake' became obsolete, except in highly restricted contexts: for purposes of devotion or beside a sick or dead person. On the other hand, in the transitive WATCH the semantic element 'surveillance' gradually disappears in a new submeaning, and at the same time the sense of sight begins to have predominance over the other senses. The resulting meanings of WATCH, which we could paraphrase as 'keep a lookout' and 'keep looking at', are both transitive, but have a different type of NP as grammatical object. In the case of 'keep

in sight', 'keep looking at', the object must refer to a state of affairs and can be followed by an X Complement specifying this state of affairs. The grammatical object of WATCH with the meaning 'keep a lookout' can be an individual (person or thing) and cannot be followed by an X Complement. The historical development of WATCH has thus shown the fuzziness of word meanings and the close links between syntax and semantics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dik, S. C. & Hengeveld, K. 1991: The hierarchical structure of the clause and the typology of perception-verb complements. *Linguistics*. 29: 231-259.
- Fischer, O. 1992: Syntax. > Hogg, R. ed. 1992: 207-408.
- Hogg, R. ed. 1992: *The Cambridge History of the English Language*. Vol II, Cambridge, CUP.
- Kilgarriff, A. 1995: Inheriting Polysemy. > Saint-Dizier, P. and Viegas, E. eds. 1995: 319-335.
- Lakoff, G. 1987: *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Saint-Dizier, P. and Viegas, E. eds. 1995: *Computational Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Sweetser, E. E. 1990: *From Etymology to Pragmatics*. Cambridge, CUP.

* * *

Seventeenth-Century Jurisprudence and Eighteenth-Century Lexicography: Sources for Johnson's Notion of Authority

John Stone

UNIVERSITY OF BARCELONA

INTRODUCTION

This paper attempts an investigation of two sustained similes (language is like law/language is like liberty) in Samuel Johnson's lexicographical tracts. Law, language, and liberty are here treated as key concepts in the continuing appeal that eighteenth-century Englishmen made to a mythologised English past, an appeal at whose rhetorical centre lies constitutional law in history — what J. G. A. Pocock calls the “myth of the confirmations” of 1066, 1215, 1628, and 1688 (232). I argue that the intellectual origins of Johnsonian standard English lie in Sir Edward Coke's early seventeenth-century restatement of common law doctrine and terms. Salient issues are common law's need to give an account of its antiquated, medieval vocabulary and its place in the constitutional conflict of the seventeenth century.

The chief *loci* of such similes are Johnson's *Plan of a Dictionary* and *Dictionary*; they have to do with the sort of standard English there discussed. Before asking what Johnson thought of the idea of a standard, one must, proceeding in one direction, ask what he thought of English, and what he thought about language. Proceeding in another direction, the necessary questions have to do with the ways in which things are governed or regulated.

Even so provisional an essay in the history of debates over fixing a standard for English would be incomplete without a Continental background. The Accademia della Crusca was founded in 1552, its chief aim being the purification of the language. It is notable that its heraldic device was a sieve. All five founders were noblemen, members of the Florentine Academy. A dictionary composed on Tuscan principles was published in 1612, at Venice. This work, in addition to espousing one region's literary dialect over the others', promoted the notion that the fourteenth century had been the golden age of the Italian language. Its attempt to fix a standard for a modern European language was admired and emulated.

With the establishment of the Académie française in 1635 the history of institutions, and of discipline as derived from the apparatus of the state, extends in a new way to writing. Cardinal Richelieu, while never a member of the Academy, was the mover behind plans to grant royal letters patent to a group of literary men who had met since 1629 to discuss literary topics. When pre-revolutionary academies were done away with in 1793, the Académie française perished with them, but it was reconstituted two years later as part of the Institut de France.

The purpose for which the Academy was founded, as set forth in its statutes, was the purification of the French tongue. A civic office had taken the place of a religious one, and the new *Nihil Obstat* that the Académie was empowered by the Crown to dispense referred to purity not of doctrine but of style. To this end the Academy members were pledged to produce a dictionary, a grammar, a treatise on rhetoric, and one on poetry. The dictionary, when it appeared in 1694, secured the state's approbation of some words and recognition for some meanings. Other words, other meanings were proscribed.

The French Academy had authorities for its dictionary: writers from a golden age whose usage was to be revered. These authorities are the hidden text of the Academy's dictionary as published in 1694; citations were the basis for philological labour but were not themselves included.

A catalogue of the most approved authors could not provide examples of many words from trade, manufacture and science, and so they were left out. The Italian example is more curious: since the time of its foundation, it had been the task of the Accademia della Crusca to supervise the development of the vernacular as a literary medium. Having determined that words for the *Vocabulario* were to be drawn from a canon of literary works and having found that no such works could be found to furnish important terms of skilled work and commerce, the Accademia commissioned one of its members, the poet and playwright Michelangelo Buonarroti the Younger, to add to the canon. He wrote the comedy *La Fiera* (1618) to supply the want. Johnson cites Buonarroti's efforts and remarks that the exclusive criterion that had made *La Fiera* necessary had been subsequently somewhat relaxed (453).

Inevitably, these notions of a fixed, standard written language had their influences on England. Impulses towards standard English come, explicitly, from three camps. Defoe, Swift, and other writers were keen on an academy because they saw civic prose as part of the job of the professional writer. They wanted a medium that would be understood as easily as possible by readers of different backgrounds, regions, and ages. In their and other proposals for an instituted authority the examples of the French and Italian language reform are always present. English writers portray English as corrupted (since the Civil War, or the Restoration, depending on the writer's political sympathies) and little refined.

Baconians and scientists (John Wilkins, John Glanvill) already had one model of "normalised" prose — the close, naked, natural style that Thomas Sprat describes, advocates, and hopes to exemplify, and that Glanvill, in his revisions of his own work, does everything to illustrate. The emphasis was on the invariable, on meanings that could be trusted to stay put with the passing of years, and on a style that was (so they thought) no style at all inasmuch as it eschewed the faddish and the fashionable. The invented ideograms of Wilkins's "real character" are an attempt to carry those principles further than English itself would allow.

In England there are two well-discussed movements towards standard English, and in France a powerful, prestigious model. Yet Johnson, by the time he composes the "Preface", has opted for a reasonable, arguable standard English based on precedents whose interpretation may be disputed and whose value may vary with the years. Indeed, Johnson states that common usage is, for the greater part of the English vocabulary, an authority equal to that of the authors cited, the precedent that stands before the precedents. Moreover, Johnson tells us he has had to sift through seemingly contradictory precedents to discover, by induction, the "decrees of custom"; he draws an analogy between the English constitution (part of the common law, rather than the other way around) and the English language. He connects both to English liberty.

The terms of his argument, the techniques of his lexicography, the resignation that he makes to a "degeneration" that can be retarded but never repelled, his resistance to a Continental model, his balancing of quotable authorities and common usage: all seem echoes of the common law. In Johnson's own similes for a normalised language there contend two notions of how the law might function: a codified, purified law built from and interpreted according to reason; and a law amassed from the particulars of experience, developed by a complex mixture of analogy and custom. He chooses the latter.

How Johnsonian standard English is to be governed might best be extracted from the *Plan of an English Dictionary* in the form of an image: two magnets govern the space of linguistic decision-making, not by attraction but repulsion. Let us imagine two fixed magnets the negative poles of which point to one to another. One pole is the authority of custom:

So we usually *ascribe* good but *impute* evil; yet neither of these words, nor, perhaps, of any in our licentious language is so established as not to be often reversed by the correctest writers. I shall therefore, since the rules of style, like those of law, arise from precedents often repeated, collect the testimonies on both sides, and

endeavour to discover and promulgate the decrees of custom, who have so long possessed, whether by right or by usurpation, the sovereignty of words. (444)

That this role corresponds to that of a common-law judge working on a point of case law is clear from the terms Johnson chooses to describe his expected actions. This pole asserts that custom governs words, and its push would seem to vary on the part of the lexicographer's task undertaken at any given moment. As this passage appears in the section on defining, one might assume that definition is governed more by custom, less by the other pole.

Censure stands opposed to custom:

Barbarous or impure words and expressions may be branded with some note of infamy, as they are carefully to be eradicated wherever they are found... If this part of the work can be well performed it will be equivalent to the proposal made by Boileau to the academicians, that they should review all their polite writers, and correct such impurities as might be found in them, that their authority might not contribute, at any distant time, to the depravation of the language. (445)

Again, the judge of purity is Johnson as appointed to the bench by Chesterfield, who is very high up in the government of the state. The conferring of authority by such a procedure is not equivalent to the royal letters patent procured for the French Academy by Richelieu, but Johnson never comes closer to an invocation of the French model.

Between these poles words fall like metal shavings, and one must ask whether the words governed are so governed forever, or merely for now; whether the *Dictionary* is to fix a standard English, or describe a standard English already existing.

In the *Plan* two models overlap: the first, which is confidently prescriptivist, is that of a correct standard of meaning and usage from which deviations are to be proscribed; the second mixes desire for a standard with a description of those features of English that preclude a fixed or frozen standard. The latter model is one of resigned prescriptivism. Johnson at the beginning and the end of the *Plan* makes Continental claims about fixing and ascertaining the language, which in the middle of the *Plan* he sometimes flirts with, sometimes rejects. Johnson the confident prescriptivist has his moments of rhetorical triumph, where he compares his task to that of the Romans bringing law to the ancient Britons (445), and in the section on pronunciation (441). Pronunciation he wants fixed and thinks fixable — “since one great end of this undertaking is to fix the English language, great care will be taken to determine the accentuation” (441). Johnson's treatment of every other field — orthography, grammar, syntax, definitions, register, and choice of authorities — contains some disclaimer, some moment in which Johnson either questions his own authority or leaves doubts as to the extent to which a language may be fixed. Everywhere he endeavours, but he does not always promise to succeed. In orthography he is nearly as confident as in pronunciation; in syntax and grammar, he thinks a standard that adheres to reason and aspires to permanence too much to ask. To describe participles and plural inflections is, by Johnson's admission, to describe something that will not last:

And who upon this survey can forbear to wish, that these fundamental atoms of our speech might obtain the firmness and immutability of the primordial and constituent particles of matter, that they might retain their substance ... But this is a privilege which words are scarcely to expect; for, like their author, when they are not gaining strength, they are generally losing it. Though art may sometimes prolong their duration, it will rarely give them perpetuity. (442)

Similarly, the “syntax of this language is too inconsistent to be reduced to rules” (443). Syntax and grammar, then, are two instances of Johnson's resigned prescriptivism: some aspects of language cannot be fixed or ascertained, and Johnson will provide only terms of debate (issues at hand and a line of precedents in the case of syntax) or descriptions of what has been “thrown together by negligence, by affection, by learning, or by ignorance” (442). We have the concession that some rules are derived chiefly from common usage, that common usage changes, that languages are formed and deformed in amidst the spittle and wind of the human mouth. Custom, conceived of as a thing in evolution, is at least as powerful as analogy or reason; where custom is

inconsistent, one looks to precedents and searches, inductively, for the hint of a rule. At times “it is not in our power to have recourse to any established law of speech,” and “we must remark how the writers of former ages have used the same word, and consider whether [the suspect writer] can be acquitted of impropriety, upon the testimony of [another writer]” (443) - *id est*, that some questions must be referred to a wider court.

The two models discussed above appear again in the “Preface” to Johnson’s *Dictionary* as published in 1755, where they overlap in a less confusing manner. Sledd and Kolb date the “Preface” between April 1753 and the summer of 1754 (110), after Johnson and his Scottish amanuenses had been at work for six or seven years. The “Preface” is nearly half as long again as the *Plan*; it is neither addressed to Chesterfield nor signed. It was published at the beginning of the *Dictionary* when the latter finally appeared in the spring of 1755. Its unmarked structure is as follows: introduction; orthography; pronunciation; etymology; word choice and classification; grammar (one paragraph in the “Preface”, whereas the *Dictionary* contained a “Grammar”); defining; authorities; syntax; and assessment of the labour the *Dictionary* had represented, its achievements and limitations.

Other prefaces and advertisements were appended to later editions, but the “Preface” was not replaced, nor revised. In the “Preface to the Octavo Edition of the English Dictionary”,¹ Johnson made the only statement that might be construed as a claim that his work was a standard:

Having been long employed in the study and cultivation of the English language, I lately published a Dictionary like those compiled by the academies of Italy and France, for the use of such as aspire to exactness of criticism, or elegance of style. (455)

Full-blooded Continental prescriptivism is here tempered by the qualifying phrase describing dictionary-users whose desire it is to attain proficiency in the twin skills of reading and writing. It is for their sake that prescriptivism is not abandoned but adapted; there remain “improprieties and absurdities, which it is the duty of the lexicographer to correct or proscribe” (446).

The whole first section is a mixed apology, polemical tract on orthography and general exposition of Johnson’s linguistic ideas. The “Preface” begins by making clear that experience and analogy are the first tools in English dictionary-making, “general grammar” being of little use. Analogy impels him to spell according to etymology; experience compels him to make exceptions. Analogy and ancestor worship require a return to some earlier spellings, but experience insists that “*words are the daughters of the earth, and that things are the sons of heaven*” (447). Words have changed because they are produced by human work, which is the imperfect forming of an imperfect thing. Once an imperfection has settled into place and entered into general use, it is best not to disturb it, however incongruent with rules of phonetics, or with the word’s own history. Johnson repeats that “for the law to be *known*, is of more importance than to be *right*” (447).

Some sentiments expressed in the *Plan* are repeated in the “Preface”. Again, in Johnson’s treatment of orthography, there appears a defence of established practice (Johnson asks that innovators respect “the orthography of their fathers” [447]), a warning against change and an advocacy of constancy. “I have attempted few alterations,” Johnson admits, “and among those few, perhaps the greater part is from the modern to the ancient practice.” He is obliged to pick and choose among precedents, some fresher than others. Here are no reforms: no spelling unsupported by citations can displace a spelling commonly found. Where common usage varies, Johnson takes sides. Where it does not, “I have been often obliged to sacrifice uniformity to custom; thus I write, in compliance with a numberless majority, *convey* and *inveigh*” (447).

¹ The octavo edition was an abridgement that retained the names of the authorities quoted in the folio edition: the quotations themselves were omitted. It appeared in an edition of 5,000 copies in 1756, the first of eight editions in Johnson’s lifetime. While scholarly interest has traditionally focused on the folio *Dictionary* (of which Johnson only substantially revised the fourth edition, published in 1773), the best-selling octavo edition is by far the more important monument in the history of the book trade.

Emphasis on the citations, promised in the *Plan*, is delivered in the “Preface” and strengthened. “The solution of all difficulties, and the supply of all defects, must be sought in the examples” (444). Whatever accent there had been on correcting faults has been leavened with doubts, lightened — one senses — with a shift of responsibility from Johnson to his sources. “Most men think indistinctly, and therefore cannot speak with exactness... This uncertainty is not to be imputed to me, who do not form, but register the language” (452).

Fixing pronunciation is now reduced to marking as distinct from the norm the stress placed by poets whose accentuation varies from the customary. There seems no effort to distinguish the accent of one region or class. All decisions taken on other matters may be appealed: “the orthography which I recommend is still controvertible; the etymology which I adopt is uncertain, and perhaps frequently erroneous” (452). Any hope to provide every word “a definition strictly logical” is dashed, or proved “the dreams of a poet doomed to wake a lexicographer” (452). The dictionary can neither embalm, nor perfect, nor exactly describe the language.

In the *Plan* Johnson had taken the academies to task, not for promising a refuge from mutability for their tongues, but for thinking any language (or dictionary) capable of perfection (442). In the “Preface” he describes their activities with images of policing; academies are to “guard avenues, to retain fugitives, and repulse intruders” (453). Their sort of law is impossible to enforce, for “sounds are too volatile and subtle for legal restraints” (453).

While conceding that we cannot restrain new words or meanings of particular words from coming into the language, but Johnson thinks it possible to defend — “legally” — English style. Cheek by jowl in two of the closing paragraphs of the “Preface” are a rousing attack on what an academy would mean for English and a rousing call to choose the path of an evolving English as it evolves. After distinguishing “the single stones of the building” from “the order of the columns”, Johnson makes it clear that he is a prescriptivist with respect to the latter: “Tongues, like governments, have a natural tendency to degeneration; we have long preserved our constitution, let us make some struggles for our language” (454).

The key to this key passage is the introduction of “English liberty” to the running comparison between how languages and realms are governed. Full treatment of this point will require a discussion in detail of Johnson’s consistent use of legal terms, legal images, and legal logic in the *Plan* and the “Preface”; of the “history of English liberty” as imagined by common-law writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries will provide the centre for much of the discussion. For the moment, it suffices to note that the concept opposed to “academies” is precisely “English liberty”:

No book was ever turned from one language into another, without imparting something of its native idiom; this is the most mischievous and comprehensive innovation; single words may enter by thousands, and the fabric of the tongue continue the same; but new phraseology changes much at once; it alters not the single stones of the building, but the order of the columns. If an academy should be established for the cultivation of our style; which I, who can never wish to see dependence multiplied, hope the spirit of English liberty will hinder or destroy... (454)

Johnson invokes English liberty and the English constitution; he takes a pretty dramatic stand on behalf of the “order of the columns” without stating outright what order, which columns. The English constitution is a set of traditions as to who is who and how they should get along; the English constitution is what gets done, just as style is what gets written and then read (and later taught). Johnson is as much a supporter of notions of correctness as he is of the basic political conventions of his day, but the correctness he supports is, at its base, a set of relations between private individuals and the decisions that govern those relations, decisions taken by judges acknowledged by the same private individuals. The law of the English constitution is the result of court decisions as to the rights of private individuals (Paton 277). The chief distinction between language and law is that the private individual may ignore the judgments handed down with respect to language and risk only a corrector’s pen.

In summary: what the *Plan* promises is more ambitious than what the “Preface” says the *Dictionary* delivers. In the *Plan* there is more talk of fixing the language, in the “Preface” of displaying it. Neither stage of the project shows hopes for achieving a Continental standard, though there is more admiration for the academies’ work in the *Plan*, less in the “Preface”. The “Preface” is hostile to the idea of an English academy, and it accords an even greater power to common usage than is granted in the *Plan* — the power, for example, to make a word obsolete (454). Neither text expounds linguistic principles from which a standard is forever to be derived deductively. Both adduce their standard from custom, past usage, reason and analogy. In neither essay does Johnson think language can be made immune to change; in the “Preface” he makes a longer, more detailed and more moving admission to this effect. In his most conservative moment Johnson calls upon speakers of English to resist the “changes that we fear be thus irresistible,” as he considers it imperative that “we retard what we cannot repel, that we palliate what we cannot cure” (454). He means changes introduced by “illiterate writers” or via “frequency of translation” (454) — only two sources of change among perhaps nine so discussed.¹ That much change is to be neither welcomed nor feared, but observed as a part of custom, is more likely to seem Johnson’s last word on fixing the language:

Swift, in his petty treatise on the English language, allows that new words must sometimes be introduced, but proposes that none should be suffered to become obsolete. But what makes a word obsolete, more than a general agreement to forbear it? (454)

To review: Johnson’s philological techniques are a mixed bag including description of general usage, induction from a sometimes confusing, sometimes conflicting line of precedents, as well as analogy, grammar, and reason. Where past usage is not consistent, Johnson will let both sides have it out in a *controversia* and endeavour to discover and promulgate the decrees of custom. Final judgment is effectively suspended. The emphasis is on the probable rather than the certain.

The authority setting up a standard English, in the *Plan*, is vetted and assented to by Chesterfield; in the “Preface”, the emphasis is on liberty rather than on authority, there being a throwing back of authority onto the examples given in the *Dictionary* entries, and forward — by way of the emphasis on liberty — onto the reader. Authority resides in a body of principles slowly evolved by the decision of concrete cases.

Johnson makes the study and the governing of language, in the *Dictionary* and elsewhere, two stages along one path. How to study and how to “govern” English common law are equally but two aspects of the intellectual and political crisis of the seventeenth century. Seventeenth-century law leads to eighteenth-century lexicography by two routes: the former begins in the late Tudor period, when lawyers begin to call for a restatement of the law. It leads through Bacon to his great rival Coke, and thence to the Civil War. The latter begins with the multiplication of jurisdictions under the Tudors; its course will take us to a controversy over the sources of law, the power to delimit jurisdiction, and ultimately to questions of sovereignty. Beyond the Civil War and the Act of Settlement there lies a national myth, a system of beliefs about the conflict between Parliament and the Stuart kings, and therefore about Coke, the common lawyers, and their ancient constitution. Johnson, in his rousing defence of the English language and English basic law, either unwittingly renewed a one-hundred-and-fifty year-old connection or showed that in these matters, as in so many, his learning was astonishing.

THE VOCABULARY OF COMMON LAW

So many ancient terms and words drawn from the French are grown to be *vocabula artis*, vocables of art, so apt and significant to express the true sense of

¹ The other seven sources of change are conquests, migrations, study of foreign languages, commerce, increase of knowledge, levity and ignorance, and the passing away of customs.

the laws, and are so woven in the law themselves, as it is in a manner impossible to change them, neither ought legal terms to be changed. (Coke xxxix)

The stuff of English law is not, according to Frederick Pollock and F. W. Maitland, “just a mixture or compound of two old national laws” (80), of Edward the Confessor’s and William the Conqueror’s. The terminology, however, is mainly of French origin. To cite a few examples: the English terms proper to public law include earl, sheriff, king, queen, lords, knights, and shire; the French, parliament, statute, privy council, ordinance, commons, realm, sovereign, state, nation, the people, and citizens. In private law deeds, wills, and bonds are English; contract, agreement, debt, bill, partner, guarantee, property, lien, marriage, guardian, infant, and ward are French. If we are arraigned, the charge may be one of trespass, assault, battery, slander, treason, arson or larceny. Felonies are distinct from misdemeanours. Proceedings involve courts, justices, judges, jurors, counsel, attorneys, clerks, parties, plaintiffs, defendants, actions, suits, claims, demands, indictments, counts, declarations, pleadings, evidence, verdicts, convictions, sentences, appeals, reprieves, and pardons, all of them French. Only witness, writs and oaths are English. Most of the vocabulary of policing and punishment is French; only outlaws and the gallows are English, and they are both things of the past.¹

From the eleventh to the sixteenth century, French was chief among the languages of the law. Latin, by the time of Henry II, had become the language of the highest official record-keeping, of the king’s acts and his court’s judgments; and of the most formal classes of legal instruments. French came to be used for the parliament and statute rolls, and for pleading. Pollock and Maitland date the undisputed predominance of French from 1166, when a decree was issued giving “to every man dispossessed of his freehold a remedy to be sought in a royal court, a French-speaking court” (84). French remained the language the law spoke until the mid-fourteenth century, when English was decreed for pleading.

The records of the English legislature were kept entirely in French until 1425, and partly in French until 1503. Perhaps more importantly, treatises on English jurisprudence were written in French from the thirteenth century on, and the law reports on arguments and decisions known as the Year Books — the most important record of medieval case law — were in French. As late as 1612 Sir John Davies, then Attorney-General for Ireland, was defending law French, whose replacement by any other language would, he thought, result in a serious loss to the law’s intelligibility (Pocock 34).

Coke’s “vocables of art” were thus, both for statute and for case law, old words often to be found embedded in what was no longer the language of state. Aspirants to the bar achieved mastery of legal terminology “not by reading books but by observing actual pleadings conducted in the courtroom” (Conley 134). The teaching methods of the Inns of Court presupposed some training in rhetoric; and the twice-yearly Reading, the major task undertaken by students, was in part exegetical (Vickers 40). That some were able to take full advantage of this educational programme is evident from Coke’s works and Bacon’s ambitions: both men thought themselves well enough trained to restate the law.

COMMON LAW UNDER THE TUDORS

Tudor law was a complex mass of almost infinite particulars, a mix of modern and ancient legislation, of accumulated lore, decisions, and maxims: terms, precepts, precedents, and statutes from many centuries co-existed without any codification. Bacon summarised the situation thus:

¹. The word lists and history have been taken from so many sources that I will limit my citations to a short, basic bibliography: for the vocabulary of law and order, courts of law, legal work, the police, crime, prison, and punishment see Tom McArthur’s *Longman Lexicon of the English Language* 122-41; for specific etymologies, see Oppé; for accounts of lexical change in professional registers in the Middle English period, see Strang 213-81 and Williams 65-90; for a legal historian’s perspective, see Allen.

Certain it is that our laws, as they now stand, are subject to great uncertainties, and variety of opinion, delays, and evasions: whereof ensueth (1) that the multiplicity of and length of suits is great. (2) That the contentious person is armed, and the honest subject wearied and oppressed. (3) That the judge is more absolute; who, in doubtful cases, hath a greater stroke and liberty. (4) That the chancery courts¹ are more filled, the remedy of law being often obscure and doubtful. (5) That the ignorant lawyer shroudeth his ignorance of law in that doubts are so frequent and many. (1874, VI, 64)

The legal historian W. S. Holdsworth records there having been a project before Parliament in 1593 “to enter into a general amendment of the state of laws, and to reduce them to more brevity and certainty” (V, 485). Bacon’s own proposal for a restatement of the law was “of a sort not unlike that which Justinian applied to Roman law” (Holdsworth V, 487). It was not to have been a logical code, for “I dare not advise to cast the law into a new mould... a perilous innovation” (Bacon 1874, VI, 67). Nor would it have done away with the authority English law gives to reported cases. Rather, Bacon’s proposal entailed streamlined digests of case law and statute law, omitting obsolete and overruled cases and resolving difficult points. The basis of case law — the Year Books and other judicial reports — was to have been preserved in libraries, for the digests would not have wholly superseded them. Three other works were to have been composed at the same time as the digests: a textbook on private law, another on general principles and procedure, and a book of terms. This last was planned as “a dictionary both of ancient and modern words, arranged, not according to the order of the alphabet, but on the principle of putting together words relating to the same thing” (Holdsworth V, 488).² Bacon stresses that his dictionary was to include “not only the exposition of the terms of law, but of the words of all ancient records and precedent” (1874, VI, 70).

Bacon never finished this scheme. It was left to Coke to publish the first of his *Institutes* in 1628, two years after Bacon’s death. Bacon had been forced from office in 1621, and Coke from the Bench five years before; both busied their retirement with writing, but Coke lived long enough to draft the Petition of Right, and to lead the parliamentary opposition to Charles I. English common law bears his stamp rather than his rival’s. If Bacon had lived another ten years the course of the law would have been more analytical, less historical; yet conditions were right for either project to prosper:

[The sixteenth century] was a century in which there had been enormous changes in men’s religious and political ideas, and an enormous mass of legislation directed

¹ The Court of Chancery administered the rules of equity as opposed to the rules of common law; equity denotes the mitigation of the ordinary rules of law where they would operate harshly in a particular case. It is at the mercy of a Chancery decision in the case of *Jarndyce v. Jarndyce* that Richard Carstone and Ada Clare find themselves in Dicken’s *Bleak House*.

² There had been a glossary of obsolete ecclesiastical and legal terms, Sir Henry Spelman’s *Archaeologus*, the first volume of which was published in 1624. More significant is *The Interpreter* (1607), a dictionary of legal terms by John Cowell. Cowell, who had been Regius Professor of Civil Law at Cambridge from 1594, resigned his chair in 1611 after the House of Commons ordered his book burnt by the common hangman. He is supposed to have advanced the opinion that the prerogative of the English crown was absolute, and that the king only consulted parliament by suspending his absolute power to make laws, which was otherwise inviolate. According to the DNB, *The Interpreter* was disavowed by James I. Both Bacon and Coke are said to have played some part in Cowell’s downfall, Coke’s hostility being expressed in references to ‘Dr Cowheel’. Cowell’s original was reissued in 1637 and 1658. A copy of the edition of 1607 is to be found in the Supreme Court of Canada Library, and there have been a number of modern facsimile editions. Editions from 1684 onwards (1701, 1709, and 1727) are expurgated, and the key entries on ‘king’, ‘parliament’, ‘prerogative’, ‘recoveries’, and ‘subsides’ greatly altered. One of these bowdlerised editions was used by Johnson in preparing the list of authorities for the *Dictionary*, and a cursory inspection of the entries for both common and civil law terms suggests that Cowell is the most frequently cited legal author. However, the 1684 edition already bears the stamp of Coke’s and Hale’s views on sovereignty, law, and the doctrine of precedent: the 1607 entry on ‘parliament’ argues that the king is above positive law, and cites Aristotle; that of 1684 describes the assembly of the king and the three estates of the realm, and cites Coke’s *Institutes*.

to settling the nation on the basis of these new ideas. [It] was therefore needed to bring the medieval basis on which the law rested into harmony with the new situation. (Holdsworth V, 489)

The common law, antiquated by the drag of its own intellectual baggage and pushed to compete with the prerogative courts, “suffered from the serious defect of being politically weak in an age of keen political controversy” (Holdsworth V, 422). Yet the common law had undergone “a great hardening and consolidation” of its system of thought (Pocock 31), and lawyers held more tenaciously than ever that a native, insular, immemorial system of customs ruled those who ruled England. Because of its medievalism, the common law sanctioned political theories which were subject to ever greater challenges, and which were defended ever more strenuously. That any successful early seventeenth-century restatement of the common law would enjoy vast prestige and influence is evident: a strengthened common law was precisely the ally Parliament needed.

SIR EDWARD COKE'S *INSTITUTES*

A more extensive discussion of Coke's impact on constitutional law will be provided later in this paper. The present concern is his work on the vocabulary of English law. Holdsworth describes the first volume of the *Institutes* — a commentary on a treatise by the medieval jurist Littleton — as “a legal encyclopedia arranged on no plan, except that suggested by the words and sentences of Littleton” (V, 467). It is more properly an encyclopedic dictionary, for Coke introduces every full discussion of a point of law with a history and definition of the terms involved. “It is apparent,” writes Holdsworth, “that he considered himself somewhat of an authority on etymology” (V, 459). Coke, whose views were those of an Elizabethan jurist and did not evolve, meant to give sixteenth-century meaning to what were often feudal terms; to that end he had to trace words through centuries of statutes, treatises, and law reports, noting the changes and developments — semantic and legal — which had occurred since Littleton wrote. The learning implied is vast: “All Coke's reading in the older text books, in the Year Books, abridgements, and records, in modern legal writers, in general literature, are pressed into this service” (Holdsworth V, 467). Coke goes so far as to expound on Littleton's use of “etcetera” (17a).

Coke knew that his undertaking was in part philological; for Coke wrote, in English, a commentary on a text in French. He was a conservative jurist, but not so conservative as to continue a moribund tradition of English jurisprudence written in French. Typically, he applied common-law reasoning to his choice of language:

This part we have (and not without precedent) published in English, for that they are an introduction to the knowledge of the national law of the realm; a work necessary, and yet heretofore not undertaken by any. We have left our author to speak his own language, and have translated him into English, to the end that any of the nobility or gentry of this realm, or of any other estate or profession whatsoever, that will be pleased to read him and these *Institutes*, may understand the language wherein they are written.

I cannot conjecture that the general communicating of these laws in the English tongue can work any inconvenience, but introduce great profit, seeing that *Ignorantia juris no excusat*, Ignorance of the law excuseth not. And herein I am justified by the wisdom of a parliament; the words whereof be... (xxxviii-xxxix)

“Our author” is Littleton, and to write on him in English is justified by the precedent of other jurists, by two Roman maxims (another is coming, after a long quotation of an Elizabethan statute), and by reference to legislation.

Coke's technique is to present Littleton's text section by section, followed by commentaries on specific phrases. “The commentary itself is of extraordinary verbal minuteness... and of an equally remarkable fullness,” writes Holdsworth. “Every word, every doctrine, every legal institution, is explained” (V, 467). A large number of miscellaneous legal topics are grouped around the ostensible matter at hand: Littleton's treatment of the land law. An historically

important definition of common law thus appears appended to a discussion of the qualifying phrase “Insomuch that such title of prescription was at the common law” at the end of a section on tenure in burgage (115a). The somewhat jumbled effect is nonetheless taken by legal historians to be the dividing line between medieval and modern law, and the unquestioned foundation of the latter.¹

The *Institutes*’ philological commentaries comprise etymologies, citations, and a reasoned discussion of meaning. Though Coke does not take meaning to derive strictly from word origins, he is nonetheless careful to begin his “entries” with etymology. *Dower* is traced through French to the Latin² “*ex donatione, et est quasi donarium*” (31a); derivations are given both for the English “timber” and the French equivalent *marreim* or *marrein*, for “it is good to fetch them both from the original” (53a). Where rival derivations exist, they are described:

‘A le seneschal,’ (which we call a *steward*). *Seneschallus* is derived of *sein*, a place, and *schale*, an officer or governor. Some say that *sen* is an ancient word for justice, so as *seneschall* should signifie *officiarius justice*; and some say that steward is derived of *stewe* (that is) a place, and *ward*, that signifieth a keeper, warden or governor. (61b)

Bailife Coke treats similarly, defending a Saxon derivation against a Latin one (62a); in giving the etymology of “reeve” he describes processes of “contraction or rather corruption” by which the Anglo-Saxon original was altered (62b).

If etymologies are important, examples are authoritative. “Coke drew his precedents from very old sources,” writes Holdsworth,

— the older the source, he thought, the purer the law. He naturally represented the law of his own day as the logical outcome of the law laid down in his older sources. The newer decisions had not changed the law — they had merely developed or explained the truth to be found concealed in the older authorities. (V, 473)

Thus meaning is historically conditioned, and it is best understood as one moment in a process. To document such a process Coke sometimes inserts quotations from earlier jurists; though he more often provides a list of references to sources of all categories. Such references include abundant citations of case law.

Further illustration of these techniques would only serve to display the consistency with which they are applied. Two more observations might profitably be made: first, Coke often gives a contextual definition of a legal term after a more general discussion of its origin and meaning. The above-mentioned passage on “seneschal” continues thus:

But it is a word of many significations. In this place it signifieth an officer of justice, viz. a keeper of the courts, &c. *Fleta* describeth the office and duty of this officer at large most excellently. (61b)³

Second, Coke often begins his treatment of issues, whether semantic or legal, with a *partitio*, a division of the whole into parts. *Partitio* announces to the reader that a topic will be dealt with through a clearly defined scheme of headings and sub-headings. It comes into English law and Re-

1. “His writings form the starting-point of the modern as distinct from the medieval common law, because in them medieval rules are so harmonized with the modern additions, that they fitted the common law to guide the future legal developments, not only of England, but also of the many dominions which Englishmen were to found beyond the seas” (Holdsworth V, 424). Similar views of Charles Butler’s, Sir James Stephen’s and F.W. Maitland’s are quoted in Holdsworth.

2. It is interesting to note that the first quotation given for the legal sense of *dower* in the *OED* is from the thirteenth-century jurist Britton and is written in French.

3. The name of the author of the tract *Fleta, seu Commentarius Juris Anglicani* (circa 1285) is not known. Traditional legal scholarship has classified this treatise as an imitative commentary on and appendix to the work of Bracton.

naissance rhetoric in general from Cicero and Quintilian, and was a tactic law students were expected to employ in their Readings (Vickers 36-40). In Coke the *partitio* often means more careful definitions, and finer distinctions between senses of quite common words:

There be two kinds of waste, viz. voluntary and actual, and permissive. Waste may be done in houses, by pulling or prostrating them down, or by suffering the same to be uncovered, whereby the spars or rafter, plaunchers, or other timber of the house are rotten. (53a)

SIR EDWARD COKE'S *INSTITUTES*: CONCLUSION

I hope that my juxtaposition of Johnson's lexicographical and Coke's jurisprudential principles will have made a few parallels clear. To begin with, both value tradition even above reason, and both are extremely conservative. Holdsworth agrees with Coke's critics that much obsolete law was preserved because of the *Institutes* (488); and Blackstone, who nevertheless affirms that Coke's works are of intrinsic authority in a court of law, calls Coke's scholarship "not a little infected with the pedantry and quaintness of the times he lived in" (72). Johnson, of courses, rages against systematic change at every opportunity. And he equally opposed a sovereign executive power's ability to regulate systems of human knowledge: what Coke denied of the courts of royal prerogative, Johnson denied of the academies.

The desire to trace a word's meaning and usage from a root in another language, through centuries of evolution to a number of contemporary senses, is common to both authors. Johnson's reverence for common usage and dependence on precedent echo Coke's definition of the common law:

"Common law." The law of England is divided, as hath been said before, into three parts; 1, the common law, which is the most generall and ancient law of the realm; 2, statutes and acts of parliament; and 3, particular customs. I say particular, for if it be part of the generall custome of the realm, it is part of the common law.¹

The common law has no controler in any part of it, but the high court of parliament; and if it be not abrogated or altered by parliament, it remains still, as Littleton here saith. The common law appeareth in the statute of Magna Carta and other ancient statutes (which for the most part are affirmative of the common law) in the original writs, in judicial records, and in our bookes of termes and yeares. (115b)

One might even argue for a parallel between particular custom — custom established in one place or among one group — and Johnson's notion of peculiar senses found in the greatest writers. Both are there because they cannot easily be got around.

Another parallel has to do with the role of the judge or lexicographer. Although the system of precedents, the worship of induction, and the lack of a code in the Continental sense have led some to call common law "judge-made", judges merely declare custom to be operative law. Later judges may differ in their judgments from such precedents as are not binding; it is declared that the earlier sentence was not law rather than bad law (Blackstone 70). Custom does not derive its inherent validity from the authority of the court. Johnson in the "Preface" likewise asserts that his chief function is to "register the language" (452) rather than to form it. Before the examples in which the "solution of all difficulties, and the supply of all defects, must be sought" (451), Johnson — without forfeiting his own right to pass judgment — recommends that the reader be the judge, and leaves older authors' spelling unaltered (447).

¹ The same three-part treatment of English law is to be found in the eighteenth-century jurist William Blackstone (63-64) and in contemporary textbooks (Paton 51).

Law and language structured after experience and custom contrast with Continental attempts to find stabler authorities from which decisions about words and justice might be deduced. Just as the French and Italian academies sought means of making their vernaculars more fixed and thus more classical, there arose in the Renaissance a movement among European jurists to revive — or “receive” — classical Roman law in place of the feudal, customary law of the Middle Ages. The latter had not gone entirely un-Romanised, but the Reception consisted in an effort to return to the strict letter of classical texts, especially of the codification of Roman law ordered by Justinian. It is important to note that the Reception had some influence in England: Henry VIII founded Regius Professorships in civil law at Oxford and Cambridge, and the “civilians” formed the main corps of judges in the prerogative courts (Plucknett 44). On the Continent the Reception meant a desire to construct a legal system analogous to Euclidean geometry, with deductions being made by rigorous logic from unshakeable axioms (Paton 151); this desire produced the codes on the basis of which the legal system functions in France (1804), Germany (1900), and the majority of modern European states. Although a long course of decisions may have highly persuasive authority in Continental countries, in practice they are seldom sought out or referred to.¹

Johnson’s trust that English liberty would destroy an academy, and his call to the English to defend their language as they had their constitution, are here in their proper context. That eighteenth-century Englishmen associated the Reception with a loss of traditional rights is apparent in this comment, almost coeval with the *Dictionary*, of William Blackstone’s:

These are the laws that so vigorously withstood the repeated attacks of the civil law, which established... a new Roman empire over most of the states of the continent: states that have lost, and perhaps on that account, their political liberties; while the free constitution of England, perhaps upon the same account, has been rather improved than debased. (67)

English law, as an organic body of principles with an inherent power of growth and adaption to new circumstances, is profoundly historicist.² “Law,” writes Paton, “lays down what is convenient for that time and place” (68), and the basis for such laying down is present fact and past wisdom. Law may be unjust without ceasing to be law, just as language may impede rather than facilitate communication and still be language. Johnson’s paragraph³ against Adamic language in the “Preface” and a passage of Paton’s⁴ on the doctrine of the logical plenitude of the law use the same image to make much the same point, despite the difference in tone: experience is, as Coke said of the law, a kind of artificial reason, an emancipation from the intellectual atmosphere of any one age.

¹. I once had occasion to visit the law library of Bufete Cuatrecasas, a Barcelona-based law firm that is the largest in Spain. It seemed astonishingly small: the endless rows of law reports that English-speakers associate with such a setting were nowhere to be seen.

². Indeed, it was Coke’s favourite proverb that “[o]ut of the old fields must grow the new corn” (Holdsworth 479).

³. “Speech was not formed by an analogy sent from heaven. It did not descend to us in a state of perfection, but was produced by necessity, and enlarged by accident, and is therefore composed of dissimilar parts, thrown together by negligence, by affectation, by learning or by ignorance” (442).

⁴. “This theory is not only logically justifiable but historically true, for we cannot imagine the whole body of common law descending from heaven and containing, even implicitly, the developed modern distinctions” (151).

CONSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Coke's reputation among later common lawyers is hard to overestimate.¹ It is true that he was attacked by Thomas Hobbes — not a lawyer — and that the analytical school of Jeremy Bentham and John Austin took a dim view of his entirely historicist jurisprudence. Yet even Austin acknowledged that “Coke's mastery of the English legal system as a whole was equalled only by the great Roman jurists” (qtd. in Holdsworth V, 482). He is the sort of thinker referred to nowadays as “the founder of a discourse”.

That he should have attained such a status has as much to do with the critical moment in which his works were published as with their inherent merits. The second (on public law), third (on criminal law), and fourth (on jurisdiction) volumes of the *Institutes* were published posthumously, thirteen years after the above-described commentary on Littleton. In that year, 1641, the Long Parliament abolished the prerogative courts; a gap was created, as matters attended to by the Star Chamber, the court of Admiralty, and the court of Wards were thrown back to the common law courts. Coke's restatement of English common law filled that gap, and his writings were made the basis of modern English constitutional law. As stated above, the courts of royal prerogative were not re-established in 1660, and Pocock thus calls the Restoration, “the greatest triumph which the cult of the ancient constitution ever enjoyed” (156). Nor were Coke's constitutional doctrines to be questioned at all after 1689. Pocock, in *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law*, shows that Coke's historiography was not seriously challenged until the 1680s, when the challenger — Dr Robert Brady, keeper of the Tower records under James II — lost his position as a result of the Glorious Revolution. His successor, William Petyt, used arguments out of Coke and the mid-century Chief Justice Sir Matthew Hale to justify to the House of Lords the assertion that there had never been a contract between the king and the people for James II to break, because “the contract might be a most liberal and rational concept, but they [Petyt and his fellow commissioners] could not find it in the laws of England” (Pocock 230).² One of the Whig apologists, William Atwood, presented Locke's *Two Treatises* as laudable philosophy which the revolution's defenders need not use, because they could argue — as men had argued since 1628 — from history (Pocock 360).

By means of an appeal to immemorial custom, the English, uniquely, had, avoided the need to posit a single ancient individual by whose sovereign will the law was first made, and by whose remotest descendant — the reigning monarch — that law could be taken away. So the “balanced English constitution” meant, in the eighteenth century, a weakened executive, parliamentary power, and a degree of personal freedom that allowed discussion of political and other topics. By Johnson's time,

England ... had secured a native body of law continuously developed on its own lines, and the supremacy of the law over all persons, and even over the prerogative of the King. (Holdsworth, X, 5)

Johnson's analogy of the English language and the English constitution is tricky: language may be something we do, something we are, something we use or something in the midst of which we live, but it is not a fixed body of laws and principles according to which anything is governed. Even if language controls us, it cannot be drafted and submitted to referendum, nor amended; it has no articles whose letter and spirit may be variously interpreted by political leaders and judges. Language is neither as neatly organised nor as wilfully planned as is fundamental law.

It is as though Johnson were pleading parallel cases on behalf of a system of words and another of government. There is, in the *Dictionary*, some idea of propriety, of an order that is at least suitable if not right in the sense of just and morally good. There is a sense that language is an

¹ For a discussion of Coke's impact on non-legal thinkers by a non-legal historian, see the whole of Chapter V in Christopher Hill's *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution*.

² Hale's rebuttal to Hobbes's *Dialogue of Common Laws* had emphasised the common law as an evolving response to history whereas Coke had stressed its unchanged character; but both considered it immemorial and rooted in the precept that accumulated wisdom “should not be too readily subjected to the criticism and amendment of individual reason” (Pocock 171).

instrument, that such an instrument may be shaped to our purposes, that it may be judged more or less useful, more or less efficient. Despite the gifted apologist it found in Orwell, clarity has lost ground in our century: ambiguity, as a stylistic trait, commands greater interest. Anyone interested in clarity, in language that expresses rather than prevents or obscures thought (Orwell 365), will see that it has to be learned and worked at, that it comes of training. Language is more a thing governed than a scheme for governing, but if we speak instead of skill at language the two are intertwined.

Johnson calls for a defence of “our language” to parallel the long struggle for “our constitution” — and perhaps the twice-repeated word is the most important of the three. For the prescriptivist lexicographer, the linguistic equivalents of the country and its constitution both go into the dictionary; for the patriotic lexicographer there may exist “our” way of knowing and ordering things, applicable in equal measure to realms and words. Johnson’s concern is with national identity as rooted in tradition-bound or at least tradition-derived practices and knowledge whose validity depends, at least in part, on their fitting vaguely together.

“We have long preserved our constitution”: the emphasis is on continuity, on there not being a before and an after. English constitutional law was and is a part of the common law, and Johnson’s analogy depends for its effect on our understanding what common law was preserved, and how. Paton’s account of the meaning the phrase “rule of law” has enjoyed since 1689 is as follows: regular law is supreme over arbitrary power; officials must obey the law, and are subject to the jurisdiction of ordinary courts; and constitutional law is based on judicial decisions as to individual rights (277). Coke addresses each of these points in his writings. Thus, on the first count: in a debate Coke had with James I in November, 1608, the King said he was the supreme judge,

inferior judges his shadows and ministers... and the King may, if he please, sit and judge in Westminster Hall in any Court there, and call their Judgments in question. The King being the author of the Lawe is the interpreter of the Law. (qtd. in Holdsworth V, 428n)

Coke’s reply, as recorded in one of his own *Reports*,¹ was that the king could neither judge cases nor remove cases nor decide on disputed jurisdiction. James insisted that the application of such a doctrine meant that he would be under the law, which was treason to affirm. “Bracton² saith,” replied Coke, “*quod Rex non debet esse sub homine, sed sub Deo et lege*” (430). Cause for dismissal indeed.

On the second count, Coke maintained in the Parliament of 1628 that imprisonment by the king’s special command, or by the Council’s, was illegal (450). On the third, it is enough to recall that Coke presented to Parliament “An Act for the better securing of every freeman touching the propriety of his goods and the liberty of his person” (451). Its provisions became the Petition of Right.

Coke’s restatement was not a tidying up; he argued on the basis of medieval rules of law that are sometimes obscure and indefinite. That something that can only be groped at, that cannot be fixed, nor made into a code, should be the fount of English law has supposed a degree of flexibility

¹. “It seems likely that Coke, having attended several Council meetings at which the king expressed his views as to the subordination of the law to the king, gave a narrative in which he states the royal views, added authorities in favour of his own views, and threw it into a literary form which bears little resemblance to the spoken words used of this particular occasion.” (Holdsworth V, 430n).

². The medieval treatise entitled *De legibus et Consuetudinibus Angliae* is attributed to Bracton, but little is known of the author. Composed in the latter half of the thirteenth century, Bracton’s work represents a thorough survey of the rules of property and the proceedings in actions, supported by deduction or corroborated by the authority of adjudged cases. Bracton was looked up to as the foremost source of legal knowledge until the Renaissance.

and a capacity for development and expansion. That Johnson, who knew some law,¹ should have favoured a similarly custom- and precedent-bound, highly conservative scheme is not in the end surprising. The *Dictionary* proposes a balanced linguistic constitution, free from arbitrary powers, open to the operation of reason upon experience, admitting — however grudgingly — change. It is a monument to what was thought to be the character of a nation (of course, we must not reify such things nowadays: but Johnson did), a spirit Bacon described in these words:

The people of this kingdom love the laws thereof, and nothing will oblige them more than an assurance of enjoying them: what the Nobles once said upon occasion in Parliament *Nolumus leges Angliae mutare*, is imprinted in the hearts of all the people. (1874, VI, 33)

WORKS CITED

- Allen, Sir C. K. 1964: *Law in the Making*. 7th ed. Oxford, Clarendon.
- Bacon, Francis 1974: *The Advancement of Learning and New Atlantis*. Ed. Arthur Johnson. Oxford, Clarendon.
- Bacon, Francis 1874: *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon*. Ed. James Spedding. 7 vols. London, Longmans.
- Blackstone, William 1979: *Of the Rights of Persons*. Introd. Stanley N. Katz. Chicago: U of Chicago P. Vol. 1 of *Commentaries on the Laws of England: A Facsimile of the First Edition of 1765-1769*. 5 vols.
- Boswell, James 1979: *The Life of Samuel Johnson*. Ed. and abr. Christopher Hibbert. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Coke, Edward 1832: *The First Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England; or, a Commentary Upon Littleton*. Ed. Charles Butler. 19th ed. London, Clarke.
- Conley, Thomas M. 1990: *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Hill, Christopher 1965: *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution*. Oxford, OUP.
- Holdsworth, W. S. 1951: *A History of English Law*. 3rd ed. 12 vols. London, Methuen.
- Johnson, Samuel 1835: *The Works of Samuel Johnson*. Vol. 2. New York: Dearboon. 2 vols.
- McArthur, Tom 1981: *Longman Lexicon of the English Language*. London, Longman.
- Oppé, A. S. 1938: *Wharton's Law Lexicon Forming an Epitome of the Laws of England Under Statute and Case Law*. 14th ed. London, Stevens and Sons.
- Orwell, George 1984: *The Penguin Essays*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Paton, G. W. 1951: *A Text-Book of Jurisprudence*. 2nd ed. Oxford, Clarendon.
- Plucknett, Theodore F. T. 1956: *A Concise History of the Common Law*. London, Butterworth.
- Pocock, J. G. A. 1987: *The Ancient Constitution and The Feudal Law: A Study of English*

¹ Johnson knew enough law to discuss in great detail the activities that British judges in India might engage in (Boswell 172); he affirmed that he “ought to have been a lawyer”, and that Johnson’s *Reports* would have meant as much to the world as the *Dictionary* (253); and he became agitated when a lawyer suggested that, had Johnson taken to the law, he might have been Lord Chancellor of Great Britain. Johnson exclaimed in an angry tone, “Why will you vex me by suggesting this, when it is too late” (254).

Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century. Rev. ed. Cambridge, CUP.

Pollock, Sir Frederick, and F. W. Maitland 1982: *The History of English Law*. New York, Legal Classics Library.

Sledd, James H., and Gwin J. Kolb 1955: *Dr Johnson's Dictionary: Essays in the Biography of a Book*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Strang, Barbara M. H. 1970. *A History of English*. London, Methuen.

Williams, Joseph F. 1975: *Origins of the English Language*. New York, Free Press.

Vickers, Brian 1968: *Francis Bacon and Renaissance Prose*. Cambridge, CUP.

* * *

Forgotten Figure on the Bridge: Richard Mulcaster

Maria O'Neill

UNIVERSITAT DE LLEIDA

Richard Mulcaster, educational reformer and linguistic theorist of the sixteenth century stands apart from his age for his original and surprisingly modern approach to language. He has been, by and large ignored by both his contemporaries and modern linguists. This paper evaluates his contribution to linguistic theory through a comparison with his contemporaries and reviews the body of literature available on him in an attempt to account for the relative obscurity to which he has been condemned.

Richard Mulcaster, first master of Merchant Taylors School and later Master at St Paul's in London was the author of two books. The first, *Positions* (1580) which dealt with educational themes was followed by *The First Part of the Elementarie* in 1582. This last was intended to have been the first in a series of works which would deal with the new curriculum he proposed. These reforms, radical in their day, are characterised by the emphasis placed on the teaching of the "petties", that is, the elementary schooling for those who would go on to grammar school, at a time when this step on the educational ladder was on the whole neglected.. The second factor which made his proposals unique was the fact that he placed the vernacular at the cornerstone of education, thereby displacing Latin and Greek, the traditional core of the syllabus to a supplementary role. It was imperative, he felt that English children know their own language as well as the classics. This is the theme that runs through *The Elementarie*, which is a defence of the vernacular, a rejection of the spelling reform movement's pursuit of an isomorphic language and the platform for Mulcaster's alternative. In presenting his objections to phonemic reform and conducting his defence of the vernacular, Mulcaster builds up a theory of the nature of language and examines how the mechanisms of custom and change influence its growth, development and its social function.

The theory of language that Mulcaster develops is unfortunately no more than a tantalizing outline. He himself was aware of this fact: "I have opened the waie unto som other" (246).¹ The language section of *The Elementarie* was conceived as preliminary groundwork which would establish the principles on which his curriculum was based. The subjects to be studied were five: reading, writing, drawing, singing and playing. There is a rich store of linguistic theory in *The Elementarie*. For the twentieth century reader, the issues he raises, his analysis of language, his pronouncements on reform and that of spelling in particular have an air of familiarity, to the extent that it is at times difficult to imagine one is reading a text from the last decades of the sixteenth century.

Mulcaster's first premise is that all languages are similar in their deep structures. The differentiation that occurs in the superficial structures is the result of differing customs and circumstances which are what leave the human imprint on language. Custom, in Mulcaster's view is what preserves the best and defining quality or "nature" of language. It is the link between the diachronic and synchronic, process and product. For Mulcaster language was tradition, and custom

¹ All quotations are from E.T. Campagnac's 1925 edition of *The Elementarie*.

the force which gives it shape and meaning. This reevaluation of custom sharply diverged from the thinking of his time. It is true that the status of custom had enjoyed a period of prominence in the early decades of the century with the stand of the Cambridge humanists against unjustified and quixotic neologising. This group, Sir John Cheke, Sir Thomas Wilson and Roger Ascham championed custom as a conservative and purifying force to off-set the onslaught of indiscriminate borrowing. However, as the century's concerns turned to orthographical reform, custom began to get bad press and became loaded with negative connotations. This is particularly evident in the writings of the phonemic reformers, Sir Thomas Smith, John Hart, and William Bullokar, Mulcaster's immediate predecessors. Smith saw in custom the origin of the woes of English spelling. Hart dismissed custom as an irrational force which constituted the only barrier to the ascent of English to a state of perfection, a task which he felt he was carrying out in spite of the common man's misguided and leech-like attachment to custom. Bullokar follows in the same line, calling custom "ignorant". Mulcaster however, reverts to the classical acceptance of the term but, more importantly, raises it to the status of sound, together with reason, in the determination of "right writing".

This dethronement of sound as the sole arbiter in spelling reform is the second major departure from current practices and indicator of his modernity. Mulcaster was the first to realize that the letter does not stand in a symbolic relationship with sound. It is a sign, arbitrary and conventional in nature. "[Letters] perform their function not by themselves or anie vertew in their form ... but onlie by consent of those men, which first did invent them, and the pretie use thereof perceived by those, which first did name them" (102). De Saussure expressed the same idea thus: "la escritura no es un vestido, sino un disfraz" (1945: 79). If the letter is a sign of a sound, then there is no need to "to chop, to change, to alter, to transport, to enlarge, to lessen, to make, to mar, to begin, to end" (79). Mulcaster therefore, unlike his contemporaries, did not regard language as the picture of sound, an analogy which appears, beginning with Smith's "ut pictura, ortografia", in all the treatises on spelling reform of the century. Hart urged that we "write as we speak" and Bullokar complained about the imperfect "picturing" of the English alphabet. Mulcaster's analysis of English spelling initiated the path down which all subsequent spelling reform movemnets would travel. Deep rooted and radical reform which went back to the roots of the language would be rejected in favour of his approach. The role of the reformer was thus redefined and the nature of reform substantially modified. The reformer became the codifier and regulator, not the innovator. Reform became the search for analogies and correspondences within the material already available in the language. Moreover, the role of tradition was magnified. Reforms in Mulcaster's opinion should be carried out within the parameters and on the principles already present in the language thus respecting what in the eighteenth century was called its "genius". All this took place in the viscous matrix of change.

This is the third point of originality which emerges in *The Elementarie*: the concept of change. From early Christian times change had been seen as the herald of doom, the process which brought the day of judgement and universal decay one step nearer. This defines the attitude to change in the Renaissance and indeed beyond. Samuel Johnson sums it up succinctly, "All change is evil". The efforts of the phonemic reformers were not confined simply to the correction of spelling. They also harboured the hope that, once their reforms had been implemented, the language in its perfect state would cease to change. Bullokar seemed confident that "a perfectnesse now surely planted, not to be rooted out as long as letters endured" would be the result of the implementation of his reforms. (1581: 2). Mulcaster, in contrast, was aware that those changes which he suggested would disappear down the gullet of time, that is, his amendments would hold up only until the language changed in response to new social needs and cultural conditions. Moreover, he seems to have been aware that change is a principle of language and not merely a response to extralinguistic forces. He sees change as a neutral force, the consequences of which could be either positive or negative, depending on the response of man. He thus shakes off the yoke of fatalism and places man as the controller of his fate.

I have outlined above the three main differences between Mulcaster and his contemporaries and they are differences which link him more closely to modern linguistic thought than to the sixteenth century. This begs the question as to why his work has lain in relative obscurity both

immediately succeeding its publication and in the following centuries. As Leo Wiener states, "His contemporaries did not appreciate him; the men of the succeeding centuries have entirely forgotten him" (1897: 66).

It was not until the late 19th and the beginning of this century that there was a renewed interest in Mulcaster and this focused primarily on his work as a pedagogue. R. H. Quick edited *Positions* in 1888 and was largely responsible for the dissemination of his educational theories giving him an undisputed place in the development of English pedagogy.¹ It was as an educationalist that Continental scholars also wrote on Mulcaster.² His second facet, that of linguist and spelling reformer has been relatively neglected as the following critical survey shows.

The first major study of Mulcaster's work is to be found in Ellis (1869-1874) in his *On Early English Pronunciation*. Ellis recognised that Mulcaster was not a reformer in the same sense as his contemporaries were. In fact, he throws little light on the subject of pronunciation but then, his objective was other: "Mulcaster's objective in short was to teach, not the spelling of sounds, but what he considered the neatest style of spelling as derived from custom, in order to avoid the great confusion which then prevailed" (910). This explains the defects that Dobson would later find in his work and his labelling him as a poor and sloppy phonetician. Mulcaster's merit lies in his ambitious plan to integrate all those factors which influence spelling, identify them in current practice and formulate guidelines.

At the turn of the century we find the first reference to Mulcaster in his capacity as linguist. Leo Wiener published a short article on the Elizabethan philologist in *Modern Language Notes* in 1897, with the declared purpose of "opening for him the gates of the histories of language and literature" (70) but he is absent in this role from the critical reviews until R. F. Jones analysed his attitude to the English language in an article in *Washington University Studies* in 1926. In J. L. Moore's 1910 work on the perceptions of the language in the Tudor and Stuart periods, Mulcaster is conspicuous by his absence. While Moore does mention him it is only to note that the manuscript of *The Elementarie* was not available to him, a fact which speaks for itself.

This lack was made good by R. T. Campagnac who provided an edition of *The Elementarie* in 1925. However, his interest lay in the christian humanist features found in the work and only two pages of the thirty-three page introduction make reference to Mulcaster's work on language and then, in reference to his style. Campagnac however, does point out that he was a man who knew how to apply the old and traditional learning to new times and purposes and sees in this combination of scholar and man of the world the prototype of the Renaissance humanist.

It was Richard Mulcaster ..., who most loudly proclaimed the equality of the vernacular with the classic languages, most earnestly asserted its independence of them and most confidently urged its widest use. (Jones 1953, 192).

This is R. F. Jones' verdict on Mulcaster. His first article on Mulcaster appeared some 27 years before his excellent work and source of references for the period *The Triumph of the English Language*. Jones' analysis of *The Elementarie* has concentrated on the attitudes towards the English language expressed therein rather than on specific details of the proposed spelling reforms. He is impressed by the breadth of vision, the pragmatic approach and the consistency of Mulcaster's arguments and lays special stress on "the startling modernity of some of his theories" seeing in him the union of common sense with a vision far ahead of his contemporaries. He mixes the conservative with the progressive: "He interests us today because his is the most significant pronouncement on the English language in the Elizabethan period" (1926, 268). Jones finds in Mulcaster a kindred spirit, sharing his view that it would be foolish to put a scientific straightjacket on such a virile thing as the English tongue. Jones' interest lies, I think, in the

¹ Foster Watson's *Mulcaster and Ascham* (1899), James Oliphant's *Educational Writings of Richard Mulcaster* (1903) and numerous publications by R.H. Quick illustrate this point.

² The two major works on Mulcaster in German are: Theodor Klähr's *Leben und werke Richard Mulcaster's eines englischen Pädagogen*, 1893 and Cornelia Benndorf's *Die englische Pädagogik*, 1905.

philosophy of ideas, not phonetics and he pays no more than passing attention to the details of his reforms other than to praise their common sense. This same verdict is offered by Baugh (1978) who points out the moderation and practical nature of the proposals.

Renwick, writing in the 1920s, like Jones, focuses on Mulcaster's philosophy of language and demonstrates the parallelism between Du Bellay's *Deffence et Illustration* and *The Elementarie*. He has the following to say of Mulcaster "his own share in the improvement of the mother tongue was the normalizing of English spelling but there is abundant evidence of keen interest in the larger problems, and careful study" (282-3).¹ This remark focuses on two fundamental points: the comprehensive scope of his writing and the identification of the key issues in language development and reform.

Mulcaster is presented in a complementary (if not complimentary) and contrasting light by Dobson (1968) in his seminal work on English pronunciation. He offers the view of the phonetician and prefaces his analysis by saying that Mulcaster had no understanding of phonetics: "Mulcaster's work is on the whole disappointing ... He misunderstood the aims of the phonemic reformers ... His arguments against the thorough reform of English spelling cannot be said to show any real understanding of the matter" (1968, 222-223). Dobson evidently finds little to recommend Mulcaster as a phonetician. This judgement is founded on a number of points, chief among which are Mulcaster's confusion between length and stress and the lack of clarity of his diacritics. His categorization of consonants into mutes and half vowels is deemed unphonetic although it was a widely accepted classification used by teachers in the period. Dobson's main criticism concerns Mulcaster's retention of numerous traits of his northern speech and he concludes that he had not, in spite of having spent all of his professional life in the South, come to a full understanding of Standard spelling conventions. In the same vein, the "Generall Table" is pronounced incomplete for Dobson's purposes as the spellings given are of little value as indicators of pronunciation. Having argued forcibly against Mulcaster as a phonetician, Dobson goes on to detract from his status as an innovator, attributing his theories to a clever anticipation of ideas that were already current or having captured, magpie-like, an unvoiced popular feeling.

Scragg (1974) views the writer in a more favourable light. As the voice of reason and moderation in an age gripped by "the sound and the fury", his main distinction lies in having made the first attempt to marshal the case against reform thus anticipating the direction that similar movements in the 17th century would take. He codified existing conventions and formulated rules for learning them. He also makes the important point that while Mulcaster's concerns were pedagogic Hart and Smith's were scientific and academic respectively.

The above review bears witness to the surprisingly little attention that he has attracted as a linguist. With the exception of R. F. Jones, he has been dealt with as educational theorist and phonemic reformer, his important contribution to the theory of language being either ignored or undervalued. How can this be accounted for?

The first hypothesis to be examined is that suggested by R.F. Jones, that it was his stature as a pedagogue which paradoxically caused his linguistic theories to recede into second place. Not only was Mulcaster headmaster of the most important schools in London, but he also enjoyed a position of prominence at court and *Positions* was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. It was as a pedagogue that he was chiefly recognised and his stature as such can be deduced from his intense rivalry with Roger Ascham. Mulcaster was granted the licence to publish *Positions* on the condition that the book "containe [no] thing prejudiciall or hurtfull to the booke of maister Askam" (Quick 1888, 305-6). This personal rivalry with Ascham who had been Elizabeth's tutor and continued in later life as her secretary and the radical nature of the reforms he proposed, it is suggested, distracted attention from his philosophy of language.

It is interesting to note that it was from the commercial and not the intellectual sector that Mulcaster received immediate recognition. His spelling recommendations were adopted by

¹ Renwick maintains that the English were indebted to the Pléiade as regards coining, neologizing and reviving.

Richard Field, successor to William Vautrollier, Mulcaster's printer and head of a well respected establishment in London. His success with the printers is due to the practicality and simplicity of the amendments he suggested. They did not, for example require the manufacture of new type face and satisfied the printer's commercial need for a public standard. Moreover, those who followed him, the compilers of spelling books, tables and dictionaries freely borrowed from his work without recognising their sources - a common practice in the sixteenth century when the concept of author was straddling the transitional period from medieval anonymity to modern deification. Mulcaster's influence was therefore, indirect and unrecognised.

A second postulation as to why Mulcaster's ideas fell on unreceptive ears lies in their modernity. "Mulcaster was easily forgotten and overlooked because he was too advanced for his time. The fact is, in the sixteenth century there was no one to compare him with" (Wiener, 1897: 69). His optimistic vision of change, the reinstatement of custom, his radical rejection of sound as the sole basis for spelling reform and the consequences that this brought, broke with the mood of the era. He in fact marked the beginning of a new period. He was on the bridge between past and present, caught between two centuries, two stages in the growth of English. His ideas on custom were gradually accepted and flourished in the seventeenth century. His successor at St. Pauls, Alexander Gill, Ben Jonson and William Camden grant custom a similar authority to that shown in *The Elementarie*. His concept of change was slower in being accepted and even suffered a reversal in the eighteenth century, when it became arch-enemy number one. However, as confidence in man's ability to shape his own destiny grew with the age of reason, the shackles of fatalism were loosened. It was not until George Hakewell's 1627 treatise on the responsibility of man in the universal scheme of things that we find the clearest echo of Mulcaster's voice. Mulcaster was sharply aware that he was breaking schemes and that his work would be ill received. He states "... I am also most redie with all pacience to digest all such difficulties, all such thwartings, as that kind of wish ... to chek and choke a writer" (3), but is content to await the judgement of posterity - which in itself has been slow in delivering a verdict.

There is a third hypothesis as to why Mulcaster has suffered such neglect and that is that he has traditionally been discussed in relation to the phonemic reformers of his time. The earliest reference is Ellis in the mid nineteenth century. The status of Ellis' work and the fact that the material therein was used freely and often unquestioningly by many other writers on phonetics, has led to regarding Mulcaster in this block, much to his detriment. He was not a phonetician and, in this role, is overshadowed by Hart, the first true English phonetician. Even the "muddle headed"¹ Bullokar is granted more book space than Mulcaster. The fact is that the phoneticians sought in his work what simply was not there. His purpose was not to provide a description of English sounds. He states very clearly that his objectives are "the correction of certain wants, and general direction for the whole pen" (7) The key words are *certain* and *general*. Moreover, he sacrificed phonetic accuracy at the shrine of practicality. *The Elementarie* was written for schoolteachers, for use in teaching. His concern was to provide rules and establish norms for use which could be formulated in a language intelligible to all.

The general presentation and novelty of the educational reforms may have blinded the critics to the rationale behind them as Jones (1953) suggests but the blame for his neglect lies, more probably in a combination of misclassification on the part of the critics and the very modernity of his ideas. These two facts have diverted attention away from his theory of language which, seen through the prism of the late twentieth century, has much of relevance to us today. Perhaps it is time for a fuller evaluation and deeper study of this forgotten figure on the bridge between two centuries.

REFERENCES

¹ This is the term used by Otto Jespersen to describe Bullokar's intricate and highly complex spelling reforms.

- Baugh, A. C. and T. Cable 1978: *A History of the English Language*. 3rd ed. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Dobson, E. J. 1968: *English Pronunciation 1500-1700*. 2nd ed. Oxford, Clarendon.
- Jespersen, Otto 1905[1972]: *Growth and Structure of the English Language*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Jones, R. F. 1920: Background to the battle of the books. *Washington University Studies, Humanistic Series* 2, 7: 97-162.
- Jones, R. F. 1926: Richard Mulcaster's view of the English language in *Washington University Studies Humanistic Series* 2, 13: 267-303.
- Jones, R. F. 1953: *The Triumph of the English Language*. Stanford, Stanford University Press
- Mulcaster, Richard 1582: *The First Part of the Elementarie*. E. Campagnac 1925. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Quick, Robert Herbert 1868: *Essays on Educational Reformers*. London, Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Renwick, W. L. n. d. Mulcaster and Du Bellay. *Modern Language Review* XVII: 282-7
- Saussure, Ferdinand de 1915: *Curso de lingüística general*. Trans. Amado Alonso 1945. 8th ed. Buenos Aires, Losada.
- Scragg, D. G. 1974: *A History of English Spelling*. Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Wiener, Leo. 1897: Richard Mulcaster, An Elizabethan Philologist in *MLN* XII 65-70.

* * *

The Renaissance environment of the first Spanish Grammar published in sixteenth-century England

*Ambrosio López Fernández*¹

UNIVERSITY OF OVIEDO

The work referred to in the present paper has the following title:

Reglas Gramaticales para aprender la Lengua Española y Francesa, confiriendo la una con la otra, segun el orden de las partes de la oración latina. Impresas en Oxford por Joseph Barnes, en el año de salud M. D. LXXXVI.

The author, Antonio del Corro, a Hieronymite monk who fled from the San Isidoro convent in Seville in 1557 in order to avoid the reprisals of the Inquisition became an exile of the XVI century who was forced to flee from his country and environment because of the prevailing religious intolerance and dogmatism in the Spain of that time. His restless and innovating spirit lead him to travel to different parts of Europe always with a clear idea in his mind; the defence of religious freedom and reconciliation. His independent character and ideological consistency implicate him in constant controversies with the believers of the same Protestant religion among which he carried out his work. Due to the intolerant accusing attitude towards him of some sectors of his own Reforming church he comes to consider them as more dangerous than the Spanish Inquisition itself.²

As mentioned on the cover itself the work was printed in Oxford in 1586. Nevertheless, the RGLS were elaborated in France twenty-seven years before as the author himself states in the dedication to the illustrious Patrician Palavicino.³

... quise servirme de la presente ocasion, en que vn nuevo imprimidor delibero tentar, si sus obreros sabrian imprimir algo en lengua Castellana; y para menor peligro hazer la prueua ma sacaron sus amigos de las manos ciertas reglas de la lengua Española y Francesa, que casi treyenta años pasados recoge, cuando yo aprendia a hablar Frances, y enseñaba el language Español, al rey Don Henrique de Navarra ...⁴

The previous quote could lead us to think that the work only had a sporadic and accidental nature for its author. The act of checking the efficiency of some workers and not the work itself seems to determine its publication. However, he later adds that he wrote for the purpose of teaching Spanish to Prince Henri, which obviously reevaluates the work.

¹ The editor regrets to inform that Mr. Ambrosio López, a very dear colleague and friend, died in september 1996 in a traffic accident in Southwestern France when he was visiting the Archives at Nerac, Pau and Bordeaux in pursuit of documents in relation to his research on Antonio del Corro and 16th century grammatical thought. This posthumous article has been edited by *Sederi* from the main draft presented by the author at the Coruña 1996 Conference.

² Böhmer, Edward 1904: *Spanish Reformers of two centuries from 1520*. Vol III. Strassburg-London: 6.

³ *Las Reglas Gramaticales* will henceforth appear in the abbreviated form RGLS.

⁴ In the RGLS quotes the original spelling is maintained as much as possible.

Independently of the modest judgement of the author himself we have to consider that it is a grammar whose elaboration implied a considerable cultural baggage. The content and structure of the work: classical inheritance, Renaissance spirit and accordance with the grammatical environment of the time show that it is a work prepared to be edited. Adverse political or religious circumstances, easily presumable at the time perhaps prevented a previous edition.

The importance of the RGLS from the historical-philological point of view is beyond all doubt if we consider that because of its scope, structure and content it equals or even surpasses its contemporaries. Furthermore, Amado Alonso says of it that it is a fundamental book for the reconstruction of old Spanish pronunciation and considers Richard Percyvall, greatly indebted.¹

It is also one of the first Spanish grammars, created around the year 60 of the XVI century, coinciding with the impulse experienced throughout Europe by the then so-called vulgar languages and with the edition of the first grammars for the teaching of Spanish edited in the Low Countries (Anvers and Lovaine) with which it has a great similarity as concerns content and structure.

The importance the previous data reveal to us is highlighted especially for the scholars of English Philology, by the fact of being the first Spanish grammar, throughout history, edited in England although it was not conceived for the English.

The previously referred to circumstance gave rise to the fact that four years later the Spanish edition was re-edited and adapted, at least in part, in English, to be useful to the people of that country, as otherwise its correct interpretation, being written in Spanish, presupposed knowledge of the language to be taught.

As far as the content is concerned the work has a first part devoted to pronunciation and the division of letters. It then deals with the apostrophe and diphthongs going on to the noun, pronouns to then deal with the verb, adverb, preposition, conjunction and interjection and a brief treatment of Spanish and French syntax. It concludes with a mystic religious sonnet contrasting human miseries with divine goodness and love.

1. SOCIOCULTURAL ENVIRONMENT

The tendency of religion to cultivate languages in all cultures and at all times as a transmitting vehicle for a transcendental message is especially obvious in sixteenth century Europe and also branching out towards the neighbouring centuries. The religious and political type upheavals encouraged by the rebirth of culture and the consolidation of Renaissance humanism meant a radical change in attitude towards the cultivation of classical as well as modern languages which were then referred to as vulgar languages.

In sixteenth century Europe there did not exist a pedagogical or philological environment behind the Church's back and within the Church, Protestant Reformers were the most innovating due to their interest in taking culture to the people and the direct study of the holy scriptures in their original languages trying to avoid the manipulation to which uncultured people were submitted to by the official Church.

Although, as its author states, the RGLS were produced in the seat of the old kingdom of Navarre, taking into account Corro's trajectory, it is obvious that the sociocultural circumstances of the court's environment were not the only determining factors in their elaboration.

To the didactic environment created by La Gaucherie as the mentor of the prince's education, we have to add to this the author's classical education, his reforming spirit and the pedagogic current inspired by his Protestant masters in the Lausanne Academy where Corro received instruction for a year and a half before arriving to the Court.

1. 2 LUTHER AND CALVIN AS PROMOTERS OF CULTURE

¹ Alonso, Amado 1951: Identificación de gramáticos españoles ... RFE, XXXV: 226.

The first to openly advocate public education was Luther who addressed the magistrates and Councillors of the German people demanding a public education which implied the creation of schools where the poorest could also receive instruction.

The real goodness, health and richness of a people lay for him in the culture, honour and education of its citizens. He even affirmed that ignorance was more dangerous for a people than the arms of the enemy.

Luther's ideas on education were those of all the Reformers. Schools were founded everywhere and books were published calling men to the analysis of their own faith and to assert their intelligence giving them the means to reason, judge and choose.¹ After Luther, it is fitting to point out in our case the pedagogic ideas of Calvin, Mathurin Cordier and Teodoro de Beza as the main inspirers of the pedagogic theory used in the academies of Lausanne and Geneva.

Concerning Calvin, the great inspirer of the Reformation, it is enough for us to briefly consider the letter sent to the King of France, published in Basle in 1536,² in which his accusations of the clergy of the time are not limited to ignorance. He also accuses them of having substituted direct communication with God for purely human and material ceremonies.

The challenge was fundamental: to establish direct relation with God re-establishing the education of the people. From this clear conviction arises the idea of creating schools and academies to instruct the poor and simple in particular and train the clergy for proclaiming the divine word fundamentally based on holy scripture.³ The interest of the Reformers for teaching was quite clear, the people had to be trained so they could make use of their own intelligence in their direct approach to God and the preachers to instruct them in the holy sources. The following quote from Calvin is highly eloquent in this respect:

L'office propre des docteurs est d'enseigner les fideles en saine doctrine, afin que la pureté de l'Evangile ne soit corrompue ou par ignorance ou par mauvaises opinions⁴

2. THE LAUSANNE ACADEMY

The decisive zeal of the Reformers for the instruction of the people and clergy compared with the Orthodox church, more interested in maintaining its power and in a tradition which for the Church was unquestionable resulted in the creation of many schools in different parts of Europe. Of these the Lausanne Academy deserves special mention, impelled by Calvin which had its golden years in the 1550 decade presided over by Mathurin Cordier and Teodoro de Beza as the main people in charge of the Academy and eminent instructors.

With the creation of these centres it was attempted to alleviate the ignorance in which the cultural legacy of the Middle Ages was caught up. The cultivation of classical languages had greatly deteriorated. Latin, upon becoming an oral language had become distant from its classical purity. For more than 400 years the Bible was only known by its translation of the Vulgate. Even the monasteries which up until the eleventh century had produced great wise men degenerated into the deepest levels of unculture. This not only affected the low clergy but also the high hierarchies and even the Popes.⁵

¹ See the introduction to the work of Berthault, E. A. 1876: *Mathurin Cordier et L'enseignement chez les premiers calvinistes*. Paris 1876.

² Let us remember the custom of the most significant reformers of addressing the kings and denouncing the deficiencies and mistakes and asking for an improvement in the state of things. Antonio del Corro also wrote a very long letter to Philip II of Spain to the same end.

³ Herminard, Aimé-Louis 1878: *Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les pays de langue française*. IV Geneve: 86-91.

⁴ Quoted by Pradervand-Amiet, Brigitte 1987: *L'ancienne academie de Lausanne*. Université de Lausanne: 18.

⁵ Santchi, C. 1987: *Ecoles et vie intellectuelle a Lausanne au moyen age*. Université de Lausanne: 30 f.

Our author Antonio del Corro arrived to the mentioned academy after fleeing from Spain in the autumn of 1557 following a brief stay in Geneva. There he spent a year and a half (from the beginning of 1568 to July of 1569) devoted to the study of the scriptures in preparation of his religious work and obviously to the study of the French language which he would later complete in Nerac and Pau as he himself states in the dedication of the RGLS.¹

As for the instruction given in the Academy according to the rules of 1547 we see how the emphasis falls on classical languages especially Greek and Hebrew. The Greek teacher gave a class every morning on the classical authors, Demosthenes or Isocrates among the orators, Homer, Sophocles, Pindarus or Eurypides among the poets. Hebrew received similar treatment based on the study of the sacred texts. Other subjects in the field of arts such as rhetoric, mathematics, etc, made up the timetable of six hours per day, as well as the debates which took place on Saturdays, as was done in the Middle Ages. The students of that country had to undergo an entrance exam whereas those from abroad who brought their diplomas did not have to do so and could freely choose their courses. Antonio del Corro would undoubtedly be among these as well as also belonging to the category of pupils called *extraordinarii*, applied to those who had concluded their theology studies. These pupils lived in a kind of seminary in the city under the supervision of a *hospes*, a man of good reputation who watched over their behaviour and gave them board and lodging in return for an agreed price.²

2. 1 MATHURIN CORDIER

The pedagogic guidelines marked out by Cordier who managed to develop a living method for the teaching of Latin based on dialogues and the spirit of Beza, principal and teacher of Greek in the mentioned academy until August of 1558, eminent philologist and outstanding scholar with whom Corro coincided for approximately one year had to form part of the inspiring pedagogic framework of our author.

H. Vuilleumier calls Cordier a model of educators and points out that in a short space of time he manages to make the Academy one of the most flourishing of the time, remaining in it for a period of twelve years from 1545 onwards in which year he had been called from Neuchatel.³ Although the teaching of Cordier was centred on the Latin language, the use of the direct, practical method and the constant insistence on oral repetition reminds us of the reiterated resort by Corro to the correct language use of good speakers in order to remedy the imperfection of the grammatical rules. The basic principles of Cordier on the teaching of languages are clearly reflected in his Colloques; in clear contrast with the Medieval teaching of grammar in itself, he considers Latin a living language applying in his teaching a direct method which can be summarised in the following principles:

The best way to learn a language is to imitate those who speak it correctly, summarised in a Latin adage constantly repeated by him: *Ex bene loquendi usu et consuetudine*. The main teaching emphasis falls on the person teaching the use of the language orally rather than on the method itself in stark contrast with the traditional analytical method. Repetition and constant exercise among the pupils and mutual correction will help these pupils to acquire a knowledge of the language without the exhausting effort entailed in the study of grammar in itself.⁴

2. 2. TEODORO DE BEZA

¹ Böhmer, Edward, 1904: Spanish Reformers ... Vol III: 7.

² See Meylan, Henri 1986: *La haute école de Lausanne 1537- 1937*. Université de Lausanne: 13-21.

³ H. Vuilleumier 1891: *L'Académie de Lausanne 1537-1890*. Lausanne, Edition de l'Université. p. V.

⁴ Bleau, G. 1972: *Mathurin Cordier: son programme, sa methode d'apres les ...* University Microfilms Limited, High Wycomb, England, A Xerox Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA: 173-179.

A direct follower of Calvin and a man of great erudition who was said to possess a very wide knowledge; an accurate historian, well-informed in legal matters, an exegesis philosopher and critic, preacher and confessor who although not as original as Calvin defended and made popular Calvin's doctrine with great skill. He is considered one of the best informed men in Europe. He also maintained extensive correspondence, and was noteworthy for his negotiating capacity in delicate matters. To this we have to add his skills as an educator, not only teaching directly but organising teaching in the Academies of Lausanne as well as later in Geneva, pioneering centres of the Reformation with great efficiency and distinction. He was in charge of the training of hundreds of clergymen carrying the germ of the new ideas. He was the defender of his doctrine against Rome and against the narrow ideas of the people who shared his same religious beliefs, just as against civil power so closely linked to the religious world of the time.¹

Beza and Corro coincided at least for a year in the Lausanne Academy enjoying a great friendship. To his great prestige as a teacher of scripture, Beza added his devotion and zeal for language, editing in 1584 in Geneva a treatise with the following title:

De Francicae Linguae recta Pronuntiatione Tractatus, Theodoro de Beza auctore. - Genevae, apud Eustathium Vignon, M: D: LXXXIII. - 1 vol. in 8.²

This treatise considering the pronunciation of the letters of the French language separately has the same structure as the norms of pronunciation of Corro's grammar and which constitute the main section of this grammar and could easily provide, given the close relationship existing between both, a great stimulation for Corro in the preparation of the RGLS, all the more so if we consider that it was in the Lausanne Academy where Corro must have started to study French possibly helped by Beza and his pronunciation rules. Beza's treatise is also a great testimony of the cultivation of the vulgar languages by the academy, not reflected in its rules.

Both Beza and Corro also coincided in Nerac when the author was preparing his RGLS not as tutors of the future Henri IV as Beza was not, but sharing the same faith and ideology and both linked to the Protestant court.

3. THE OLD COURT OF NAVARRE

Henri II of Albret and II of Navarre (1503-1555) inherited from his parents the House of Albret in the year 1522. He was the last king born in the old kingdom. Upon his death, in 1555 in the Castle of Hagetmau, Jeanne, his daughter and Antoine de Bourbon, her husband appeared before the States of Bearne which recognised their rights. Jeanne de Albret in this way became Queen of Navarre and her husband, after long debates was recognised as co-sovereign.

The child who was to become Henri IV of France was born in 1554 to Jeanne and Antoine. The child was left alone at the age of four due to the death of his brother Louis Charles before he was three. This is the prince who was to receive a Spartan education in the royal castles of the Albret House following the guidelines marked out by his grandfather and under the direct supervision of Jeanne, his mother.

The relations of this kingdom with the King of Spain due to mutual claims and tradition were constant. Some historian even affirms that it was a kingdom which only existed because the Kings of Spain had not wanted to annex it.³ This reason had to be what caused Queen Jeanne to look for her own teacher of Spanish for her son Henri.

¹ Bernus, Auguste 1900: *Théodore de Beze a Lausanne*. Université de Lausanne: 6-9.

² Livet, Ch. L. 1967: *La Grammaire française et les Grammairiens du XVI Siècle*. Geneva, Slatkine Reprints: 510 f. quotes the full title adduced to and makes a brief study of its pronunciation. Without going into a detailed comparison with Corro it is fitting to point out, alike him, the emphasis given to the pronunciation of letters, observations in the margin of the content, constant references to Greek and Hebrew and coincidence in the interpretation of some sounds.

³ Babelon, Jean-Pierre 1982: *Henri IV*. Fayard: 19.

3. 1 FROM THE LAUSANNE ACADEMY TO THE ALBRET COURT

Henri IV had been born in Pau (31 Dec, 1553) and so was only seven years old when Antonio del Corro, coming from Lausanne (1560) took charge of instructing him in the Spanish Language. As Corro himself states in the dedication of his Rules, (IIIJ r.) he taught Spanish to King Henri of Navarre. The classes took place from 1559 to 1560.¹

Corro was recommended by Calvin himself with a letter written in May of 1559 to La Gaucherie, then tutor of the child Henri. In this letter he is not recommended as a tutor but rather as a genuinely pious man as the original text affirms: “Hispanus est, in quo genuinum pietatis studium deprehendimus”, to continue further on, “Abs te non aliud peto nisi ut pro solita tua humanitate in eum conferas quae absque tuo incommodo officia poteris.”² Corro took on the role of teacher of Spanish but undoubtedly this was not his only duty as his principal motive was to teach the new faith.

The overwhelming prestige of Calvin as pillar of the Reformation and man of great erudition were enough for his recommendation to become effective. To this we have to add that already in 1534 when he was only twenty-five years old he had already spent time in Nerac (as much the residence of the Court as Pau) and always maintained a special relationship with the court of Navarre being concerned from Switzerland for the spiritual emancipation of its churches, sending pastors and even maintaining a lengthy correspondence with the Queen herself.³ Corro’s arrival at the Court of Navarre was not then the result of chance, but rather something regulated and controlled by the very hierarchy of the new Reformation.

Although the philological concern of the Reformers was quite clear the importance given to the teaching of modern languages in the education of Henri IV is still only relative. To this respect it is only affirmed that he had knowledge of Latin and understood Spanish and Italian quite well.⁴ On the contrary, Jeanne, his mother, is said to have spoken Spanish, something quite credible taking into account that her father had been born in Spanish Navarre in 1503 and the tradition of considering the King of Navarre as an Iberian prince was maintained.⁵

3. 2 THE EDUCATION OF THE PRINCE AND ITS METHODOLOGY

Referring specifically to the education of Henri IV, historians coincide in that he received a Spartan education tending to make a strong and determined man of him. His mother who was said to have known the classical languages and to have spoken various modern ones was the supervisor of his education.

In accordance with her Calvinist faith, Jeanne de Albret looked for a tutor of the new religion for her son, Francois de la Gaucherie, of austere customs and a great wise man on which she bestowed all her authority. She did not aim to make a scholar of her son but to avoid him becoming an illustrious ignorant man. The religious education affected all the pedagogic environment, being a question of a Christian prince who had to set an example of carrying out his religious duties.

As the well-known present day historians Tucoo-Chala and Desplat reiterate, in perfect harmony with their predecessors, the education of the prince had a popular touch not oriented towards the instruction of a wise man and even less towards that of a feeble child. Even his food

¹ McFadden, W. 1953: *Life and Works of Antonio del Corro*. PhD. Thesis, Belfast: 112.

² See Böhmer, E. 1904: *Spanish Reformers...* III: 8-9 where the original text of the letter is reproduced in Latin.

³ See Forissier, Marc (s. d.): *Nérac, ville royale et Huguenote. Histoire de l’église réformée de l’origine à la révolution de l’édit de Nantes*. Editions D’Albret, Nerac (L+G): 41-47.

⁴ Druon, H. (s. d.) *Histoire de l’éducation des princes dans la maison des Bourbons de France*. P. Lethielleux libraire-éditeur, Paris: 29).

⁵ Babelon, Jean-Pierre 1982: *Henri IV*. Librairie Artheme Fayard: 22-23.

was totally natural and normal among the people; brown bread, cheese and meat and he was made to walk barefoot and with his head uncovered. Desplat expresses in a very concise way what made up the nucleus of the education of Henri IV by La Gaucherie:

Former un homme plutôt q'un savant en faisant largement appel a son libre arbitre. Lui donner quelque teinture des lettres, non par les regles de la grammaire, mais par les discours et les entretiens.¹

The previously mentioned corporal austerity was accompanied by an education which was not at all bookish. La Gaucherie almost totally excluded books from his education, certainly with the idea of not making him hate them. Freedom was the inspiration behind this type of education based on the affection between educator and pupil. This was the only condition which the tutor made upon taking charge of the child, that he would love him.²

As concerns other subjects it is said that he received some lessons in Spanish and Italian without any reference to the tutor and the study of French had a limited place; practice and frequent dealing with educated and illustrious people were considered the best teachers to learn how to speak and write well.³ The importance given to the use of language as opposed to rules, a recourse frequently used by Corro in his RGLS again becomes obvious.

In the teaching of Latin and Greek, La Gaucherie used a method which undoubtedly had to influence the didactic theory of Corro when he taught him Spanish. Recognising that he did not have to make a scholar of the Prince he did not spend too much time, as Druon says, on the grammatical rules, rather he tried to give him instruction based on practice, without rules just as we learn our mother tongues. He made him learn selected phrases by heart without writing or even reading them but reciting them frequently.⁴ Therefore it was an education more oriented towards practice as opposed to theory, very much in harmony with the RGLS of our author.

CONCLUSIONS

The RGLS of Antonio del Corro constitute a simple and clear work created according to the style of the times, in which the constant reliance on classical languages stands out as well as the constant resorts to practice and illustration with examples from daily life of religious nature.

The Reforming environment in which Corro moved upon leaving Spain, characterised by the promotion of culture, especially biblical and with this the cultivation of the classical and vulgar languages, as channels for the study and dissemination of their message has to be considered as a determining factor in Corro's cultural evolution and the culture medium of his RGLS.

Being entrusted with the role of teacher of Spanish in the old Court of Navarre gave Antonio del Corro the immediate occasion for the creation of his RGLS, devising as the tutor of the future king his own method in accordance with the didactic environment which his education inspired.

The work presented here formed part of more extensive research on the first Spanish Grammars edited in England, their implications and interferences. In a near future we hope to offer an article on the figure of del Corro in England and the consequences of his work among his immediate followers.

* * *

¹ Desplat, C. 1983: Le bon roi Henri ou la pédagogie du mythe. *Revue des Sciences Politiques* 9: 16.

² Tucoo-Chala, Pierre & Desplat, Christian 1980: *Principatus Bearnia. La principauté de Bearn*. Pau, Societe d'editions regionales: 243-248.

³ Druon, H. o. c. LXV.

⁴ Druon, H., o. c. 18-19.

English and French as L1 and L2 in Renaissance England: a consequence of medieval nationalism

Begoña Crespo García

UNIVERSIDAD DE SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA

1. THE NATIONALIST PHENOMENON

During the Middle Ages the natural tendency of Latin was to replace vernacular languages and their literatures, but this tendency was little by little cut off by ecclesiastical politics. The Church, which accepted and even fostered religious conflicts among culturally different peoples through the Crusades was, in fact, promoting national wars. A feeling of differentiation and separate cultural interests favours the use of the word nation, “found in the fourteenth century with something of a modern sense” (Galbraith 1941, 117). Although other terms of the same lexical field (national, nationalism, nationality) are not traced until much later, the occurrence of the word nation proves the awareness of ethnocultural different communities as it was admitted in the Council of Constance¹ (1414) where “the right of each nation to be counted as the equal of every other” (Fishman 1973, 4) called for general acceptance.

A nationalist ideology embraces “the more inclusive organization and the elaborated beliefs, values and behaviors which nationalities develop on behalf of their avowed ethnocultural self-interest” (Fishman 1973, 4). But, for the recognition of these common characteristics to have practical consequences two circumstances are to take place:

1. The existence of an elite

It is necessary the establishment of a powerful social group which can carry out political actions to defend its culture and territories at the same time that it transmits the nationalist feeling to members of lower social strata. These groups:

form an increasingly coherent intellectual community activated by the idea of a culturally united and socially solidary national society, which should include all the people whose folk cultures are presumed to be essentially alike, and who are supposed to share the same historical background ... (and) who should be equally separated from peoples with different cultures. (Fishman 1973, 16)

In England the loss of Normandy in 1204 marks the beginning of the nationalist movement. The English nobility progressively breaks its bonds with France and concentrates upon its own land. English is gradually turning into the nobility L₁. Henry III's (1216-72) incessant importation of French favourites (1233, 1236, 1246) joined English upper and middle classes in a common cause: the expulsion of all these aliens which resulted in *The Provisions of Oxford* (1258) and more practically, in *The Baron's War* (1258-1267). This can be considered as the first step towards the strengthening of nationalism since the protoelites make the lower classes be involved in this anti-foreign feeling. Almost twenty years later, in 1295, constant conflicts with France lead Edward I (1272-1307) to use the vernacular in order to move his people against the rival country and his king who “not satisfied with his wickedness, (he) has beset our realm with a mighty fleet

¹ To study ecclesiastical implications in nationalism see Hayes, Carlton J.H. 1942: The Church and Nationalism: A Plea for Further Study of a Major Issue. *Catholic Historical Review* 28: 1-12.

and army and proposes, if his power equal, his detestable purpose, which God forbid, to wipe out the English tongue altogether from the face of the earth" (Tout 1922, 94). The vernacular is being used as an instrument since English is not Edward I's native tongue, but this sign of patriotism will exert a great influence on the people around him. The subsequent problem of the *Cinque Ports* with France that ended in war (1297-1299) will add another reason for this growing self-esteem.

2. Social and economic changes

Social and economic changes are closely related. The feudal system is dying out: *the Black Death* (1348-1350) and the ongoing outbreaks of the epidemic throughout the century bring about a shortage of labourers that will change medieval social relations. The increasing number of free tenants producing a stock beyond the levels of subsistence together with an incipient textile manufacturing make possible the creation of a market. The development of trade in an urban environment runs parallel to the rise of a new social class: the bourgeoisie, an ascendant middle class which seeks in the support of vernacular culture a symbol of distinction.

The most representative example of an external event showing a nationalist attitude is *The Hundred Years' War* (1337-1453). Other internal actions all over the 14th century to foster the rise of the English language largely derive from it. Not only victories but also defeats strengthen English patriotism ultimately resulting in the decay of French in England and all things French. The *Petitions of the Commons*, first in 1346, and later in 1377 asking for the expulsion of foreigners illustrate this general concern. At the same time there is evidence of the use of English in the Court of London and Middlessex in 1356, just six years before the official recognition of the vernacular in Parliament. National pride will also turn English into the vehicle of instruction in schools as Trevisa points out in his translation of the *Polychronicon* (1360) in the last quarter of the century:

For Iohan Cornwall, a mayster of gramere chayngede the lore in gramer-scole, and construccion of Freynsch into Enlysch; and Richard Pencrych lurnede that manere of techyng of hym, and other men of Pencrych. So that now, in the yer of our lord a thousand three hondred foure score and fyve, of the seconde kyng Richard after the conquest nyne, in al the gramer-scoles of Engelond children leveth Frensch and construeth and lurneth an Englisch, and habbeth therby avauntage in on syde and desavauntage yn another. (Kibbee 1991, 56)¹

Meanwhile, Wycliffe (1328-1384) becomes the first famous English heretic by challenging the whole ecclesiastical system and by defending the rights of his king against France. Religiously speaking, he will back up the purest Christian principles trying to approach the Church to the population. The translation of the Bible into the vernacular is the most obvious way of doing it. His interests will be followed by learned men of Oxford, but also by the lower clergy, the gentry, or, even, by laymen. That is how religion becomes an integrative force, a common belief ready to create a national church side by side with the emergence of a nation.

A conspicuous moment in the defence of the vernacular took place when Henry IV (1399-1413) was crowned in 1399 and in the Deposition Parliament "challenged the realm and made declaration of his right in English and after his election returned thanks in the same language" (Bernt 1970, 363)². This was the first king, after the Conquest, for whom English was definitively

¹ See also Stevenson, W.H. 1901: *The Introduction of English as a Vehicle of Instruction in English Schools*. In Skeat, Walter W., Napier, S. Arthur & Ker, William P. eds. 1901: *An English Miscellany Presented to F.J. Furnivall*. Oxford, Clarendon: 421-429

² Henry V's strong determination to hoist the English flag and to defend fiercely his native tongue is recorded in *The Brewers' First Book* (1422): «Cum nostra lingua materna, videlicet lingua Anglicana, modernis diebus cepit in honoris incrementum ampliari et decorari, eo quod excellentissimus dominus noster Rex henricus quintus, in literis suis missiuis, et diuersis negociis personam suam propiam tangentibus, secreta sue voluntatis libencius voluit declarare, et ob meliorem plebis sue intelligentiam communem, aliis ydiomatibus pretermisissis, animo diligenti scripturarum exercicio comendari procurauit; Et quam plures sunt nostre Artis Braciatorum qui in dicto ydiomate anglicano habent scienciam, illud idem scribendi atque legendii in aliis ydiomatibus videlicet latino et Franco ante hec tempora vsitatis minime senciunt et intelligunt; Quibus de Causis cum pluribus aliis

his mother tongue. The consolidation of England's national identity begins with his son Henry V (1413-1422) and the defeat of the French military dominance at the *Battle of Agincourt* in 1415. This country, poorer in population and resources, had been beating the enemy once and again. These victories were mainly due to a shift in military tactics: giving yeomen or townsmen, representatives of a diffused middle class, a more prominent role in war. From now on victories will be not only of the king but of the whole nation.

As a result of these social events, the mother tongue changes its status. Its growing importance in the oral field during the fourteenth century crystallizes now in a rapid progress in writing. Thus, from the first quarter of the 15th century, English becomes the language of records in Parliament and of general writing for wills, indentures, deeds and other documents, even for written laws. Caxton's introduction of printing in 1476 also contributes to the diffusion of the national tongue. At the end of the century almost all statutes are written in English¹.

The social and economic changes that took place in the Late Middle Ages guaranteed the recognition of English as the vehicle of expression of the whole nation. External events were slowly generating internal changes in favour of this tongue until it was socially settled and was admitted in learning circles as a symbol of Englishness. This is the situation at the beginning of the 16th century. Once the nation has selected her own code with the acceptance and support of the official policy, a step forward in the development of the language has to be faced: the selected code needs regularization due to the existing variability. It requires a codification through dictionaries, grammars and guides on spelling, punctuation and pronunciation. Renaissance scholars will deal with this issue.

2. ENGLISH IN TRANSITION

I love Rome, but London better. I favor Italie but England more. I honor the Latin but I worship the English. (Mulcaster 1582, 254).

Passion and pride in Englishness is easily deduced from Mulcaster's statement. This nationalistic spirit is going to pervade the whole Renaissance in all levels of life. This is an intellectual age interested in classical literature, geographical explorations, scientific advances. The educational goals embedded in the humanist trend together with the Protestant Reformation (1509-1547) spread this knowledge through vernacular translations. The defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588 and the foundation of Jamestown in 1607 as symbol of the British Empire will enhance English pride based on national achievement. In the 16th century English is England L₁ par excellence and while Latin and French are still used in the learning process or in administrative writings, these two are secondary languages, artificially learnt, but not the language of ordinary intercourse transmitted from one generation to another. Knowledge of Latin was important for those intending to become clerks, who were asked to have a good command of this language. Hence, the publishing of the *Vulgaria* (1519), a collection of sentences in Latin and English about everyday life. This learning method was superseded by Roger Ascham in his *Scholemaster* (1570) who proposed the study of Latin through double translations. The supremacy of Latin over, even,

consideratis in presenti quemadmodum maior pars ducum et Communum fidedignorum facere ceperunt in nostra materna lingua suas materias annotari, Sic et nos in arte nostra, predicta eorum vestigia quodammodo sequentes que nos tangunt necessaria decreuimus memorie infuturum commendare vt patet in sequentibus ... » (Chambers 1931, preface). Comments on the general linguistic situation of common people (he chooses English "for the better understanding of his people") and the language of writing used by Lords and Commons (they use it "to make their matters be noted down") are good indicators of the code switching which was progressively transforming English into England L1 at a national level. However paradoxical the fact of writing this text in Latin and its content may seem, it just mirrors the sociolinguistic situation at that particular moment.

¹ For further information see Bernt, R. 1972: The Period of Final Decline of French in Medieval England (Fourteenth and Early Fifteenth Centuries). *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 20: 341-369; and Suggest, H. 1945. The Use of French in England in the later Middle Ages. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 28: 61-83.

Greek, neglected the study of modern languages, excluding English. It was Richard Mulcaster that posed the inclusion of the vernacular as subject in school curricula.

The rise of the English nation in the 16th century paves the way for a conscious effort in the study of the mother tongue. It makes possible a sort of planning on the language that will cover mainly:

- a) Lexicography and grammar in writing.
- b) Pronunciation in the oral field.

The increasing number of terms required to cover and spread all knowledge reveals a lack of vocabulary which has to be urgently overcome. On the whole, Renaissance scholars offer two ways of vocabulary enlargement:

a) Borrowing: it consists in the transference of words from ancient and modern languages to represent new ideas or conceptions. These borrowed words have to adapt to the vernacular and are to be accompanied by an explanation of their meaning when first introduced. Finally, it is necessary to create the adequate environment to make sure people familiarize with this term. Among these innovators we find Sir Thomas Elyot's (1533) *The Knowledge that Maketh a Wise Man*, Richard Eden (1562) and George Pettie (1581), who in the preface of Guazzo's *Civile Conversation* asserted that:

for my part I use those woords as litle as any, yet I know no reason why I should not use them, and I finde it a fault in my selfe that I do not use them: for it is in deed the ready way to inrich our tongue, and make it copious, and it is the way which all tongues have taken to inrich them selves ... (Baugh 1991, 220)

b) Use of native sources: the main opponents to the tendency above mentioned regard borrowing as an obstacle to expand knowledge among the unlearned. New terms, so called "inkhorn terms", from other languages are not easy to understand and the plainness and purity of the mother tongue can be destroyed. These defenders of native sources are imbued with a patriotic appeal. They do not believe in enrichment through foreign words, but in the possibilities of their language. This trend encompasses revivalists and compounders. The former advocate the use of old terms as capable of expressing any content. The latter attempt to make up self-explanatory words out of native material. Sir John Cheke in a letter to Sir Thomas Hoby wrote: "I am of this opinion that our tongue should be written clean and pure, unmixed and unmangled with borrowing from other tongues" (Baugh 1991, 216). Cheke's defence of purity is echoed by Wilson, Nash, Samuel Daniel and others.

The problem of lexical enrichment constitutes the first purely linguistic step which will launch the native tongue into a corpus planning process. In the following step scholars will attempt to codify the language in dictionaries, grammars and other manuals. The first dictionaries were bilingual and their purpose was mainly didactic, to make easier the learning of Latin. Hence, we find English-Latin lexicons such as:

- ca. 1440. A Dominican Friar in Norfolk. *Promptorium Parvulorum, sive Clericorum*.
- 1483. Anonymous. *Catholicon Anglicum*.
- 1552. Richard Huloet's *Abcedarium Anglico Latinum*.
- 1553. John Withals' *Shorte Dictionarie for Younge Begynners*.
- 1573. John Baret's *Alvearie*
- 1589. John Rider's *Bibliotheca Scholastica*.

There are also other lexicons containing Latin-English wordlists:

- 1460. *Medulla Grammaticae*.
- 1500. Wynkyn de Worde's *Ortus Vocabulorum*.
- 1538. Thomas Elyot's *The Dictionary of Sir Thomas Elyot*.
- 1545. Thomas Elyot's *Bibliotheca Eliotae*.
- 1548. Thomas Cooper's revision of the *Bibliotheca*.

- 1565. Thomas Cooper's *Thesaurus Linguae Romanae et Britannicae*.
- 1587. Thomas Thomas' *Dictionarium linguae Latinae et Anglicanae*.

There was not a fixed rule to order the entries in a dictionary, only the last one has been arranged in today's alphabetical order. The rest follow different ordering principles: grouping according to topics, etymology, or, even, by alphabetical cross-references. The increasing number of reading public and the expansion of vocabulary require the creation of lists of words with their meanings. Mulcaster admits this need in a passage of his *Elementarie*. He demands a work which "wold gather all the words which we use in our English tung, whether naturall or incorporate, out of all professions, as well learned as not, into one dictionary, and besides the right writing, which is incident to the Alphabete, wold open into us therein both their naturall force and their proper use" (Mulcaster 1582, 166). Following the example of the medieval glossaries we now find "lists of hard words" that can be seen as the origin of later dictionaries. Robert Cawdrey's *A Table Alphabeticall* (1604), John Bullokar's *An English Expositor* (1616), Henry Cockeram's *The English Dictionarie* (1623), Thomas Blunt's *Glossographia* (1656), Edward Phillips' *The New World of English Words* (1658) and Elisha Coles' *An English Dictionary* (1676) can be included in this tradition. There is not an essential difference among them since, as Burchfield points out "copyright rules did not exist and wholesale lifting of material from one dictionary to another was commonplace" (Burchfield 1985, 82). Cawdrey's explanation on the content of his lexicon summarizes the practical aim of these wordbooks:

A Table Alphabetical, conteyning and teaching the true writing, and understanding of hard usuall English wordes, borrowed from Hebrew, Greeke, Latine, or French & c. With the interpretation thereof by plaine English words, gathered for the benefit & helpe of Ladies, Gentlewomen, or any other unskilfull persons. (Wells 1973, 17)

English lexicography begins to change in the 18th century with the publication of John Kersey's *A New English Dictionary*. The difference lies in his attempt to include not only difficult but also common words in a comprehensive way. This takes place around fifty years before Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary* (1747) is published. The authoritarian tradition starts with it.

Grammar seems to be for scholars a matter of later concern. It was generally thought that grammatical features did not require instruction. In fact, authors like Hart, Bullokar or Mulcaster confine to writings on spelling and orthography. Nevertheless, towards the end of the period, the prevailing educational bias of humanism highlights the validity of grammatical knowledge. It is useful to teach the structure of English to foreigners and to help children to learn Latin. In 1586 Bullokar publishes his *Bref Grammar for English*, a work highly influenced by Latin. Ten years later, Edmund Coote's *The Englishe Scolemaister* comes out. It contains a "miscellany of chronology, syllabification, numbers, spelling, catechism, psalms, grammar and a table of difficult words with glosses" (Peters 1968, 283). During the 17th century some grammarians tried to account for differences between English and Latin but the mirror of the classical tongues was always present. John Brinsley in 1612 stated that the main aim of studying grammar was "to attaine to the puritie and perfection of the Latine tongue" (Burchfield 1985, 94). We will have to wait until the second half of the 18th century to see the improvement of grammatical studies.

As for pronunciation, the primary concern on correct speaking and the relationship between letters and sounds evolves into a scientific description of sounds and speech organs. In an effort to set up the standards of speech, scholars of the age advance in their works the idea that the speech of the "learned and literate" is "the nearest (we) can follow", or that the best English is "the usual speech of the court, and that of London and the shires lying about London within IX miles and not much above" (Dobson 1955, 28)¹. Edmund Coote stands by these comments when he characterizes country people's way of talking as "barbarous". Charles Butler in his *English Grammar* (1633) defines the oral standard as that "of the Universities and Citties" (Dobson 1955,

¹ These quotations were originally taken from Hart's *Orthography* (1569) and *Method* (1570), and Puttenham's *The Arte of English Poesy* (1589).

29). This 16th and 17th century position will also be supported by Alexander Gill, Wallis, Owen Price, Elisha Coles, Cooper and, even, by the anonymous writer of *Right Spelling* (1704) for whom the speech of a common Londoner is inferior to that of educated people¹. The implication is that the emergent standard English can be largely defined by two features: place and social class. The first one refers to London and his surroundings. The second one relates the standard language to that of the highest classes of the Court, the administration in general and to that of University men. At the same time this normalization issue is discussed, some authors such as Palsgrave and Salesbury prepare comparative works on sounds. Other kind of studies constitute a mixture of orthography and pronunciation with the aim of achieving some consistency between writing and speaking. Thus, we find Thomas Smith's *De recta et emendata linguae anglicae scriptione* (1568) and Hart's *Orthographie* (1569) which also deal with the description of sounds and some aspects of modern articulatory phonetics. Nevertheless, a more scientific and technical interest in speech and language is found in 17th century authors such as John Wallis, Bishop Wilkins² and Christopher Cooper. This one is specially analytical in his descriptions and offers specific information about sounds and the way they are produced with illustrative examples.

3. FRENCH IN RENAISSANCE ENGLAND: AN L2

The emergence of nationalism in medieval England runs parallel to the decline of the French language. As Rothwell points out,

from the French version of Magna Carta (1215) to the threshold of the fifteenth century, French was the principal vehicle of recording the life of England, its law on land and sea, its government and administration at all levels, all the correspondence - both national and international - between kings, sheriffs, mayors, bishops and merchants. (Rothwell 1993, 314-5)

However, at the turn of the 15th century we can state that French gradually gave way to English in most legal writings: deeds, wills, Parliamentary petitions and other documents. Even correspondence between noblemen, ladies or religious institutions changed to English. In private letters the use of either of the languages ended by being a matter of individual preference.

The fact that French was denied official recognition in 16th century England can be put down to the linguistic pride of the period. This is no longer the mother tongue of any of the inhabitants of the Isles. On the contrary, it will be a sort of complementary knowledge in learning apart from the language of the law.

Some scholars regard English as “barbarous and rude”, lacking in eloquence, as a result of the comparison they establish with the classical tongues. This debate about the state of the language, its characteristics and peculiarities, and the fact of using it as a vehicle of popular instruction is, in fact, promoting the adherence of the nobility to French as a sign of class distinction. Therefore, in spite of not being native speakers of French, “the majority of the English nobility and gentry spoke and understood French at least tolerably well” (Lambley 1920, 62).

French will be important as an L2 in the field of education, especially for those intending to hold any kind of official post for which it was compulsory. Despite the fact that French was not integrated in either grammar school or university curricula, it could be learnt by other means. There were private schools directed by Englishmen or Frenchmen where this language, Latin, writing and counting were taught. They were especially strict with the learning of French. In one of them placed in Southampton: “anyone who used English, though only a word, was obliged to

¹ These authors supported this theory in Alexander Gill's *Logonomia Anglica* (1619, 1621), Wallis' *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae* (1653), Owen Price's *Vocal Organ* (1655), Elisha Coles' *The Schoolemaster* (1674) and Christopher Cooper's *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae* (1685).

² In 1668, Bishop Wilkins, a member of the Royal Society, published an *Essay towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language*. He describes the functions of the speech organs and gives a general classification of sounds.

wear a fool's cap at meals, and continue to wear it until he caught another in the same fault" (Lambley 1920, 150-1). The Londoner John Palsgrave, author of *L'Esclaircissement de la langue françoise* (1530) was, at first, one of them. Peter Du Ploich, a French refugee is another private schoolmaster who also published *A Treatise in English and Frenche right necessary and profitable for al young children* (1553). Schools connected with the French churches were also founded. The subjects taught were the same as in other private French schools. On denying the learning of French as a social requirement, both schools and universities fail in providing scholars with the necessary knowledge to work in everyday life. So, a competitor at University level springs up: they are the Inns of Court. Black tells us that there all the aspirants after knowledge of the common law received an education rivalling that provided by Oxford and Cambridge, where the canon and civil law formed the backbone of culture, and had for a long time opened the way to high office in church and state. (Black 1969, 321-2)

Other authors do not value so high this institution stating that gentlemen's sons attending the Inns could learn music, dancing and other accomplishments such as French to form their manners. In this sense it would be a kind of academy and as such, a complement to university studies. French was necessary in diplomatic affairs and to travel abroad. This is the main reason why certain social classes other than the aristocracy chose to study the foreign language. These are merchants, soldiers and travellers who are instrumentally motivated. In many cases learning French was not limited to private schools. Private tuition at home or in France was also common. In fact, the education of a nobleman required the study of Greek and Latin at Universities, to spend a time at the Inns of Court and, finally, to travel abroad in order to practise French.

As for the production of manuals to learn this L2, many are the scholars engaged in this task and many as well the works published. From the 16th century onwards there is a proliferation of Dialogues in French and English, grammars, pronunciation manuals and dictionaries, all written by English and French scholars indistinctively. Holyband's *The French Schoolemaister* or *The French Littleton*, Baret's *Alvearie*, Bellot's *Le Jardin de Vertu*, De la Mothe's *French Alphabet* or Cotgrave's *Dictionary* are some of the examples. All this proves how French is treated in England as an L2. Although social needs demand its knowledge, it is no longer a dominant language in the British Isles.

4. CONCLUSION

To sum up, after a struggle for official acceptance, English consolidates as England L₁ par excellence in the 16th century. Medieval nationalism is responsible for it. Many historical events have taken place for English society to regard its language as the most valuable symbol of cultural distinctiveness. The richness of Elizabethan literature speaks for it. From the emergence of the nationalist movement in the 13th century through the beginning of national consciousness (14th) and its consolidation (15th), we get to the national linguistic consciousness of the 16th century which considers the vernacular as a medium of expression. Discussions about the state of the native tongue in this transitional moment neglect the treatment of French which has never been the language of the majority of the population. Its use has been socially restricted to the high classes and those middle classes that by mimetism try to ascend in the social scale. French is not taught for everybody in grammar schools, and, although, it is useful for legal matters and for any kind of international relations, it will be just privately learnt as an L2 of culture.

5. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- Baugh, A. & Cable, Th. 1991 (1951): *A History of the English Language*. London, Routledge.
- Bernt, R. 1972: The Period of Final Decline of French in Medieval England (Fourteenth and Early Fifteenth Centuries). *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 20: 341-369.
- Bernt, R. 1989: *A History of the English language*. Leipzig, Veb Verlag Enzyklopädie.

- Black, J. B. 1969 (1959): *The Reign of Elizabeth*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Bolton, W. F. 1967: *A Short History of Literary English*. London, Edward Arnold Limited.
- Bornstein, D. ed. 1977: *Bullokar's Book at Large (1580) & Bref Grammar for English (1586)*. New York, Scholars Facsimiles & Reprints, Inc.
- Burchfield, R. 1985: *The English Language*. Oxford, OUP.
- Chambers R. W. & Daunt M. ed. 1931: *A Book of London English 1384-1425*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Clairbone, R. 1994 (1990): *English. Its Life and Times*. London, Bloomsbury Publishing Ltd.
- Danielsson, B. 1963: *John Hart's Works on English Orthography and Pronunciation*. Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Dobson, E. J. 1955: Early Modern Standard English. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1955: 25-54.
- Fishman, J. A. 1973: *Language and Nationalism. Two Integrative Essays*. Massachusetts, Newbury House Publishers.
- Foster Jones, R. 1966 (1953): *The Triumph of the English Language*. Stanford, S.U.P.
- Galbraith, V. H. 1941: Nationality and Language in Medieval England. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 23: 113-128.
- Gómez Soliño, J. S. 1986: La normalización lingüística en la época de Enrique VIII. > Onega, S. 1986: *Estudios Literarios Ingleses. Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid, Cátedra.
- Görlach, M. 1985: Renaissance English (1525-1640). > Greenbaum, S. 1985: *The English Language Today*. Oxford, Pergamon Press.
- Jacob, E. F. 1969 (1961): *The Fifteenth Century 1399-1485*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Kibbee, D. A. 1991: *For to speke Frenche trewely. The French Language in England, 1100-1600: its status, description and instruction*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lambley, K. 1920: *The Teaching and Cultivation of the French Language in England during Tudor and Stuart Times*. Manchester, MUP.
- Mackie, J. D. 1972 (1952): *The Earlier Tudors 1485-1558*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Machan, T. W. & Scott, Ch. T. eds. 1992: *English in its Social Contexts. Essays in Historical Linguistics*. Oxford, OUP.
- Mckisack, M. 1991 (1959): *The Fourteenth Century 1307-1399*. Oxford, OUP.
- Mulcaster, R. 1582: *The Elementarie*. London, Thomas Vautroullier.
- Myers, L. M. 1966: *The Roots of Modern English*. Boston, Little, Brown and Company.
- Nist, J. 1966: *A Structural History of English*. New York, St. Martin's Press.
- Partridge, A. C. 1969: *Tudor to Augustan English*. London, André Deutsch Ltd.
- Peters, R. A. 1968: *A Linguistic History of English*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Rothwell, W. 1968: The Teaching of French in Medieval England. *MLR* 63: 37-46.
- Rothwell, W. 1993: The Faus Franceis d'Angleterre: Later Anglo-Norman. In Short, I. ed. 1993: *Anglo-Norman Anniversary Essays*. London, Anglo-Norman Text Society 2.
- Suggett, H. 1945: The Use of French in England in the Later Middle Ages. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 28: 61-83.

- Thompson, J. 1992 (1983): *The Transformation of Medieval England 1370-1529*. London, Longman.
- Tout, T. F. 1922: *France and England. Their Relations in the Middle Ages and Now*. Manchester, MUP. Publications of the University of Manchester Historical Series No. XL.
- Wells, R. A. 1973: *Dictionaries and the Authoritarian Tradition. A Study in English Usage and Lexicography*. Mouton, The Hague.

* * *

The English Spelling Reform in the Light of the Works of Richard Mulcaster and John Hart

Susana Doval Suárez

UNIVERSITY OF SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA

1. INTRODUCTION

This study is an approach to the works of Richard Mulcaster and John Hart, who can be considered as the best representatives of the English Renaissance spelling debate. Since the controversy over the adequacy or inadequacy of English orthography is still alive, a comparison between present and past reform proposals is suggested.

The starting point of the discussion is the assumption that many of the so-called “modern” linguistic disciplines can be traced back to the Renaissance, as is the case with Language Planning. In fact, the English Renaissance meant the emergence of an intensive Language Planning activity entailing both standardization and normalization processes. Thus, using Haugen’s 1984 terms, both Corpus and Status Planning were developed at this stage of the history of the English language. However, the extent to which past and present activities can be compared has to do with the prescriptive character of the former as opposed to the more “social” character of the latter (cf. Fernández Pérez, 1994). In the case of Spelling Reform the difference is assumed to lie in the interdisciplinary approach of modern script reformers in contrast with the more unidirectional proposals made in the past.

2. THE RENAISSANCE SPELLING DEBATE

2.1. THE EMERGENCE OF SPELLING REFORM

By the middle of the 16thc the inconsistency perceived in the English Orthography gives rise to the first spelling reform treatises based on phonological principles. The English reform movement is vinctuated to the French orthographic reform, carried out by Meigret¹ and to the controversy over the pronunciation of Classical Greek confronting Sir John Cheke and Sir Thomas Smith on the one hand, and Bishop Gardiner on the other. Furthermore, it cannot be forgotten that in the 13th century, a canon called Orm had already written a homily using a phonetic system of his own invention for the purpose of improving predication. During the 16th and the 17th century numerous proposals are made: Smith, *De Recta et Emendata Linguae Anglicae Scriptione Dialogus, etc* (1568); Hart, *The Opening of the Unreasonable Writing of Our Inglish Toung* (1551); *An Orthographie* (1569); *A Methode or Comfortable Beginning for All Unlearned* (1570); Mulcaster, *The First Part of the Elementarie* (1582); Gill, *Logonomia Anglica* (1621); Butler, *The English Grammar or the Institution of Letters* (1668); Wilkins, *An Essay Towards A Real Character and A Philosophical Language* (1668). Nevertheless, the 18th century concern with

¹ He was the author of *Traité Touchant Le Commun Usage de L'Écriture* (1545) and *Le Menteur de Lucien* (1548), a translation of a Classical work in his own spelling system and which includes a preface advocating Spelling Reform (cf. Hausman, 1980).

rules will temporarily vanish almost all reform efforts until the 19thc, when sound spelling will gain new force.

2.2. JOHN HART

2.1.1. LIFE, WORKS, AND EARLY INFLUENCES

John Hart (?-1574), best known as Chester Herald, designed the first truly phonological scheme of the 16th century. Jespersen (1907), whose research into Hart's works has revived interest in the author, holds that "the system is purely phonetic¹ which is more than we can say of any other system of the period" (1907, 19). For this author, Bullokar only deserves the adjective "muddle-headed" (op. cit.), and though Gil's scheme was certainly superior to the former, it is still unphonetic (1907, 22). Dobson (1969, 62) states that "John Hart deserves to rank with the greatest phoneticians and authorities". In fact, Hart throws a valuable light on early Elizabethan phonology. His phonetic descriptions are sometimes tinged with humorous realism, as when talking about the vowel [e], he says: "[it is made by] thrusting softlye the inner part of the tongue to the inner and upper great teeth (or gummess for want of teeth)" (Vallins, 1965, 96).

Hart's ideas on the subject of Spelling Reform owe much to Meigret² and Smith³. First, both Smith and Hart design an "augmented alphabet". Second, both use the comparison with painting in order to express the idea that writing should imitate speech. Thus, Smith said "ut pictura, ortographia" (Foster Jones 1966: 145) and Hart says that we should imitate the voice in writing "even as the Painter, ought to chaunge the variable quantities and accidents, in the images of man" (Hart, 1959, 26r).

Hart is the author of three works on English orthography: *The Opening of the Unreasonable Writing of Our English Toung* (1551), an unpublished manuscript defending the case for Spelling Reform; *An Orthography* (1569), where he uses the same arguments and devises a new system of representation; and *A Methode or Comfortable Beginning for All Unlearned* 1570, a primer of reading according to his new system.

2.1.2. THE ARGUMENTS FOR SPELLING REFORM

An analysis of the state of contemporary orthography and an exposition of the arguments for reform appear in both the Manuscript and the *Orthography*. The latter is a four-fold scheme written for (1) "commoditie for the unlearned", (2) "for strangers and rude countrie Englishmen", (3) for "cost and time saved⁴ and (4) for foreign language learning (Danielsson 1955, 53-54). Hart sees the chaotic orthography of his time as "a kinde of ciphring". Spelling is abused because of four vices: diminution, superfluity, usurpation of letters and misplacing of letters (Hart, 1569, 146 & ff). On his opinion, some of these vices have been maintained "with some lykelihood of reason" (Hart, 1569, 11a), but he undertakes the task of removing/futing them in them in Chapter nine. These are his arguments:

- (i) "But their strongest defence is use..." (op. cit. p. 11b)

Reason must rule the reform of spelling removing the vices originated by Custom.

¹ Dobson (1955, 71) has called our attention upon Hart's abandoning of phonetic consistency for showing derivation or due to the influence of conventional spelling). However, this must not rest merit to the book, which on the whole is consistently phonetic. He refuses to use capitals, which, on Jespersen's opinion, makes him "more consistently phonetic than some phoneticians of the 20th century..." (Jespersen, 1909, 22).

² "... whose reasons and arguments I do here before partly use as he did Quintilians" (Hart, 1569, 53r)

³ "... sir Thomas Smith knight, hath written his minde ... in hys booke of late set forth in Latin entituled, *De Recta et emendata linguae Anglicae Scriptione*. Whereof and of this my treatise, the summe, effect, and ende is one. Which is, to vse as many letters in our writing, as we doe voyces or breathes in speaking, and no more..." (Hart, 1569: Preface).

⁴ However, in 1551 he had already seen the necessity of a gradual change due to the cost that new punches would involve (cf. Danielsson, 1955, 51).

Tongues haue often chaunged ... then if occasion in the fancies of men, haue had power to chaunge tongues, much more Reason should correct the vicious writing of the speech, wherein ... use shoulde none otherwise take place...and the contrarie to be taken for abuse or misuse (op. cit., p. 13b).

(ii) Against showing the derivation of words

It was generally argued that Traditional orthography had the merit of indicating the origin of words. In his book, Hart remarks that, although this is considered as a kind of duty by his contemporaries there is no natural law nor human agreement that may “oblige” languages to keep special marks for loanwords. In fact, he says, “we derive from the Saxons and do not write like them” (Hart, 1569, 18b). Hart compares neologisms with that person, who living in a foreign country should be obliged to wear a special costume to indicate his origin: “why shoulde he not be framed in every condicion as we ... and leave all his colours or markes of straungenesse” (op. cit. p. 16a-b).

(iii) Against showing difference

With a Reformed Orthography homophones would no longer be distinguished. Hart argues that if such a distinction is not kept in speaking, there is no reason for maintaining it in writing:

So as they say, it is necessary to write different letters, that the reader should not understande amisse, so say I, that is needfull for the reader, to pronounce the same difference of letters written, least the audience for want of hearing thereof, should fal into the same doubt, which they say the reader should do by sight, if they were not written. (op. cit. p. 24a)

Besides, he states that the common practice in this matter is inconsistent, since it does not serve to distinguish all homophones:

And many other equivoces, where we make no difference in speech, therefore ought to make none in writing: though they be of use of diverse significations, if now they could show me their reason why they use their fantasie in some, and not in these foresayde and many more, I would be glad to heare them... (op. cit. p. 26b)

(iv) Against showing time

Traditional Orthography used consonant doubling and final mute <-e> to indicate length “partly upon a reasonable cause ... which I confess we are forced to doe, and is necessary...” (op. cit. p.15). In 1569 Hart devises a diacritic mark to show time, but later, he will also allow for the use of double consonants to indicate shortness of a preceding vowel. In any case, he advocates the abolition of mute <-e> for indicating length.

In *The Methode* (1570) the educational and social aspects of reform are stressed. On the one hand, Hart makes up a new method for teaching orthography through the use of pictures for letters. On the other hand, the social argument present in the manual implies a criticism to the learned: They, he argues, “have no regard to the multitude, living, not to come” (Danielsson, 1955, 236) and oppose reform “for feare it [a new orthography] should be to easie for the Reader” (op.cit.).

2.1.3. HIS SYSTEM

Table 1 (see appendix) shows the evolution of his system from 1551 to 1570. In spite of the simplifications introduced in 1570, Hart’s system was severely censured by his fellow countrymen so, in 1573 he wrote:

For that the newe letters of myne orthographye and method are of many harde to acquainte them selves with them. I shall by godes grace frame to correcte the many abuses or our englishe writinge ... withoute any newe letters, other then iij ligatures of sh: th: and dh: ... (Hart, 1573; quoted by Danielsson, 1955, 58)

2.1.4. COMMENTS ON HART’S SPELLING REFORM

The validity of Hart's proposal is proved by the fact that his arguments are still valid today (cf. Danielsson, 1955, 50). His concern for literacy and his social criticism evidences a concern for the less favoured that makes his proposal even more "modern" in the light of present schemes. He was no rash reformer, since he conceived reform as a gradual process. He was aware of certain implementation problems, such as the lack of literature in the new system. Therefore, he suggested printing The Psalter and The New Testament in his own spelling.

Nevertheless, the key to his failure did not rest so much with technical or economic problem¹ as with the problem of acceptance. In the *Orthographie*, Hart reports having been persuaded against going on with his plans since

the power of soundes and of some letters have bene over long double for nowe to be recyved single, whatsoever they were aunciently: for that which use by little and little and with long continuance bringeth into any peoples maner of doing is never spoken against without great offence to the multitude ... (Hart, 1569, 11b)

This sociolinguistic problem (which modern reformers have not yet been able to cope with² had delayed the publication of the *Orthographie* and lead him to change his system in 1573 (vide supra). Even though from a 20th century perspective, Spelling Reform would have been a more feasible task in the Renaissance, we should not forget the special sociocultural conditions of the period: The Elizabethan man already saw in the language a symbol of the recently conquered national identity, especially at a time when a rich literature was flourishing. As Hart pointed out in *An Orthographie*, there was a general feeling that English had been "of late brought to such a perfection as never the lyke was before" (Hart, 1569, 11). Furthermore, Hart, unlike Mulcaster, did not receive any official support and, under such poor conditions, Spelling Reform was inevitably unattainable.

2.2. RICHARD MULCASTER

Richard Mulcaster (ca.1530-1611) was the first headmaster of the Merchant Taylor's School, and High Master of St. Pauls between 1608 and 1611. He is the author of two books: *Positions...for the Training up of children* (1581), which deals with general educational issues, and *The First Part of the Elementarie* (1582), which was intended to be the first of a series of books on vernacular literacy. His interest in Spelling Reform arises from his being a pedagogue and this justifies his position against phonetic Spelling Reform, since, as a schoolmaster, he had to teach the established spelling.

2.2.1. MOTIVATION AND PURPOSE OF *THE ELEMENTARIE*

At the beginning of the book, Mulcaster makes clear he is writing out of educational and patriotic interests:

besides som friendship to secretaries for the pen and to correctors for the print, to direct such peple as teach children read and write English ... to direct the Reader, I will thouroughli rip up the hole certaintie of our English writing ... bycause it is a thing profitable to my cuntry. (Mulcaster, 1582, 53)

In view of this, it is not surprising that Mulcaster's position regarding English orthography might be a middle one "judging it most well appointed, tho in particulars to be helpt" (op. cit, p. xii).

2.2.2. THE CASE AGAINST SPELLING REFORM

¹ Money was indeed one of the problems he had to face. Danielsson (1955, 54) states that "in 1551 he hoped that the costs for the necessary new punches would be borne by the King, but when he presents his new orthography in 1569 ... it has been printed at his own expense".

² 20th century reformers have also encountered the opposition of those who disparage their proposals on purely "aesthetic grounds", i.e. they do look illiterate.

In Chapter 12, Mulcaster explicitly assumes the task of defending the case against Spelling Reform: “to answer all those objections, which charge our writing with either insufficiency or confusion.” (op. cit. p. 62). Mulcaster does not completely censure past reformer.¹ He recognizes the good intentions of those, “who bearing a good affection to their naturall tongue ... devised a new mean ... to bring the thing about” (op. cit. p. 78). He thinks they failed because their proposals went “against common practice and use” (op. cit. p. 78). He foresees the failure of future schemes and realizes the difficulties for implementation: “From what a day is the act of reformation to take full place? It is a strange point of physik, when the remedie itself is more dangerous than the disease.” (op. cit. p. 97)

His argumentation against Spelling Reform can be summarized in the following points:

(i) Conventional character of writing²

Mulcaster does not deny the alphabetic principle, but insists that “the letters being thus found out to serue a nedefull turn took the force of expressing everie sound in voice, not by themselves or anie vertew in their form ... but by consent of those men which first invented them”.³ (op. cit., p. 65)

(ii) “Use is the mistress herein...” (op. cit., p.90).

Reformers think Custom is corrupted but Mulcaster holds that “[not] everie our custom is plaine corruption” (op. cit., p.86) and that the Reformers’ “misnamed custom is error” (op. cit.). He thinks that custom cannot be altered: if the existent letters were sufficient for those who invented them it is a matter of respect to leave them unaltered.

(iii) Philosophical argument: natural vs. artificial things

Mulcaster reminds us that, according to philosophers, while natural things have been made to serve only one end, artificial ones “maie serve to sundrie ends and uses” (op. cit. p. 92), as is the case with letters. Besides, if words may have different meanings in order to refer to the infinite number of things, “will letters kepe a countenance and stand so alouf, as to sound still but one, where their great grandfathers euen the words themselues, ar forced to be manifold?” (op. cit. p. 93)

(iv) Other languages use the same symbols so why are they not enough for ours?

Disregarding the fact that different languages use different phonological systems, he states:

This paucitie and pouertie of letters, hath contented and discharged the best, and brauest tungs, that either be, haue bene, shalbe, or can be...The peple that now vse them, and theie that haue vsed them, haue naturallie the same instruments of voice and the same deliverie in sound...that the English men haue (op. cit. p. 89)

(v) Against introducing new letters

Mulcaster argues that it is as bad to ouercharge letters with many uses (as it had been the custom) as to diversify the system by introducing new ones.

(vi) Ease of writing

¹ Danielsson (1955, 35) thinks his arguments are directed against Hart (cf. op. cit., p. 35).

² This is an attack to the main argument of reformers, i.e. that writing should be an image of speech. According to Foster Jones (1966, 149), “There is no better example of the absurd degree to which the peculiar idea of a “letter’s nature” was carried out than Hart’s refusal to use capital letters on the ground that, though different in form from small letters, they represent the same sounds. In place of that, he advocated putting a slanting line before the word”.

³ This is a very “modern” idea, very similar to the theories about written language developed by the Prague school of linguists (especially by Vachek, 1962-1989). Mulcaster even mentions the functional difference that holds between written and spoken language: “For the tung conueing speche no further then to those, which were within hearing, and the necessitie of conveiance oftymes falling out betwene som persons that were further then to those, which were within hearing ... a device was made to serue the eie afar of, by the mean of letters...” (Mulcaster, 1582, 65).

In devising new letters or altering the form of the existent ones one must consider ease of writing since “a form which is fair to the eye in print and cumbersome to the hand in penning, is not to pass in writing” (op. cit.). However, some of Mulcaster’s remarks on this respect sound naïve and irrational to a modern reader. When talking about final <-ie> for [i], for instance, he claims that “the verie pen, will rather end in the e than in naked i” (op. cit. p. 114). And he advocates the use of <-ew> instead of <-u> to “avoid the nakedness of small u in the end” (op. cit. p. 116).

(vii) If the reader understands what the writer says, there is no need to alter common use.

This really misses the point the reformers were trying to make, as the problem lay, not in mutual understanding, but in ease of learning, especially for the less favoured with no knowledge of the standard or the foreign terms recently introduced in the language (cf. Hart, 1570).

2.2.3. MULCASTER’S SYSTEM OF SPELLING

Even though Mulcaster opposed the works of previous reformers, he was for stabilization. His system, designed to improve the teaching of reading, was ruled by five precepts: *General rule* (describing “the propertie and use of ech letter”), *Proportion* (or analogy), *Composition* (“which teaches how to write a word made of mo”), *Derivation* (“which examineth the ofspring of euerie originall”), *Distinction* (“which bewraiethe the difference of sound and force of letters by som written figure or accent”), *Enfranchisement* (“which directeth the right writing of all incorporat foren words”) and *Prerogative* (or the precedence of use”) (op. cit. p. 54). The system that results from the application of each precept is represented in Table 2 in the appendix.

Some of his recommendations, such as the use of silent <-e> and consonant doubling, were successful and some others were not, as is the case with final <-ie>, the use of <i/y> and <u/v> and final <-ck>. In any case, Mulcaster played an important role in the standardization of spelling, even though his spelling was probably “modern” in his own day, and even though many of the changes he advocated were not made effective until the following century.

2.2.4. COMMENTS ON MULCASTER’S SPELLING REFORM

Mulcaster places himself in a middle position. First, he tries to balance the interests of the learner and the already learned. He is for example against the etymological argument arguing that although keeping the original form may be a “shew of learning” neologisms must be reduced to the “enfranchiser’s laws”. This he claims out of concern for the unlearned:

Neither must anie learned man think it strange to write foren terms after an English ear, tho it be contrarie to his acquaintance, seing it is not contrarie to the custom of his cuntrie. Neither it is anie ambassing to learning, to lend the common man the vse of his, tho to kepe the substance: neither yet both to se, suffer the learneddest terms that he hath, to com vnder an English hand, seing there is no dishonor ment them. (Mulcaster, 1582, 157)

However, Mulcaster also makes concessions to Custom when he declares himself strongly against reducing the exceptions to rules. His words are those of the proud Elizabethan man: “I take this period of our English tung to be the verie height thereof, bycause, I find it so excellentlie well fined...” (op. cit. p. 159)

As a language planner, Mulcaster deserves the merit of having understood the problems of implementation and evaluation posed by Spelling Reform: He saw clearly that language resists private innovation, that change cannot be forced (cf. Foster Jones, 1966: 166). The reason for his success must lie in the fact that his reform was supported by Elizabeth I, as it was based on tradition. This fact was of great importance for a country still looking for its national identity. As Howatt (1984, 92) remarks, “The Tudor Monarchy represents the nearest that England came to a system of centralized power and, had Elizabeth I decided that orthographic reform was necessary for the health of the realm she might just have succeeded in imposing it” (Howatt, 1984, 92).

3. SPELLING REFORM TODAY

During the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century Spelling Reform was subject to a debate as vivid as that of the Renaissance, and numerous societies for the simplification of spelling were founded. Nowadays, although the debate is not so vivid, reform is not a dead issue: The Simplified Spelling Society in Britain¹ and the American Literacy Council² still advocate the simplification of English Spelling for the attainment of general literacy. However, while the voices claiming for Spelling Reform can be heard only in reduced circles, there is widespread concern for the falling standards of literacy. The fact is that the number of functional illiterate³ is too big in both Britain and the USA (around six million and forty million respectively.⁴ As late as 1989, for instance, the British Department of Education and Science reported that although:

by the end of compulsory schooling pupils should be able to spell confidently most of the words they are likely to need to use frequently in their writing ... The aim cannot be the correct unaided spelling of any English word -there are too many words in English that can catch out even the best spellers... (Department of Education and Science, 1989; quoted by Upward, 1992, 19)

3.1. THE SYSTEMS

So numerous have been the schemes devised since the 19th century, that a complete revision of them escapes the purpose of this study. However, table 3 (see appendix) gives an overview of them using Brown's 1992 typology (cf. Brown, 1992, 4-5). As can be seen, there has been a general tendency towards the rejection of purely phonetic schemes in search of regular patterns. Diacritics are now quite old-fashioned and the devising of a completely new alphabet such as Shaw's (cf. Shaw, 1962) seems completely out of place. Present reformers are aware that full phonemicity is "an impractical idea" (Yule, 1982, 12), since a reform design must be not only linguistically perfect, but also, and principally, socially acceptable. That's why phonetic consistency tends to be sacrificed to the principle of "minimum disturbance" with Traditional Orthography (cf. Simplified Spelling Board, 1920, 17; Ripman and Archer, 1940, 13; Yule, 1982, 12 and ff.; Upward, 1992a).

3.2. THE ARGUMENTS

3.2.1. OBJECTIONS TO TRADITIONAL ORTHOGRAPHY AND ARGUMENTS FOR SPELLING REFORM

(i) Traditional Orthography is an assault on the alphabetic principle as it does not show the relationship between letters and sounds (cf. Upward, 1992a and 1992c).

(ii) It is the cause of literacy problems: It renders the learning of reading and writing very difficult, which implies an unnecessary waste of time.

(iii) Traditional Orthography also means wasting money and paper, for the number of redundant or unnecessary letters existing in Traditional Orthography. A Reformed Orthography, being shorter, would be more economical (cf. especially, Tauber, 1963, 102-3 and 125; Upward, 1992a).

¹ The latest scheme supported by the Society is *Cut Spelling* (1992), by C. Upward.

² This society has recently published *The Dictionary of Simplified American Spelling* (1986), edited by E. Rondthaler and E. Lias.

³ Functional literacy can be defined as "the contextual measure of literacy needed to function in society" (Brown, *Personal Views*, 1:7).

⁴ As regards The USA, the authors of *The Dictionary of Simplified American Spelling* estimate that they "number between 25 and 55 million. One in every seven of us, perhaps, one in every four. From the very limited statistics available it is estimated that more than 40 nations have a higher percentage of literacy than the US" (Rondthaler and Lias, 1985:4). Bob Brown, Secretary of the British Simplified Spelling Society, holds that "there could be more than 6,000, people in this category in Britain, in addition to another 4,000,000 with definite literacy problems" (in *Personal View* 1: 2).

(iv) A new orthography would be more legible and easy to write. Shaw's alphabet, for instance, removes capitals and linked handwritten characters. Upward (1992a) does also remove capitals but there is no general agreement on this point and some reformers think capitals may contribute to legibility (Cf. Ripman and Archer, 1940, 86).

(v) The International Argument: Traditional Orthography is a great obstacle to the universality of our language and its general use among learners (Simplified Spelling Board, 1920, 23).

(vi) A Reformed Orthography would preserve language from change (cf. Zachrisson: 1933). This opinion, philologically questionable, is not however shared by other reformers who think that even if a better spelling implies a better speech, change is inevitable (cf., for instance, Simplified Spelling Board, 1920).

(vii) A Reformed Orthography would align English with other European languages who have updated their orthographies (Spain, Holland, the Scandinavian countries...) (cf. Upward, 1992, 25-27).

3.3.2. OBJECTIONS TO REFORM AND ANSWER OF THE REFORMISTS

As in the Renaissance, Spelling Reform today encounters resistance on the part of the conservatives. The arguments against reform are more or less the same as in past centuries (etymological argument, homonymical objection, lexical objection... cf. Simplified Spelling Board, 1920; Wijk, 1959, 10-11; Follick, 1965, 11; Lindgren, 1969, 11). Nevertheless, three new arguments are used by 20th century opponents to Spelling Reform:

(i) The Economical Objection:

Opponents to reform claim that with a Reformed Orthography the old books would be wasted and printing them again would mean spending a lot of money in punches, paper, etc. But reformists argue that: (1) The change would only come gradually, so the old books will still be readable; (2) Types are always changing and the advance of learning requires continual reeditions of books. (cf. Follick, 1965, 225; Ripman & Archer, 1940, 93; Upward, 1992a, 24-5, etc).

(ii) The aesthetic argument: "in a RO the words will have a strange appearance and look ugly".

This argument, though apparently irrational, has important sociolinguistic connotations and it refers to a problem very difficult to overcome. Most reformers claim that all these difficulties will disappear when the new spellings are no longer new. On the other hand, it was this argument that led Shaw to depart from the Roman alphabet, since he thought that a Reformed Orthography would always look illiterate:

For this very reason, however, the reform cannot be effected by a shortened spelling which is indistinguishable from ordinary wrong spelling. If any man writes me a letter in which through is spelt thru, and above abuv, I shall at once put him down as an illiterate and inconsequent plebeian, no matter what Board or what potentate sanctions his orthography. (Tauber, 1965, 37)

A basic difference between past and present reformers is the fact that illiteracy is considered as a more serious problem today and social criticism in present authors is even fiercer than in Hart. Thus Lindgren (1969), with his typical energy, protests that,

there is a great deal of ignorance, indifference, egotism and snobbery among those sections of community who have themselves acquired the arts of reading and writing without much difficulty and who are not aware of the extent of semi-literacy and backwardness in reading among English-speaking school children. (op. cit. p. 15)

And Yule (1982) states:

Behind these assertions, and behind the name-calling of reform as scholarly, uncouth, etc, may lurk the unmentionable argument that present spelling is a shibboleth, a barrier separating the elect from the common herd who cannot even spell and who mispronounce uncommon words... (op. cit. p. 11)

Another difference between present and past reformers has to do with the 20th century concern with the international status of English that remained unexplored until the last century. Special care must be also given to the new approach to the spelling problem from an interdisciplinary perspective.

3.3. THE INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH

The recent developments in Psychology, Sociology and other disciplines close to Linguistics have further contributed to the study of written language and of the problems of devising new spelling systems in specific social and political contexts.

3.3.1. FURTHER CONTRIBUTIONS FROM 20TH-CENTURY LINGUISTICS

In the 20th century, “it is possible to trace the development of a school of thought which is not so much antireformist as fearful of too radical or precipitous a change” (Scragg, 1974: 114). The basic assumption held by Bradley (1913-14) and the functionalist Vachek (1989) is that spoken and written language are mutually independent, which implies that “writing should not be blamed for being inaccurate in recording the phonic-make-up of spoken utterances -it lies outside the scope of its function to do this” (Vachek, 1945-1945, 90; quoted by Tauli, 1977, 21). From a generativist perspective, Chomsky and Halle (1968) claim that the English orthography is close to optimal in keeping the similarity existing between related words, while other linguists, like Albrow (1972) or Venezky (1970) have assumed the existence of patterns of regularity in Traditional Orthography which partially deny its supposed chaotic nature. All these comments, some of them quite reasonable, have exerted a big influence on the conservatist views.

3.3.2. CONTRIBUTIONS FROM PSYCHOLINGUISTICS

Psycholinguistic evidence has led to establish two fundamental distinctions:

(i) Reading and writing are different psycholinguistic processes both from an anatomical and a functional point of view. Frith (1980, 496) has suggested that “it is most natural for users of an alphabetic script to ‘write by ear’ ...but to read ‘by eye’.

(ii) Skilled Adults are different from learners as far as their reading strategies are concerned. The “dual route of reading” implies that while a graphemic-phonemic strategy (or indirect route) is used by children when learning to read, more skilled readers use a direct or lexical strategy.

These two distinctions imply that any Spelling Reform has to balance the interests of the reader and the writer on the one hand and those of the learner and the skilled adult on the other. While a phonemic system would always help the writer and the young or foreign learner, a more ideographic system stressing word distinctiveness would on the contrary benefit the reader and the skilled adult.

3.3.3. CONTRIBUTIONS FROM SOCIOLINGUISTICS

The contribution of Sociolinguistics has been decisive for determining which non-linguistical factors should be borne in mind by reformers: (1) It does not matter how rigorous a system may be; if speakers do not like it, it is a waste of time; (2) Any writing system is embedded in a powerful social network (comprising users’ attitudes, publishing trades, international communication, technology...) which may exert enormous inertia against change; (3) Spelling is considered, in highly literate societies, as a social function difficult to achieve and, for that reason, difficult to renounce to (cf. Stubbs, 1989, 71 & ff.).

3.3.4. THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE PLANNING

Language Planning is the receptor of all these interdisciplinary contributions. It is the task of Language Planners to channel all the initiatives into the appropriate implementation activities bearing in mind all these factors and accounting for the interests of the majority. Since its early beginnings as a consolidated discipline in the 1950’s, Language Planning has been especially concerned with the problems of providing those languages with no previous written tradition with appropriate writing systems. However, since the problem of Spelling Reform is still unresolved and, since the role of writing in modern societies is so important, many authors are presently claiming that more research should be undertaken concerning the orthography planning of languages such as English or French (cf. Tauli, 1970).

4. CONCLUSION

This study has tried to demonstrate that the Renaissance was an especially rich period as far as linguistic production is concerned. The Spelling Reform activities undertaken at this time set out the lines along which modern Phonetics and Corpus Planning would develop. As regards Mulcaster and Hart, 20th-century authors have acknowledged their influence and their merits. Thus, Axel Wijk reminds us that Mulcaster was able to perceive “that the natural way of amending the spelling was to clear away old abuses and not to devise a wholly new and untried spelling system” (Wijk, 1959, 18). And, Upward (1992b, 21) recognizes that the concept that guides his own plan (i.e., “teaching literacy first, Traditional Orthography second”) had been already advanced by Hart in his *Methodie* in 157.¹

Two conclusions can be drawn from our analysis: on the one hand, in the light of present Spelling Reforms, the work of past authors does not look so old-fashioned: Mulcaster and Hart’s

¹ Thus, Upward (1992, 21) says: “An early, graphic statement of the psychological rationale of the ‘literacy first, spelling second’ approach was made by Hart”. Then he quotes Hart’s words on the traditional way of teaching reading: “VViich I finde as reasonable, as if a nurse shoulde take in hand to teach a child, to go first vpon high patters or stiles, or vpon a coarde, or on the hands, before he should be taughte as the naturall and reasonable order is...” (Hart, 1570; quoted by Pitman and St John, 1969, 77; op. cit.).

arguments are, for the most part, still valid, differences in this respect having to do with the new status of English and with technological changes. On the other hand, the work of past reformers also throws light on the future development of orthography planning. In view of the disappointing failure of the schemes so far designed, most sensible reformers are now aware that the future lies with interdisciplinary research, bearing in mind Upward's words that "like a garden, a writing system cannot be left neglected for ages" (Upward, 1992b: 33).

REFERENCES

- Albrow, K. H. 1972: *The English Writing System. Notes Towards a Description*. Longmans for the School's Council.
- Chomsky, N & J. Halle. 1968: *The Sound Pattern of English*. New York, Harper & Row.
- Cox, B. ed. 1989: *English for Ages 5 to 16 ("The Cox Report")*. London, Department of Education and Science and The Welsh Office.
- Danielsson, B. ed. 1955: *John Hart's Works on English Orthography and Pronunciation (1551-1589-1570)*. Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Dobson, E. J. 1969: *English Pronunciation (1500-1700)*. Oxford, The Clarendon Press.
- Fernández Pérez, M. 1994: Teoría y Aplicación. El Estatuto de La Planificación Lingüística. *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica X*: 63-101.
- Frith, U. ed. 1980: *Cognitive Processes in Spelling*. London & N. York: Academic Press.
- Follick, M. 1965: *The Case for Spelling Reform*. London, Pitman & Sons.
- Foster Jones, R. 1966: *The Triumph of the English Language*. Stanford, Stanford U. P.
- Hart, J. 1969 (1569): *An Orthography*. Menston, Scholar Press Ltd.
- Hart, J. 1551: *The Opening of the Unreasonable Writing ...* > Danielsson, B. ed. 1955.
- Hart, J. 1570: *A Methode*. Danielsson, B. ed. 1955.
- Hausman, F. J. ed. 1980: *Louis Meigret, Le Traité de la Grammaire Française (1550). Le Menteur de Lucien. Aux Lecteurs (1598)*. Tübingen, Gunter Narr.
- Howatt, A. P. R. 1984: *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Jespersen, O. 1907: *John Hart's Pronunciation of English (1569 and 1570)*. Heidelberg, Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Lindgren, H. 1969: *Spelling Reform. A New Approach*. Sidney, Hallstead Press.
- Mulcaster, R. 1582: *The First Part of the Elementarie*. Menston, The Scholar Press Ltd.
- Ripman, W. & W. Archer. 1940: *New Spelling*. The Simplified Spelling Society and J. I. Pitman and Sons Ltd.
- Rondthaler, E. & E. J. Lias. 1986: *Dictionary of American Spelling*. New York: The American Language Academy. Scholars Edition.
- Scragg, D. G. 1974: *A History of English Spelling*. Manchester, Manchester U. P.
- Shaw, B. 1962: *Androcles and The Lion*. Hardmonsworth, Penguin. The Shaw Alphabet Edition.
- Simplified Spelling Board. 1920: *Handbook of Simplified Spelling*. New York.

- Sterling, C. M. & C. Robson. eds. 1992: *Psychology, Spelling and Education*. Philadelphia, Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Stubbs, M. 1989: *Language and Literacy. The Sociolinguistics of Reading and Writing*. London & N. York: Routledge.
- Tauber, A. ed. 1965 (1963): *Bernard Shaw. On Language*. London, P. Owen.
- Upward, C.: 1992a. *Cut Spelling*. Birmingham, The Simplified Spelling society.
- Upward, C.: 1992b. Teaching Literacy First, Traditional English Orthography Second. > C. M. Sterling & C. Robson, eds. 1992: 18-29.
- Upward, C. 1992c. "English Spelling and Its Reform". *Terminologie et Traduction* 2: 161-180.
- Venezky, R. 1970: *The Structure of English Orthography*. Janua Linguarum Series Minor 2. The Hague, Mouton.
- Wijk, A. 1959: *Regularized English*. Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Yule, V. 1982: An International Reform of English and Its Advantages. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 4: 9-22.
- Zachrrison, R. E. 1931-2: Four Hundred Years of English Spelling Reform. *Studia Neophilologica* 4: 1-69.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1. EVOLUTION OF HART'S SYSTEM OF SPELLING

	<i>Manuscript</i>	<i>Orthography</i>	<i>Method</i>
	-Differentiation of <i/j> and <u/v> ¹ - <e> is not valid for representing [i:] - <oo> stands for [o:] and <u> for [u:] - <ea, ai, ay, ei, ey, ee, ie, eo> disappear		- <uu> for [w]
Vowels and Diphthongs	<w> is used for [u] <y>=[wi]	rejection of <w> and <y>	
Consonants	- <th> to be substituted for or <th> and <dh> respectively - <c> is used instead of <ch> - <sh> as in ModE <i>shame</i> - ph is always <f> - <g> is only [g] - <j> with ModE value - <k> for [k] so <q> disappears - <z>, <s> for [z], [s]	- devising of new symbols: - a new symbol for ch - new symbol for syllabic [l] - <gh> for <h> - <th>=[t ^h]	

¹ Dobson (1955, 69) believes this is "the earliest record in English of this proposal" (op. cit. 69) and Scragg (1974, 66) remarks on the fact that consistent use of them as separate letters was already being made by scribes at the beginning of the 15th century.

Use of diacritics	- acute and weak accents for strong and weak stress and a circumflex for length but he also allows for consonant and vowel doubling - abolition of mute <-e>	- subscript dot for long vowels - acute accent for short vowels (in doubtful cases)	- No special sign for [I] - No acute accent
-------------------	---	--	--

TABLE 2. MULCASTER'S SYSTEM OF SPELLING (1589)

GENERAL RULE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - use of mute -e to indicate length of preceding vowel ("qualifying e") or to alter the quality of a preceding consonant <c, g, s> ("mere silent") (never if the preceding vowel is short) - <-ie> to be written finally for /i/ - <-y> is used for /ai/ finally - <-y>+<-ing>=<-ying>; <-y>+<-ed>=<-ied> or <-yed> - <-ew> instead of <-u> in <i>trew</i>, <i>virtwe</i> - <i> vowelish vs. "consonantish" - u/v are variants of the same letter - Consonant doubling only if belonging to different syllables (except for <ss> and <ll>; no doubling after mute <-e>) - <-ick> in <i>traffick</i> - <ph> disappears - <-ss> =<-sse>
PROPORTION	- application of the principle of analogy: i.e. <i>hear</i> , <i>fear</i> , <i>dear</i> , <i>gear</i> , <i>wear</i> (exceptions due to prerogative, i.e. <i>where</i> , <i>here</i> , or enfranchisement, i.e. <i>mere</i>)
DISTINCTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ' , for time (with discretion) - ' sharp accent for sharp and quick vowels - ' flat accent for flat and quick vowels - ' straight accent for showing double force of letters
ENFRANCHISEMENT	- Neologisms should not imitate the original
PREROGATIVE	- Exceptions must not be reduced to rules

TABLE 3. TYPOLOGY OF ENGLISH SPELLING REFORM — ADAPTED FROM BROWN (1992)

INTENT NATURE	PERMANENT	TRANSITIONAL		
		TO RO	TEACHING TO	
			L1	L2
DIGRAPHIC	<i>New Spelling</i> (SSS, 1910 on) <i>Anglic</i> (Zachrisson, 1932) Follick, 1965 Rondthaler and Lias, 1985			
DIACRITIC	<i>Phonetic B</i> (Lindgren, 1969)			
MIXED (DIG/DIAC)	Hodges, 1644 <i>Phonetic A</i> (Lindgren, 1969) Hart, 1551-1570			
AUGMENTED ALPHABET	Smith, 1568 Bullockar, 1580 Hart, 1551-1570		<i>ita</i> , Pitman 1958	
NEW ALPHABET	Wilkins, 1668 Shaw/Read, 1962			
CUT REDUNDANCY	<i>DUE</i> (Citron, 1983) <i>Cut Spelling</i> , (Upward, 1992) <i>Clipd Spelling</i> (Yule, 1981)			
CONSISTENT RULES	<i>Regularized English</i> (Wijk, 1959, 1977) Mulcaster, 1582	<i>SR1</i> (Lindgren 1969)		
PARTIAL RECTIFICATION	Webster, 1789-1829 American Reforms, 1906			

READING AID	Hodges, 1644 <i>Writing to Read</i> (Martin and Rondthaler, 1986)			<i>English Teaching Alphabet</i> (Hofmann, 1988)
-------------	---	--	--	--

* * *

Mad Moll and Merry Meg: the roaring girl as popular heroine in Elizabethan and Jacobean writings

Patricia Shaw

UNIVERSITY OF OVIEDO

The “Mad Moll” and “Merry Meg” of my title refer, respectively, to Mary Frith, likewise known as “Moll Cutpurse”, and a tall, strapping Lancashire lass, known since her arrival in London, as “Long Meg of Westminster”, who are the protagonists of a series of late sixteenth and seventeenth century writings, two of which I should like to analyse in some detail, in order to explore, and, if possible, to account for, the attraction which these “roaring” cross-dressing girls obviously exercised over the Renaissance imagination and over the male authors who, basing themselves perhaps on popular legends concerning these probably real-life characters, endowed them with such enduring and endearing vitality both in fiction and in drama. The works which we shall be principally concerned with here are: the anonymous jest-biography, *The life of Long Meg of Westminster*, first entered into the Stationers’ Register in 1590¹; and Middleton and Dekker’s play, *The Roaring Girl*, first performed in about 1605. It is interesting to note, however, that Moll likewise appears in fiction, protagonising her “autobiography”, *The Life and Death of Mrs. Mary Frith*, published in 1662, and, conversely, that Meg is “the heroine of a play, noticed in Henslowe’s *Diary*, under the date February 14th, 1594” (Hindley, 1872: xxvi), but no longer extant. In the Renaissance period, the adjective “roaring” was applied to anyone “behaving or living in a noisy, riotous manner”², and was used particularly in combination with *boy*: “a roaring boy”; the word is, therefore, gendered, and hence its use with *girl* was obviously meant to evoke a hoyden, or tom-boy, who behaves in what is traditionally considered to be a masculine way.

Before commenting on the works mentioned, it would not, perhaps, be otiose to summarise briefly what is known about the real-life existence of these two interesting protagonists of, in Middleton’s words, “heroicke spirit and masculine womanhood” (*The Roaring Girl*, II.i.320-21). For chronological reasons, Long Meg should be considered first: her “actual existence as a real person has been both asserted and denied, but though in the nineteenth century the question was hotly debated by ... antiquarians ... in the pages of the early volumes of *Notes and Queries*, it remains unsolved”³ (Mish, 1963: 82). In the opinion, however, of Meg’s modern editor, Charles C. Mish: “... there must have been some living prototype for our heroine, and if she did not do everything ... recorded of her, the stories which clustered around her name have nothing inherently improbable or inconsistent.” (Mish, 1963: 82).

It is interesting to note in this context that the poet, John Skelton, and Henry VIII’s jester, Will Summers, who actually feature as characters in *The Life of Long Meg ...*, and who certainly *did* exist, were the supposed begetters of, respectively, a jest-book: *The Merry Tales of Skelton*, registered in 1566-67, and a jest-biography: *A Pleasant History of the Life and Death of Will*

¹ For the bibliographical history of *Long Meg*, see F. P. Wilson (1939: 155). The text used here is that to be found in Charles C. Mish (1963: 81-113).

² *The Oxford English Dictionary ...*, sub vocem. “roaring”.

³ “... notably by ... Edwin F. Rimbault and Peter Cunningham”.

Summers, 1637. The “living prototype” of Meg, hypothesized by Mish is not, therefore, as he says, at all improbable, and the reference in the opening pages of the book to her being “a Lancashire lass” determined to go to London “to serve and to learn City fashions”, together with “three or four lasses more” rings true, and the rhyming couplet with which one of the last chapters (Ch. 15) closes: “If any man ask who brought this to pass, / Say it was done by a Lancashire lass.” suggests that her northern origins were not a purely introductory convention. Significant, too, is the affirmation made in the preface to the book that “A woman she was of late memory and well beloved, spoken on of all and known of many: therefore there is hope of better acceptance”, i.e. people who had actually *known* her would be more interested in reading about her! It should, however, be remembered that *Meg*, according to the OED¹, is used dialectally “to indicate a hoyden, coarse woman, etc.”, and that in Edinburgh Castle there is a large 15th century cannon, known as Mons Meg (because it was cast in Mons), and also *Roaring Meg*, “so called from the loudness of her report”².

Of the real-life existence of Mary Frith there is no doubt: according to the *Oxford Companion to English Literature*, she was “a notorious thief, fortune-teller and forger, who lived about 1584-1659. She did penance at St. Paul’s Cross in 1612”³, a fact borne out by John Chamberlain (McClure, 1939: 334), who writes in one of his contemporary letters that:

... this last Sunday Mall Cut-purse a notorious bagage (that used to go in mans apparell and challenged the feild of divers gallants) was brought to ... (Paul’s Cross), where she wept bitterly and seemed very penitent, but yt is since doubted she was maudelin druncke, being discovered to have tiple of three quarts of sacke before she came to her penance.

According to Paul Salzman, “the redoubtable Mrs. Mary Frith ... was a well-known figure in the early part of the (17th) century. She dressed in male attire and led a sternly independent life” (Salzman, 1985: 213).⁴ For Havelock Ellis, “Mary Frith ... was a noted character of the period, and her reputation was none of the best” (Ellis, 1887: vii); however, according to her 17th century biographer, by “her heroick impudence (she) hath quite undone every Romance” (1662: 17).

As will be seen, the most outstanding characteristic shared by these two young women (Meg is eighteen when she comes to London, and Moll about twenty-five when the events described in the play occur), is their *afición* for dressing up as men, above all, as swaggering, fighting men, in other words, as “roaring boys”, and that this tendency is not a purely literary invention, but, in fact, reflects a real-life vogue, is witnessed by a number of contemporary documents and references, dating from the 1580’s and continuing well into the 1620’s: thus we find such observations as the following by William Harrison in 1577: “I have met with some of these trulls in London so disguised, that it passed my skill to discern, whether they were men or women.” Philip Stubbes, in his *Anatomy of Abuses*, 1583, inveighs against women wearing doublets and jerkins, affirming that:

... though this be a kind of attire appropriate only to man, yet they blush not to wear it; and if they could as well chaunge their sex, and put on the kinde of man, as they can weare apparel assigned only to man, I think they would as verely become men indeed, ...

For another commentator, such women are monstrous who are disguised as men, and are: “... like *Androgini*, who counterfaying the shape of either kind, are in deede neither, so while they are in condition women, and would seeme in apparell men, they are neither men nor women, but

¹ *The Oxford English Dictionary* ..., sub vocem, “Meg”.

² *Ibid.* See also: *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, under “Mons Meg”.

³ *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, under “Moll Cutpurse”.

⁴ See also Singleton (1970: 77-78).

plaine Monsters.”¹ Middleton is obviously reflecting such opinions when he has Old Wengrave say of Moll:

A creature ... nature hath brought forth
 To mocke the sex of women. - It is a thing
 One knowes not how to name, her birth began
 Ere she was all made. Tis woman more then man,
 Man more then woman, ...
 Davy. A Monster, tis some Monster. (RG, l.i.129-38)

Middleton and Dekker themselves classify various types of “Roaring girls” in the *Prologus* to their play, for, they affirm, “of that Tribe are many”, in order to distinguish *their* girl from the others, and it is likewise worth noting that, although no longer extant, there was entered into the Stationers’ register a work by John Day, probably a play, entitled: *The Mad Pranks of Merry Moll of the Bankside, with Her Walks in Man’s Apparel* (August 7th., 1610), presumably referring to Mary Frith.

By 1606, even Dekker “that tender-hearted poet” to whom, according to Havelock Ellis (1887: vii), “we probably owe much of the charity shed over the central figure” in *The Roaring Girl*, was accusing women of being “men’s Shee Apes” (Grosart, 1963: 59), and by 1620, we learn from that well-informed commentator of contemporary affairs, John Chamberlain (Shepherd, 1981: 68), that the king himself had taken up the cudgels against such unnatural behaviour on the part of women:

Yesterday the bishop of London called together all his Clergie about this towne, and told them he had expresse commaundment from the king to will them to inveigh vehemently and bitterly in theyre sermons against the insolence of our women, and theyre wearing of brode brimd hats, pointed doublets, theyre hair cut short or shorne, and some of them stillettaes or poinards, and such other trinckets of like moment, adding withall that yf pulpit admonitions will not reforme them he wold proceed by another course.

Such indignant criticism of women’s “insolent” cross-dressing and hair-cutting makes the sympathetic treatment meted out to the literary Meg and Moll by their authors particularly striking: in the case of Meg, it must be said, however, that in spite of all her derring-do, she still preserves her essential femininity (symbolised, perhaps, by the letting down of her hair after bouts of successful sword-play) in her willingness to be submissively married. There are more dimensions to the presentation of Moll Cutpurse in *The Roaring Girl*, since the authors allow us both to learn how the world judges her, and to see her, as, according to them, she really is, it being significant in this context that it is the despicable characters who disparage her most. Not the least suggestive aspect of this fascinating play then, is the fact that Middleton and Dekker chose to convert Chamberlain’s “notorious baggage” into a “goodly, personable creature”, strong, courageous, intelligent and virtuous, and morally soaring above the vicious and mediocre characters by whom she is surrounded.

Essentially, what these two “roaring girls” manage to do is give a number of unworthy men their “come uppance”, in a series of episodes which are comic precisely because the victors are women: such episodes protagonised by men would not, of course, be funny, the essence of humour being, precisely, topsy-turvydom, and in a patriarchal society, that a woman should physically overmaster a man, is topsy-turvydom with a vengeance! These “roaring girls”, then, proved to be attractive both to the authors who used them for copy, and to the readers and audience who could read about, or witness, and enjoy, their activity, because of their comic potential. In this sense, the preface to *Long Meg*, and Middleton’s preface to the printed edition and his *Prologus* to the play, are significant, all three texts insisting on the amusement in store for their readers/audience. Thus the anonymous author of *Long Meg*, the complete title of which is:

¹ These three texts are all reproduced in Shepherd (1981: 67-68).

The Life of Long Meg of Westminster: Containing the mad, merry pranks Shee played in her life time, not onely in performing sundry Quarrels with divers Ruffians about LONDON: But also how Valiantly she behaved her selfe in the Warres of Bolloigne,

after affirming that many have written of the jests of Robin Hood and Bevis of Southampton (i.e. *men*) “to procure mirth and drive away melancholy”, informs the reader that he bethought himself of the merry pranks of Long Meg, which are “as pleasant as the merriest jest that ever passed the press”, and will serve as the “whetstone to mirth” after his readers’ “serious business”. “If”, he adds, “she have any gross faults, bear with them the more patiently for that she was a woman”, a characteristic male rider, to shift the blame on to his subject, should the book prove unsatisfactory! The emblematic words here are *merry* and *mirth*!

As regards Moll, Middleton and Dekker affirm in the *Prologus* to their play that: “A Roaring Girle (whose notes till now never were) / Shall fill with laughter our vast Theater / That’s all which I dare promise.” revealing in the last line, that she is called “madde Moll”, the emphasis again being laid on merriment and, indeed, “midsummer madness”, for, says Middleton in the preface to the printed version of the play, “this published Comedy” is a “kind of light-colour Summer stuffe”. It is, then, the merriness of these madcap girls, and their potential for comedy which constitutes one of their principal attractions.

Another may well be their originality as subjects for literary exploitation: jest-biographies, that is to say, jest books “to which some semblance of unity has been given by grouping them round the figure of some popular hero” (Wilson, 1939: 133) do generally correspond precisely to this definition, i.e. they centre on “popular heroes”: Scoggin, Tarlton, Old Hobson, etc. Meg is unique in this sense as an examination of the relevant literature will reveal¹. Moll is similarly unique, as Middleton is quick to point out: “A Roaring Girle (whose notes till now *never were*)”, in the theatre, we are presumably to understand. For although Elizabethan drama, with Shakespeare at its head, is full of girls disguised as men, they are not counterfeit “roaring boys” engaged, sometimes aggressively, although always justifiably, in picking quarrels with unworthy men of all ages, nor do they possess the physique which would permit them so to do. Although the text of *Long Meg* is more forthright on the subject, there seems to be no doubt that both girls have physical attributes which facilitate their being transformed into honorary men (and, incidentally, would make it easy to find a suitable actor to play Moll’s part). In the case of Meg, it is her height which is her principal asset - not for nothing is she nicknamed “Long Meg” - for: “she did not only pass all the rest of her country in the length of her proportion but every limb was so fit to her tallness that she seemed the picture and shape of some tall man cast in a woman’s mold.” (Ch. 1). The poet, Dr. Skelton, composes some impromptu verses on first beholding Meg, which emphasize other physical advantages: “methinks she is of a large length, / Of a tall pitch and a good strength, / With strong arms and stiff bones.” (Ch. 2) and the Hostess of the inn where she will find employment sees her as “a good lusty wench”, who will be useful when it comes to obliging backsliding customers to pay their scores (as, indeed, she proves to be!).

Moll is less clearly evoked physically (much would depend on the actor in this case), although there are implicit allusions to her strength and robustness in speeches such as Laxton’s admiring: (that wench is) “as the Spirit of four great parishes, and a voyce that will drowne all the City, methinks a brave Captaine might get all his souldiers upon her ... if he could come on and come off quick enough.” (RG, II.i.166-69). There is an interesting parallelism here with Meg, which is hardly surprising since Middleton and Dekker do actually refer to her in their play², for in the second chapter of *Long Meg*, Will Summers, Henry VIII’s jester, likewise suggests she be married

¹ F. P. Wilson (1939: 154-57) registers: *Salomon and Markolf, The Parson of Kalenborow, Scoggin, Robin Goodfellow, Friar Rush, Tarlton, Dobson, George Peele, Old Hobson, Peter Fabell and Oliver Smug, George a Greene*, i.e. all *men*.

² At the beginning of Act V, Sc. 1, Jack Dapper asks: “But prethee Maister Captaine *Iacke* ... was it your *Megge* of Westmisters courage that rescued mee from the Poultry puttockes indeed?”

to “Long Sanders of the court, (for) they would bring forth none but soldiers”. Laxton calls Moll, his “sweete plumpe Moll” and compares her to a “fat Eele”, while one of his boon companions comments: “Tis the maddest fantasticalst girle: - I never knew so much flesh and so much nimbleness put together” (RG, II.i.182-83), so that one gets the impression that whereas Meg is strong and tall with it, Moll is strong and stout with it!¹ Their originality would, therefore, obviously contribute to their popularity as, above all, would the motives that lead them to engage in physical skirmishes and armed combat with masculine opponents. Although, as will be seen, Moll is portrayed in a far more subtle manner than Meg, drawing on her “wit” and intelligence as often as she draws her sword, there is a quixotic element perceptible in the behaviour of both these heroines, which makes them especially endearing, and, indeed, which undoubtedly endeared them to those readers who, a few years later, were to be likewise captivated by the immortal Don’s well-intentioned endeavours to right all that he saw as wrongs.²

Thus, Meg, for example, uses her physical advantages to defend the weak, to castigate masculine arrogance or deliberate rudeness (if it comes from a foreigner, even more so!) and to repel anything that smacks of abuse of authority, thus combining her quixotry with an admixture of Robin Hoodery! In Ch. 5. for example, we read: “... (Meg) was famoused amongst all estates, both rich and poor, but chiefly of them which wanted or were in distress, for whatsoever she got of the rich (as her gettings were great) she bestowed it liberally on them that had need;” tendencies illustrated in Ch. 9, in which after having defeated a couple of tall, swaggering thieves, she spares their lives “upon certain conditions”, these being:

1. First, that you never hurt woman, nor company that any woman is in;
2. Item, that you hurt no poor or impotent man;
3. Item, that you rob no children nor innocents;
4. Item, that you rob no packmen nor carriers, for their goods nor money is none of their own;
5. Item, no manner of distressed persons, but of this I grant you exceptions, that for every rich farmer and country chuff that hoard up and lets the poor want, such spare not, but let them feel your fingers.

Such conditions closely echo Robin Hood’s statutes of “robbing the rich ... suffering no woman to be molested, and sparing poor men’s goods”³. Like all her opponents, the thieves are “full of grief that a woman had given them a foil” (Ch. 9).

Similarly, Moll terrifies a group of cutpurses, even demanding of them some money stolen from a friend (RG, V.i.274-76) which they promise to do in their haste to get away from her, with, as one says literally, *pacus palabros!* This little episode serves, as happens in several occasions in *The Roaring Girl*, to trigger off one of Moll’s superb and profound tirades, the moral of which is that being acquainted with vice does not necessarily mean that one is vicious, and, indeed, that forewarned is forearmed! *Long Meg*, when all is said and done, is but a jest-book, in which one can hardly expect to find much rhetorical excellence, but Middleton, as we know from *The Changeling* and *Women Beware Women*, when writing at his best, writes very well indeed, and his espousal of Moll’s cause (perhaps at the instigation of Dekker, as Havelock Ellis suggests) means that she is endowed with some very powerful and very moving speeches. As T. S. Eliot (1976: 162) so aptly puts it: “In *The Roaring Girl*, we read with toil through a mass of cheap conventional intrigue, and suddenly realize that we are, and have been for some time without knowing it, observing a real and unique human being.”

Meg’s first martial enterprise is motivated by her natural indignation at the carrier in Ch. 1, who wants to extort more money than they possess from the Lancashire lasses he is taking to

¹ In the last chapter (Ch. 18), there is a reference to Meg’s “gross” and “fat body”, but the impression given in the rest of the book does not concur with this view of her.

² Thomas Shelton published his translation of the first part of *Don Quixote* in 1612.

³ *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*, under “Robin Hood”.

London to look for work - a case of a worker trying to exploit his own class for financial gain, an ambition Meg soon puts paid to by dint of her "lambasts". It is, however, characteristic of her nobility, that, when, in another episode (Ch. 9), she finds this same carrier robbed and thrown in a ditch, she offers to do her best to help him make up his losses!

Of genuine sexual exploitation or harassment in *Long Meg* there is none: however, one of her most outstanding achievements occurs when, disguised as a man, she defeats in a duel her mistress's insistent but despised suitor, Sir James of Castile (Ch. 4). It will be remembered that the book was first registered in 1590, just two years after the Armada, so it is hardly surprising that, this being a jest book, some episode or other should, indeed, reflect the discomfiture of the arrogant Spaniards: exacerbated patriotism is a distinguishing feature of this type of popular literature, as we find, for example, in Deloney's episodic novels, and this would, undoubtedly, constitute another of the attractions of the text. As in some of Deloney's stories too, Meg's activities are situated in the reign of Henry VIII, and finally in that of Mary, which allows the author to introduce as regular customers at Meg's inn, *The Spread-Eagle in Westminster*, not only the fictional Sir James of Castile, but also such real-life characters as John Skelton, Will Summers and, even, Sir Thomas More. As has already been mentioned, the first two were sufficiently identified in the popular imagination with tricks and mirth, as to be the heroes of jest-biographies¹, and, indeed, in this text, Skelton is shown composing "in his mad, merry vein" a poem about Meg which is, in fact, an amusing parody of the real-life Skelton's characteristic poetic style. That Sir Thomas More was a "merry man" is a commonplace of contemporary writings: as F. P. Wilson (1939: 125) has pointed out, the first collection of jests in English: *A Hundred Merry Tales*, was published by More's brother-in law, John Rastell, and in the opinion of William Hazlitt, was compiled by John Heywood (Rastell's son-in-law) "possibly at the instigation of Sir Thomas More".

In fact, before this duel, Sir James has already had occasion to regret the doubts he has expressed concerning Meg's strength, for: "try her", quoth Skelton, "for I have heard that Spaniards are of wonderful strength" (Ch. 2); however, Meg fells Sir James at one blow, so that he collapses "at her feet" (defeated Spain prostrate before Elizabeth?), which allows Will Summers to deliver the punch-line: "By my faith ... she strikes a blow like an ox, for she hath struck down an ass!" The suggestion concerning Elizabeth and defeated Spain is not, I think, totally far-fetched, for after winning the *duel*, Meg obliges Sir James of Castile to serve her at dinner, which he accepts with a fairly good grace, thinking that he has been defeated by some valiant English *man*, only to discover, as Meg lets down her hair, that he must play "the proper page, (to) Meg sitting in her majesty" (Ch. 2). The 1620 edition of *Long Meg* would likewise have enchanted those Londoners who, in 1624, flocked in their thousands to see Middleton's anti-Spanish political drama, *A Game at Chesse*.

Spain, however, is not the only target of Meg's patriotic enterprises, for in Ch. 11, at the siege of Boulogne, where she is employed as a laundress, she takes the initiative of leading other "women-soldiers" to throw stones and boiling water over some intrepid French soldiers who are managing to enter into the town, being likewise "the foremost with her halberd" to chase them from the walls. Not content with this, she actually challenges an arrogant Frenchman to single combat, proving herself, of course, the victor and cutting off his head, before letting "her (own) hair fall about her ears". Such female prowess has the patriotic advantage of making the enemy seem even more contemptible, and must have contributed greatly to the popularity of this text. *The Roaring Girl*, being a City comedy, Moll has few opportunities to meet hostile foreigners, although on two occasions (II.i. and III.i.), she suggests her hypothetical willingness to measure herself against "high Germans"! Sexual harassment and adultery do, however, constitute an essential feature of *The Roaring Girl*, which, as we are suggesting, is a much more impressive piece of writing, and never more powerfully so as in Act II.i., and Act III.i., in which the philanderer, Laxton (deceived by her hail fellow well met manner) sees in Moll an easy prey, a

¹ According to the Rev. A. G. L'Estrange, Skelton, indeed, "was esteemed more fit for the stage than the pulpit" (L'Estrange, 1877: 198)

purchasable prey, as he explains by means of sexually charged military metaphors: “He lay hard siege to her, mony is that *Aqua Fortis*, that eats into many a maidenhead; where the wals are flesh and bloud, He ever pierce through with a golden auguer.” (RG, II.1.172-75). In accordance with his conviction that *aurum vincit omnia*, he offers her “ten Angels in faire gold” “to be merry and lye together” with him at Brainford, an offer she apparently accepts, but only, in fact, to then challenge him to a duel in Gray’s Inn Fields, the motive of which, she assures him is “To teach thy base thoughts manners”, this declaration leading into a superb “feminist” speech, which Middleton might well be proud of composing, both for its rhetorical power and for the liberality of the ideas expressed therein. The text deserves to be quoted in full:

th’art one of those
 That thinks each woman thy fond flexible whore,
 If she but cast a liberall eye vpon thee,
 Turne backe her head, shees thine, or amongst company,
 By chance drinks first to thee: then shee’s quite gon,
 There’s no meanes to help her: nay for a need,
 Wilt sweare vunto thy credulous fellow letchers
 That th’art more in favour with a Lady
 At first sight then her monky all her life time,
 How many of our sex, by such as thou
 Haue their good thoughts paid with a blasted name
 That neuer deserued loosly or did trip
 In path of whooredom, beyond cup and lip.
 But for the staine of conscience and of soule,
 Better had women fall into the hands
 Of an act silent, then a bragging nothing,
 There’s no mercy in’t -- what durst moue you sir,
 To thinke me whoorish? a name which Ide tear out
 From the hye Germaines throat, if it lay ledger there
 To despatch priuy slanders against mee.
 In thee I defye all men, their worst hates,
 And their best flatteries, all their golden witchcrafts,
 With which they intangle the poore spirits of fooles,
 Distressed needlewomen and trade-fallne wiuers.
 Fish that must needs bite, or themselues be bitten,
 Such hungry things as these may soone be tooke
 With a worme fastned on a golden hooke.
 Those are the letchers food, his prey, he watches
 For quarrelling wedlockes, and poore shifting sisters,
 Tis the best fish he takes: but why good fisherman,
 Am I thoughte meate for you, that neuer yet
 Had angling rod cast towards me? cause youl’e say
 I’m giuen to sport, I’m often mery, iest,
 Had mirth no kindred in the world but lust?
 O shame take all her friends then: but now ere
 Thou and the baser world censure my life,
 He send ‘em word by thee, and write so much
 Vpon thy breast, cause thou shalt bear’t in mind,
 Tell them ‘twere base to yeeld, where I haue conquer’d.

I scorne to prostitute my selfe to a man,
 I that can prostitute a man to mee,
 And so I greete thee. (RG, III.i.68-109)

This, of course, is rôle-reversing with a vengeance, rôle-reversing which is reflected physically for, like Meg's opponents, Laxton gets the worst of the ensuing duel, loses much blood, and is forced to beg her pardon and sue for his life. A triumphant Moll then celebrates the independence that her valour allows her to enjoy in a significantly worded speech: "... shee that has wit and spirit, / May scorne to live, beholding to her body for meate ... / [...] / My spirit shall be mistress of this house (i.e. *body*) / As long as I haue time in't." (RG, III.i.133-140). Moll is not, therefore, all brawn and no brains: she has wit, intelligence, intuition and imagination. Indeed, Long Meg is more characteristically the "roaring girl", defending the interests of the oppressed by dint of her strength, whilst Moll, for example, forwards the cause of the happiness of Sebastian Wengrave and Mary FitzAllard - the central plot of the play - by convincingly lending herself to the deception that she, Moll, is the object of the young man's affection, and hence, reconciling his mean and miserable old father to his marriage to Mary, as the decidedly lesser of two evils. Moll is, therefore, cast into the sympathetic rôle of the agent through whom true love eventually finds a way, albeit Mary FitzAllard, colourless and rather malicious, hardly seems worthy of such a good-hearted and disinterested ally. Moll likewise thus gets the chance to avenge herself on her most vicious detractor, there being no end to the insults which Old Wengrave is willing to heap upon her, nor to the lengths that he will go to discredit her, including the ignoble stratagem of ostentatiously leaving valuables within her reach, in the hope that she will steal them, and hence may be arrested. This trick "to catch the young one" of course fails abjectly, since, as Havelock Ellis (1887: viii) points out: "She is acquainted with the shapes of iniquity, but she moves among them uncontaminated, and uses her knowledge not to practise but to defeat vice."

We have seen Meg punishing the arrogance of foreigners, but, of course, these chivalrous girls are just as willing to put down specimens of home-grown male arrogance and presumption, as is made manifest in many a merry episode or scene: Sir James of Castile may be a *miles gloriosus*, but, then, so too is Huffing Dick who, in his arrogance, deliberately picks a quarrel with Meg (Ch. 17), who then "so beat him that she had almost killed him." She then obliges this *machista avant la lettre* to dress up in women's clothing, whilst she goes in man's attire, and not only attend her through the public streets, but also, again, wait on her like a page, at dinner. After this humiliation, Huffing Dick "for very shame went out of London". As may be seen, rôle-reversing is being played out here with all its consequences, but one has no sympathy for a victim who so obviously deserves what he gets! At a more light-hearted level, Moll has several skirmishes with the bragging Trapdore, who is invariably worsted by her, and punishes a rapier-wearing ruffian for having insulted her in a tavern (RG, II.i.), the *pundonor* of these "roaring girls" being as pronounced as that of any other City gallants. Thus Meg, who has liberally paid a waterman to take her across the Thames (Ch. 15), is insulted when he begins to hum behind her back (an outward sign of inward dissatisfaction!) and decides "to revenge (her) own wrong", by tying him to the stern of his boat and sculling him back and forth herself, to make him remember "how he misused an honest face".

Similarly, when, dressed one evening in man's attire, she is insulted by a nobleman (Ch. 8), she responds immediately by giving him "a good box on the ear", and drawing her sword as fast as he and his servant draw theirs: "Meg was ready as they, and together they go, but Meg housed them both in a chandler's shop", the fray finally being interrupted by the representatives of law and order. In this episode, it is interesting to note that the wearing of men's clothes on the part of Meg, is associated specifically with having *fun*: "It chanced in an evening that Meg would be pleasant, and so put on man's apparel, and with her sword and buckler walked the streets, looking how she might find some means to be merry, ..." the implication being that for Meg, as for Moll, cross-dressing gives her the opportunity and the liberty of enjoying herself in ways which she cannot do in the spheres of action conventionally assigned to women.

The quixotic vein which, as has already been mentioned, is characteristic of both Meg and Moll, is patent in their sympathetic treatment and support of such victims of society as cashiered

soldiers, and any who are the victims of what they see as an abuse of authority. Being in their own way “warrior-women”¹, they seem to feel a natural affinity with that most masculine of professions, soldiering. Thus, most of Ch. 5 of *Long Meg* is dedicated to narrating how Meg befriends an out-of-work soldier, after first putting his valour to the test by crossing swords with him whilst disguised as a man. When Trapdore pretends to be “a poore Souldier with a patch o’re one eie” in order to beg, Moll is momentarily taken in by him and by Teare-Cat “all tatters”, exclaiming: “Come, come, *Dapper*, lets give ‘em something, las poore men, what mony haue you? by my troth, I loue a souldier with my soule” (RG, V.i.70-72), a sentiment, indeed, echoed by Meg: “I reverence all soldiers and honour captains” (Ch. 10), so it is hardly surprising that when she decides to marry, she should choose “a proper tall man and a soldier”!

Any abuse of authority arouses the indignation of these girls, proud to be a law unto themselves: thus, a creditor and the bailey he sends to arrest one of Meg’s customers, find themselves paid only in blows and drenchings administered by Meg’s powerful hands, outraged as she is that such an action be attempted on her premises: “Arrested.” quoth Meg, “what in our house?”², a house which she conceives of as “a sanctuary for any gentleman and not for bailies and catchpolls” (Ch. 6). One cannot help being reminded here of Don Quixote’s releasing of the galley-slaves. Similarly, when Davy Dapper’s father, in Middleton’s play, has his son, whom he sees as a “roaring boy”, shadowed by a sergeant and his yeoman, in order to have him arrested on a false charge of debts concocted by himself, in the hope that a term in prison will cure him of his wild ways, Moll happens to walk by, and foils this new example of “a trick to catch the young one”, for she immediately scents the sergeant for what he is, and resolves to “spoyle (their) game”, by warning their intended victim. Insulted by the sergeant who calls her “a whore to hang upon any man”, she retorts: “Whores are like Seriants, so now hang you, draw rogue ...”, thus frightening him and his fellow away. Revelling in her success, she assures the audience that: “I’m glad I haue done perfect one good work to day, / If any Gentleman be in Scriveners bonds, / Send but for Moll, she’ll baile him by these hands.” (RG, III.iii.212-214). A similar and not unattractive self-confidence informs the speech in which she assures Old Wengrave that he could do far worse than have her as a daughter-in-law, enumerating the benefits (qua dowry) that she brings:

Now all the towne will take regard on you,
And all your enemies feare you for my sake,
You may passe where you list, through crowdes most thicke,
And come of brauely with your purse unpickt,
[...]
No cheate dare work upon you, with thumbe or knife,
While y’ aue a roaring girle to your sonnes wife. (RG, V.ii.155-161)

Abuse of parental authority is thus foiled twice by Moll in the course of the play, and it is in this skirmish with the sergeant that Moll’s valour earns the epithet of “Megge of Westminster’s courage” (RG, V.i. 1-3), courage which, indeed, *Meg* displays against the Constable of Westminster who is determined to press her ostler into the army: when all entreaties fail, she gives the Constable a sound box over the ears, thus bringing to his aid the Captain, before whom she displays her martial skills so convincingly that she is able to enlist in her man’s place (more rôle-reversing), and thus, as has been seen go to Boulogne. If civil and military authority do not impress her, it is unlikely that ecclesiastical authority will be able to do better, and in the last and anti-Catholic chapter (Ch. 18), situated in the reign of Mary Tudor, an hypocritical and corrupt friar gets his “come uppance”, thanks to her strength *and* her resourcefulness. On her recovery from a grave illness, Friar Oliver exhorts Meg to do the Penance imposed by the Church; if not, he says, he will “complain to the Ordinary, and so to the Bishop, and compel you to it by injunction”. Such words are, of course, like a red rag to a bull for Meg! The penance is not

¹ Cf. Simon Shepherd’s title, op. cit.: *Amazones and Warrior Women ...*

² One cannot help but be reminded of Lady Macbeth’s: “What! in our house?” (II.iii.97)!

dissimilar to that imposed on the real-life Mary Frith at Paul's Cross, for Meg is to go to Mass and "Kneel before the pulpit and declare to the people the vileness of (her) life", or, alternatively, "bestow five pound for five solemn masses". Meg apparently accepts this second alternative, but, of course, eventually gets her money back by a clever trick "which was such a disgrace" to Friar Oliver that "he was ashamed to show his face in the streets". The whole episode smacks very much of the popular anti-Catholicism of the 1590s.

There is, of course, another kind of authority, husbandly authority, and here the ways of the two "roaring girls" part: for Meg is willing to submit to the authority of the right husband, while Moll is incapable of being obedient to any man. In this context, it is interesting to note that when Thomas Deloney incorporated Meg into several chapters of Part II of *The Gentle Craft*, 1598, her pranks are all centred on her unsuccessful wooing of Richard Casteler, the shoemaker, and her rivalry in this connection with Gillian of the George. Thus, unlucky in love, she ends up badly in Deloney's version, becoming "common to the call of every man", though repenting in old age. However, in *Long Meg*, she marries her tall soldier, to whom she offers "great obedience" even when, on one occasion, curious to confirm the stories of her martial exploits, he tries to put her fighting skills to the test. She refuses, however, to be drawn, saying, on her knees (!):

Husband, ... whatsoever I have done to others,
it behooveth me to be obedient towards you,
and never shall it be said, though I can
swinge a kave that wrongs me, that Long Meg
shall be her husband's master, and therefore
use me as you please. (Ch. 3)

Moll's attitude to marital obedience is, in fact, similarly conventional - these works were, after all written by men! - deprecating the idea that a man should stand in awe of his wife (RG, III.i.138), and admitting that "a wife you know ought to be obedient" (RG, II.ii.36-37). Precisely for this reason, she herself prefers to stay single, an attitude explained in a lively speech very much in the spirit of Shakespeare's Beatrice making *her* declaration of independence! However, there is perhaps no such telling illustration of Moll's innate sense of fair play as in the speech, in the same scene (II.ii.) in which she advises young Sebastian not to "take a wife running", and warns him against the craftiness of "old cozoning widdowes, that ... make (a) poore Gentleman worke hard for a pension ..." Her anti-marriage speech deserves to be quoted in full:

I haue no humor to marry, I loue to lye aboth sides ath bed myselfe; and againe ath' other side; a wife you know ought to be obedient, but I feare me I am too headstrong to obey, therefore Ile nere go about it, I loue you so well sir for your good will I'de be loath you should repent your bargaine after, and therefore weele nere come together at first, I haue the head now of my selfe, and am man enough for a woman, marriage is but a chopping and changing, where a maiden looses one head, and has a worse ith place. (RG, II.ii. 34-43)

Equally amusing are her "only in a blue moon" verses at the end of the play (RG, V.ii.) which culminate in her affirmation that doomsday would be the best day for marriage: "For if I should repent, I were soone at rest"!

I think it may be said, therefore, with some justification that mad Moll and merry Meg owe their popularity not only to their inherent potential for comedy, but also to the fact that they reflect a contemporary vogue, that they embody dramatically the adventures of real-life characters, as also to the fact that their quixotic traits are endearing, as such traits always are (it being a natural human tendency to delight in seeing the underdog defended, and authority, arrogance and vanity taken down a peg or two), and, probably, to the fact that contemporary women would enjoy and identify with, the feminist tendencies featured in these stories. At a purely literary level, it should perhaps be pointed out that because their supporting casts are made up of either colourless or anodyne characters, or downright disagreeable, not to say vicious and corrupt ones, these honourable girls soar above them morally, and hence can depend on their readers' full approval. Meg's story is lively and entertaining, and the miscellaneous episodes do endow her with an

attractive, well-defined outline, but the work does not display the subtlety nor the unexpected depth which Middleton and Dekker were capable of bestowing on a character who has, obviously, been deliberately moved far away from her disreputable original. Middleton, indeed, confirms this in his *Prologus: his "Roaring Girl"*, he says, "flies / With wings more lofty" than others "of that Tribe", and these "lofty wings" have gained her many admirers: for T. S. Eliot, as has been mentioned, "she is a real and unique human being", whilst for Havelock Ellis (1887: vii-viii):

She is strong and courageous ... and her sword is the match of any man's, but it is never drawn save in a good cause. She is frank and free-spoken; when among friends the mood takes her, she can even sing a wanton song, and accompany it on the viol; but she is modest for all that, and woe to the man who attempts to take liberties! She is acquainted with the shapes of iniquity, but she moves among them uncontaminated, and uses her knowledge not to practise but to defeat vice. She is a knight-errant who goes about succouring distressed lovers in the way of honesty, and she would like in her own person to avenge all the wrongs of women.

Ellis's reference to knight-errantry brings to mind again the quixotic elements in the behaviour of these two honorary and honourable men, elements which were not lost on later commentators by then familiar with Cervantes' immortal work through Shelton's translation (1612): thus, at the level of burlesque, Edmund Gayton, in his *Festivous Notes on the History of the renowned Don Quixote*, 1654, bestows on Meg some verses entitled *Long Meg of Westminster to Dulcinea of Toboso* (a parody of the verses prefixed to Cervantes' novel), in which she welcomes Dulcinea to share her lonely tomb in Westminster Abbey:

Indeed, untill this time, ne'r any one
Was worthy to be Meg's companion.
But since Toboso hath so fruitfull been,
To bring forth one might be my sister Twinne,
Alike in breadth of face; no Margeries
Had ever wider cheeks or larger eyes;
Alike in shoulders, belly and in flanks,
Alike in legs too, for we had no shanks,
And for our feet, alike from heel to toe,
The shoemakers the length did never know.
Lye thou by me ... (Hindley, 1872: xxiv-xxv)

Eight years later, and at a more romantic level, as is fitting, Moll was awarded "an accomplished interior monologue" in the fictional autobiography, *The Life and Death of Mrs. Mary Frith*, 1662, a monologue in which she sees herself, dressed as she is in man's apparel, as a character in the Spanish book:

In my own thoughts I was quite another thing: I was Squiresse to *Dulcinea of Toboso*, the most incomparably beloved Lady of *Don Quixote*, and was sent of a message to him from my Mistress in the Formalities of *Knight-Errantry*, that I might not offend against any *punctilio* thereof which he so strictly required; and also to be the more acceptable to my lovely *Sancho Pancha*, that was trained up by this time in Chivalry, whom I would surprise in this disguise. (Salzman, 1985: 213)

Indeed, as I hope to have suggested, in or out of such disguises, these "roaring girls" are never less than surprising!

REFERENCES

Eliot, T. S. 1976 (1932): Thomas Middleton. *Selected Essays*. London, Faber.

- Ellis, H. 1887: Preface to Vol. II. *Thomas Middleton, The Best Plays of the Old Dramatists*. London, The Mermaid Series.
- Grosart, A. B. ed. 1963: *Thomas Dekker: Non-Dramatic Works*. 2nd. ed., 5 vols. London, Russell.
- Harvey, Sir P. ed. 1965 (1946): *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. 3rd edit. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Hindley, C. 1872: Preface to Vol. II. *Old Book-Collector's Miscellany*. London.
- L'Estrange. A. G. (Rev.). 1877: *History of English Humour, with an Introduction upon Ancient Humour*. London. > Franklin, B. ed. 1970: *Research and Source Works Series 415. Essays in Literature and Criticism*. 46. New York.
- Life and Death of Mrs. Mary Frith, The*. 1662. London.
- McClure, N. E. ed. 1939: John Chamberlain, *The Letters*. 2 vols. *American Philosophical Society*, I. Philadelphia.
- Mish, C. C. ed. 1963: *The Anchor Anthology of Short Fiction of the Seventeenth Century, Selected and Edited by Charles C. Mish*. New York, Doubleday Anchor Books.
- Salzman, P. 1985: *English Prose Fiction 1558-1700, A Critical History*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Shepherd, S. 1981: *Amazons and Warrior Women, Varieties of Feminism in Seventeenth-Century Drama*. New York, St. Martin's Press.
- Singleton, R. R. 1970: English Criminal Biography, 1651-1722. *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 18: 77-78.
- Wilson, F. P. 1939: The English Jestbooks of the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Century. *Huntington Library Quarterly* II.

DICTIONARIES:

- The Philological Society 1961 (1933): *The Oxford English Dictionary, Corrected Re-Issue with an Introduction, Supplement, and Bibliography of A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles, Founded Mainly on the Materials Collected by The Philological Society*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

* * *

Lyric and lyric sequences

Maria Hélena de Paiva Correia

UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA

Let us start with a daring question, one that we will try to answer in due course. And the question is: What is lyric?

Books and articles dealing with this issue are hard to find and their conclusions remain elusive. Most turn to the safety of a historical approach quite useful in itself, but leaving everything else less than clear cut. Many seem to be responsible for the easy adoption of romantic criteria, uncritically confining lyric to the expression of human subjectivity. Surprisingly enough such a statement seldom meets with fierce opposition, as if romantic ideology could still rule unchallenged.

When compared to the vast, illuminating bibliography on Drama and Narrative extending from Greek culture to our own days, the bibliography on lyric is brief and unconvincing.

Notwithstanding this obviously discouraging state of affairs, the fact is that people do recognise a lyric piece of writing, and that is fortunate indeed!

If recognition is possible and reading can be enjoyed, then it follows that there must be some perceptible traits in a type of discourse the main description of which apparently defies human intelligence. That is the aim of my lecture but I will have to digress a little before I get to it.

For better and for worse Western criticism is grounded on Aristotle's *Poetics*, and as far as we know, Aristotle did not choose to discuss the lyric instance. In *Metaphysics* his philosophy emphatically points out to movement and energy, in other words, to action, as the kernel of human life and human society. Accordingly, the philosopher's attention centers on the imitation of human actions by means of speech. Hence this criterion leads to a distinction between Narrative and Drama, implying the superiority of the latter, since it comes nearer to human dialogue.

Thus we understand now that such a criterion would lend a poor hand to a kind of speech where action can hardly be found. As a matter of fact a lyric utterance seems to lack action, especially if we take action to mean, as Aristotle has repeatedly enhanced, a coherent plot. As a result of this the Aristotelian tradition has led Western criticism to neglect the lyric genre.

Nowadays Aristotle's classification still holds because its linguistic basis has gained new credibility. The criteria of such a classification, however, and the hierarchy they outline, have lost ground, especially in an era where non-imitative art is deliberately produced.

Anyway, the two traditional modes of uttering human speech — Drama and Narrative — have later on been joined by a third entity — Lyric — which, after all, has nothing to do either with Aristotelic thought or its linguistic recovery. Such an inconsistency doesn't seem to concern contemporary criticism, though I must say I personally find it deeply disturbing.

As early as 1564, Minturno worried about the lack of any explanation for a literary fact that theory totally ignored. He did his best to make room for Lyric within the strict boundaries of mimetic theory. His approach, however, didn't prove relevant though he must be remembered as the first and only one of the few to take interest in the matter.

It is obvious that the theoretical frame we have inherited can hardly deny its Greek sources, so let us tackle the problem, and try to distinguish the main features of a lyric utterance when compared to both Narrative and Drama.

Common speech generally implies dialogue and narration. This fact alone should explain why Drama and Narrative have so easily been traced in literary texts.

Conversely, literary texts very often disclose the expression of intimate feelings and thoughts conveyed in a way that cannot be labelled either as dialogue or narration, although something similar to those procedures may sometimes occur. Let it also be said that it is quite unusual to talk at length about one's intimate feelings and thoughts in front of other human beings. Thus the difference between common speech and a lyric utterance is indeed striking.

Nevertheless, expressing intimate feelings and thoughts is undoubtedly familiar to all of us when carried out in the deep silence of our minds. I do not mean what twentieth century criticism has chosen to call stream of consciousness or its related counterpart, the interior monologue, but a perfectly coherent discourse where difficult conceits are frequently developed and where syntax shows a most intricate though fully equipped completeness. Needless to say, that these mental reasonings may either lend expression to our inmost feelings and thoughts or resort to a fictional mask which takes possession of the silent voice of the I.

Lyric as a literary genre is to the best of my understanding the expression of this third kind of utterance human speech is capable of. We are aware of its existence though common speech seems reluctant to acknowledge it. But we are also aware that extensive mental narratives and continued mental dramatic utterances are possible, though not usual, even if common speech seems to welcome them more easily.

Thus our first step has been taken. It consists of the full recognition of a kind of utterance that from now on we will call lyric. Though it generally takes place in a mental, silent territory, it may and does break into sound. History tells us that lyric utterances have long made their way towards the audience with the support of music. Music has compelled these utterances to acquire a particular kind of intensity and measure; that is, what first looked silent has surrendered to the power of human voice. The matter seems likely to arouse some contradiction, but once we come to the conclusion that common speech makes little room for lyric utterances, it is only natural that an alternative had to be discovered. Music, of course, has proved to be a lasting influence on Lyric, even after the two arts went their separate ways. Yet, though we must acknowledge this undeniable feature, let us proceed. After all, measure and rhythm are not alien to Narrative and Drama as we all know by experience; so they cannot fully explain the lyric mode.

From a linguistic point of view, it seems easy to understand that the lyric utterance reveals itself as *immediate*, that is, it makes no use of an intermediate instance to carry its voice. When compared to Narrative, what strikes us first is the absence of a narrator. When compared to Drama, the lyric utterance seems to flow just as the words of a dramatic character spring out of his or her mouth, with the exception that no character has been presented to impersonate the voice. The voice is there, in direct approach. This must be the reason why the speaking voice is generally taken as the expression of its nearest human support, the author. Hence the persisting belief in its being the expression of human subjectivity, as if human subjectivity could not and would not make use of other kinds of utterance. Hence the biographical phallacies that seem not to be able to tell the difference between reality and a too successful illusion. Hence the inability to recognise fiction in a voice which seems to convey its own truth.

Immediacy is then the most striking feature of the lyric mode.

It is perfectly acceptable to admit that the immediate voice we are listening to may, at any time, introduce a narrator and give place to narration or present characters and make room for dialogue. Nevertheless neither can be held responsible for the basic structure of the utterance. Their appearance will be recognised as merely episodic. Let us call to mind here that Drama often gives way to narration and even to lyric utterances without running the risk of being confused with another mode, just like Narrative may include dialogue by way of direct speech. This doesn't mean that we are shifting from Drama to Narrative whenever narration happens, or that Narrative turns into Drama whenever dialogue breaks, or even that Lyric ceases whenever either narration or dialogue are detected. Narration is not identical with Narrative and does occur outside its scope.

Dialogue clearly differs from Drama, as common speech unmistakably shows. What matters is the recurrent, structuring mode. Once this is recognised, the lion's share consists of mixed discourse.

The first sonnet of Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella* is a case in point.

Loving in truth, and faine in verse my love to show,
 That the deare She might take some pleasure of my paine:
 Pleasure might cause her reade, reading might make her know,
 Knowledge might pitie winne, and pitie grace obtaine,
 I sought fit words to paint the blackest face of woe,
 Studying inventions fine, her wits to entertaine:
 Oft turning others' leaves, to see if thence would flow
 Some fresh and fruitfull showers upon my sunne-burn'd brain.
 But words came halting forth, wanting Invention's stay,
 Invention, Nature's child, fled step-dame Studie's blowes,
 And others' feete still seem'd but strangers in my way.
 Thus great with child to speake, and helplesse in my throwes,
 Biting my trewand pen, beating my selfe for spite,
 'Foole', said my Muse to me, 'looke in thy heart and write.'
 (William A. J. Ringler, Oxford, 1962: 165)

We are faced with an immediate utterance. The voice we are listening to makes no use of any intermediate instance to reach us. Yet, a character is introduced in the last line, and a voice is lent to this character so that it may speak using the direct speech: '*Foole*', said my Muse to me '*looke in thy heart and write*'. In spite of the occurrence of direct speech, no one would deny that the poem belongs to the lyric mode.

If we focus on what we have been reading we will also notice that this sonnet draws a small, but very clear line of action. The lyric 'I' shows itself as a poet who desperately seeks to write love poetry in order to win the affections of the *deare She*, until the Muse gives him some advice.

There is sufficient evidence to help us to realize that lyric poetry includes action and characters. Most of it deals with a thin action that remains far from a coherent plot. Allow me to remind you, however, that some Narrative and Drama offer a thin action too. The reason why it seems difficult for us to be conscious of the tenuous kind of action generally to be found in a lyric piece of writing is grounded on Aristotle's legacy, for it has established the type of plot we are still used to.

As there is action in lyric poetry, so there are characters. Sidney's sonnet offers us three characters: The lyric I which, of course, is the main character, the dear *She*, and the Muse.

In most lyric poems, characters seem hard to find because the great majority is reduced to one character: the immediate lyric I, or lyric voice. Besides, this character — or characters when there is more than one, as it is the case with this sonnet by Sidney — does not follow the kind of presentation we are used to both in Narrative and in Drama. The lyric voice presents itself while speaking, that is, it depends upon its own immediacy.

After careful analysis it becomes clear that several sweeping assertions about the lyric are proven wrong, seem to have been originated by deep prejudice, and that prejudice can probably be traced to the Aristotelian tradition which has penetrated Western criticism so powerfully.

Going back to Sidney's sonnet, a good example, we can easily detect two contradicting points of view. The lyric I and his Muse do not share a common belief. The Muse seems to know better.

Literary criticism has generally handled the question of point of view in very narrow terms. When reading the bibliography on that difficult subject we get the impression that there is no point of view outside Narrative, which, of course, is wrong. Let us not discuss the matter now, at least on theoretical grounds. Instead, let us stress that point of view is always present in human speech, and as such it must occur in all literary modes.

If it seems absent from many lyric poems, that is due to the fact that in most of them only one point of view can be perceived: the point of view of the lyric I, that is, the point of view of the only character in the poem. But never doubt it is there. In some poems the lyric I adopts two conflicting points of view. In a few poems — and Sidney's sonnet is one of them — two characters offer two different points of view. In this particular case the issue becomes more visible. Since the lyric I is either the only or, at least an overwhelming, main character in lyric poetry, his or her point of view prevails.

With the help of Gérard Genette's established terminology, let us also distinguish, within the wide scope of point of view, the eye that sees from the voice that is speaking. It is undeniable that the eye is bound to see *something*, and the voice to speak about *something*. Earl Miner in *Comparative Poetics* (Princeton, 1990) calls this *something* "point of attention".

Bearing this notion in mind, I will try to explain why, in lyric poetry, the ascendancy of the lyric I becomes so complete. In fact, the lyric I proves to be, if not the only, at least the main point of attention. In a great part of lyric poems, the lyric I is his or her own point of attention, that is, both point of view and point of attention converge in the same instance. In Sidney's sonnet, even the Muse's point of view, which seems to disagree with the point of view of the lyric I, — 'Foole' ... 'looke in thy heart and write' — undoubtedly centers on the same point of attention.

Many lyric poems are devoted to the description of the beloved Mistress, that is, the voice of the lyric I reports the observation of another character. The character being described seems to invade the whole poem, and turns out to be the clearly discernible point of attention. Nevertheless the voice we are listening to develops an outstanding point of view which often imposes itself. The voice seems to be more important than the character spoken about, since it shapes the image that is being conveyed to the audience. The viewer overpowers the object submitted to examination. The interaction between point of view and point of attention contributes to the predominance of the lyric I.

Such is the case with the famous sonnet 130 belonging to Shakespeare's sequence: (*The Complete Works*, Oxford, 1988)

My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun;
 Coral is far more red than her lips' red.
 If snow be white, why then her breasts are dun;
 If hairs be wires, black wires grow on her head.
 I have seen roses damasked, red and white,
 But no such roses see I in her cheeks;
 And in some perfumes is there more delight
 Than in the breath that from my mistress reeks.
 I love to hear her speak, yet well I know
 That music hath a far more pleasing sound.
 I grant I never saw a goddess go:
 My mistress when she walks treads on the ground.
 And yet, by heaven, I think my love as rare
 As any she belied with false compare.

It is true that, here, the pervading influence of ironic inversion emphasizes a rather uncommon point of view. As a result the lyric I draws attention to itself.

Let us consider, however, another example, sonnet 7 in Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella* (William A. J. Ringler, Oxford, 1962: 168):

When Nature made her chiefe worke, *Stella's* eyes,
 In colour blacke, why wrapt she beames so bright?
 Would she in beamie blacke, like painter wise,
 Frame daintiest lustre, mixt of shades and light?

Or did she else that sober hue devise,
 In object best to knit and strength our sight,
 Least if no vaile those brave gleames did disguise,
 They sun-like should more dazle then delight?
 Or would she her miraculous power show,
 That whereas blacke seems Beautie's contrary,
 She even in blacke doth make all beauties flow?
 Both so and thus, she minding *Love* should be
 Placed ever there, gave him this mourning weed,
 To honor all their deaths, who for her bleed.

In this particular case, in the first quatrain two characters share the point of attention: Nature and Stella, through the metonymy of her eyes. As we can notice, the point of view of the lyric I surpasses the point of attention in so far as it is responsible for a kind of praise which gives full testimony to some particular traits. The character of the speaking voice is mainly depicted by what is being expressed. Relating this sonnet to the first poem in the sequence, a poem we have read a few minutes ago, we come to the conclusion that the poet followed the Muse's advice, since he is writing love poetry. His description of the dear She, now bearing the name of Stella, tells us that he is aware of the literary conventions of his craft. It is the character of a poet that is being depicted, and not merely the character of a lover.

Thus the lyric I overpowers the whole discourse. His or her voice imposes itself by means of its immediacy, and the immediate utterance it implies carries in itself the display of a main character involved in minimal action. The point of view of the main character is predominant, falling heavily on the main character proper. Hence the intensity one generally detects in a lyric poem. This intensity results from a type of concentration difficult to be found elsewhere. The lyric I organizes the whole text, establishing its basic coherence.

This leading instance is, however, a fictional entity. We should bear that in mind, since the power it enjoys reinforces an illusion of truth which has been the source of a considerable amount of mistakes.

Now that we are aware of at least some distinctive features pertaining to the lyric mode, we should be able to understand why a lyric sequence seems to tell a story. This historical genre developed from the original pattern set by Petrarca's *Canzoniere*. This collection consists of a series of poems combined in a given order so that the whole may convey the impression of a continuous meaning. The meaning holds because each poem is part of it and all poems contribute together to extend the almost unsuspected capacities of the lyric mode we were able to discern.

When comparing Narrative with Drama it becomes clear that both can tell a story, though only Narrative can do it according to the narrative mode. We have already seen that a lyric poem has got a minimal action, and at least one character. A lyric sequence provides room for the required development of action and character, since each poem, in an ordered series, adds further elements to those perceived in the previous ones. The complex whole resulting from the connexion of the separate parts conveys the impression of continuity, though each part, in itself, seems to be autonomous and doesn't look like a fragment. It only becomes a fragment when its meaning is analysed against the meaning of the entire sequence. Contrary to Narrative or Drama, the parts of a lyric sequence are complete and make sense in isolation. When put together their meaning changes into an expanded reality.

This meaning results from the transition of one poem to another, following the continuous, ordered series of a considerable number of pieces of writing. If the order were changed, the meaning would be seriously altered, while in Narrative or Drama the plot can be told in a different way and still keep its outline. Of course the action generally displayed by a lyric poem and a lyric sequence is made of indispensable details. Such details cannot be translated into a few traits. They can find its full expression only in the course of an extended continuity.

Let it be understood, however, that this continuity is different from the continuity conveyed by Narrative. There a permanent flux is being delivered, while a lyric sequence is built by means of an ordered series where each unity starts and ends, being followed by the next. This interrupted continuity derives its meaning from both the transition and the break it implies.

There is no doubt that the story a sequence tells is still grounded on the overall tyranny of the lyric I. The major point of view as well as the persisting point of attention fall on this instance. The enlarged extension, however, offers new opportunities. The action can be developed, acquire a remarkable length and include complex turnings. The number of characters may be increased. There is room to explore their featuring and to lend detail to their interaction.

Lyric sequences are thus able to develop, and reinforce the latent possibilities existing in the lyric mode. Hence they provide the clear recognition of action and character in a genre which seemed not to favour either. Maybe Shakespeare's sequence remains the best example of increased action and character by means of the flowing of continuous meaning.

To my mind, lyric sequences are to be taken as the most influent genre that Lyric has ever produced. They are able to further the hidden capacities of lyric poems into unsuspected realms, going well beyond the original limited scope of the lyric mode.

* * *

John Donne: Holy Sonnet XIV or the Plenitude of Metaphor

Purificación Ribes

UNIVERSITAT DE VALÈNCIA

The aim of the present paper is to offer a new interpretation of John Donne's Holy Sonnet XIV: *Batter my Heart*. It is by no means the first attempt at shedding light on this complex and enthralling poem. In fact, we have read interesting and varied contributions to its understanding. J. C. Levenson (1953, 1954), G. Herman (1953), G. Knox (1956), A. L. Clements (1961), J. E. Parish (1963), E. Schwartz (1965), D. Cornelius (1967), R. D. Bedford (1982) and T. Romein (1984) have attempted to offer a coherent reading of *Batter my heart*.

Before we proceed further in its analysis, it may be convenient to read it once more.

Batter my heart, three-personed God; for you
As yet but knock, breathe, shine, and seek to mend;
That I may rise and stand, o'erthrow me, and bend
Your force to break, blow, burn and make me new.
I, like an usurped town, to another due,
Labour to admit you, but O, to no end;
Reason, your viceroy in me, me should defend,
But is captived, and proves weak or untrue;
Yet dearly I love you, and would be loved fain,
But am betrothed unto your enemy;
Divorce me, untie, or break that knot again,
Take me to you, imprison me, for I,
Except you enthrall me, never shall be free,
Nor ever chaste, except you ravish me.

For some critics (Levenson, Schwartz and Cornelius) three images may be identified in the poem, each corresponding to each of the three quatrains. In their opinion, these images are metalurgical, military and amorous, respectively.

R. D. Bedford also interprets the poem in terms of three images, although for him the first is related to pottery.

T. Romein, finally, sees a glass-blowing image in the first quatrain, while the interpretation of the other two remains military and amorous.

For other critics, however (Herman, Knox, Clements, Parish) only these last two images exist in the poem, starting at the first line.

Although some analyses are easier to sustain than others, there is not a single article which gives a thorough explanation of the poem. There is always some verb which doesn't suit their proposal, and which is systematically ignored.

This is also the case with the symbolic connection between different quatrains and images, where those words which might be problematic are often omitted.

In our opinion, there are not two, but three images in this poem, which are intimately connected from the first line to the last one.

The first quatrain is undoubtedly the most challenging, which is amply proved by the variety of interpretations we have gathered.

All critics admit the existence of the military and amorous images in the second and third quatrains, though not all of them see the same kind of connections between the two.

In our opinion, T. Romein's discovery of a glass-blowing image in the first quatrain poses serious difficulties both from a theological and from a strictly symbolic point of view. He portrays a ridiculous image of God as a fallible entity who is unable to mend a crystal vessel, and who attempts to do so by "lightly striking its surface -in order to see if it rings truly- "and by later "breathing on it to fog it with his breath so that he can shine it with a cloth" (1984: 14)

He later describes God's behaviour in the following terms: "To make the piece perfect he (God) must rather break it into pieces and then blow the glass into a new form as he burns it to keep the glass molten", where the order in which the verbs are explained doesn't correspond to the order of the original sequence of verbs in the poem. There (break, blow, burn) "blow" precedes "burn", whereas their order is reversed by Romein to suit his explanation.

R. D. Bedford's proposal is not too coherent either. Looking for Biblical sources which may justify his reading of the quatrain, he selects two passages by Jeremiah which either cannot be applied to God or which work in a direction contrary to that of the poem.

In Jer. 18.4, a potter is mentioned who must make a new vessel because the first one has been "marred in the hands of the potter". Theologically, this cannot be applied to an infallible God.

In Jer. 19.10-11, which is also mentioned by Bedford (1982: 19), God's attitude while destroying his people is contrary to the one Donne develops in this sonnet, where man has to be destroyed by God in order to be completely renewed. In the passage by Jeremiah, however, we hear the following: "So I will break this people and this city as one breaketh a potter's vessel, *that cannot be made again*"

Technically, Bedford's analysis is equally deficient. Verbs such as 'breathe (on it)' and 'shine (it up)' cannot be applied to a potter's vessel. The verb 'to blow', which is central to Romein's interpretation, is simply omitted by Bedford, who would undoubtedly have serious difficulties to make it suit his image. Lastly, the activity denoted by the verb 'to burn' cannot be repeated if the potter's vessel which has to be destroyed and re-made has already been exposed to the action of the fire.

This leads us to previous interpretations of the quatrain, which, in our opinion, are easier to sustain, although they need to be completed.

J. C. Levenson (1953: 246) was the first critic to find out a metallurgical image in the quatrain although he wisely modified his first interpretation, which was too restricted. In 1953 he thought of God as a 'tinker' and of the poet as a 'pewter vessel'.

G. Herman's ironic commentaries on the image that same year made Levenson extend its scope. Herman (1953: 248), realizing the difficulty of suiting verbs like 'shine' to this image, said: "Incidentally, wouldn't it be rather futile to attempt to shine pewter?", which made Levenson (1954: 248) apply the image to other metals, while keeping the same explanatory principle: "that God should cease to 'tinker' (seek to mend) the damaged object, but demolish it, melt it down and make it new" .

This new proposal was followed both by E. Schwartz and by D. Cornelius, and serves as a point of departure for our own interpretation of the quatrain, in which an alchemical image is at its centre.

According to our reading of the quatrain, the poet sees himself as an utterly corrupt person, whose soul can only be saved if its present condition is deeply transformed. This can only be achieved by violent means, since all gentle attempts to make him follow the right path are doomed to failure.

The poet compares his heart -the traditional seat of the soul- to a metallic vessel, whose imperfections have been externally mended by God. He has *knocked* -that is, hammered - it (OED 2 trans.) to rectify its form. He has then *breathed* on it -that is to say, tarnished (as if with breath) (OED 9 fig.) in order to *shine* (it up) (OED 11, 'to cause to shine').

This process would have been perfect if the poet's condition were not completely corrupt, as Donne's calvinistic creed made him believe. Being such the case, if the soul wishes to be chosen for salvation, the self must go through a thorough process of change, both external and internal. In order to achieve it, the metallic vessel must not be merely knocked upon, but *broken* (OED I 'to sever into distinct parts by sudden application of force') as a result of God's battering. God must then *blow*, that is, "direct a current of air into (a fire) in order to make it burn more brightly", and the sinner's heart / self is not to be merely polished but placed in that purifying fire which may transform it inwardly as well as outwardly ('*burn*' OED 13 "to alter in chemical composition (by oxidation, volatilization of a constituent etc) or in appearance, physical structure or properties, by intense heat").

Only after such a violent and profound process of purification may the soul be transformed into a new being (make me new).

The action of the fire doesn't limit itself to the outward melting of the metallic pieces before they are given a new form, but also affects the constituent essence of that metal, which, through an alchemical process, is liberated of its dross and thus purified.

It was a common belief among alchemists that lead could be transformed into gold through a prolonged process of heating. And a parallelism between this phenomenon in the Natural World and the purification of the human soul was frequently drawn among astrologers.

Donne uses this image several times in his religious poetry. In some cases there can be found examples of close similitude to the lines in this poem. In *Good Friday, 1613* (ll.39-40), for instance, Donne asks God to punish him, so that the metal he is made of may be purified. Here are his words:

O think me worth thine anger, *punish me,*
Burn off my rusts, and my deformity.

In *Resurrection imperfect* (ll. 141-147) Donne alludes to Christ's alchemical power, which he has obtained through extreme suffering, and which enables him to transform the sinful soul's iron and lead into gold:

He was all *gold* when he lay down, but rose
All *tincture*, and doth not alone dispose
Leaden and iron wills to good, but is
Of power to make even sinful flesh like his.

In another passage: *The Lamentations of Jeremy, for the most part according to Tremellius* (4, 73-75), Donne expressly mentions gold as the ideal which the Sons of Sion must aim at:

The precious sons of Sion, which should be
Valued as pure gold, how do we see
Low rated now.

Thus, the interpretation of the first quatrain in alchemical terms would not be alien to Donne's conception of man's ideal and God's ways with men.

This would be our first contribution to the understanding of the poem. The second would have to do with the interrelation of the different images within the poem, which is deeper than has usually been acknowledged.

In our opinion, the opening imperative of the sonnet: '*batter*', and its object: '*heart*' might be read in terms of the three images. The coexistence of all of them is strengthened by the fact that the paradox of this quatrain (*that I may rise and stand, o'erthrow me*) applies equally and simultaneously to the objects (city and town) of the second and third quatrains.

Here once more a similar co-occurrence of these three images can be traced outside the poem. In Isaiah (I.21-27) we find what could have easily been a source for *Batter my heart* since their similarities extend beyond the simultaneous appearance of the three images. Not only does the metal become purified through God's stern ways with it, but the town/woman image interchanges its qualities, so that the city, which has become a prostitute, later regains its original faithfulness:

How the faithful city
has become a prostitute
(...) your silver has become dross
(...) I will turn my hand against you,
And thoroughly purge away your dross,
And take away all your alloy
(...) Afterwards you shall be called the city
of righteousness, the faithful city.

The opening verb of the first quatrain, '*batter*', aptly suggests the violent reaction which is needed to purify the metal of the heart (OED 1. trans. 'to strike with repeated blows of an instrument or weapon (...) to beat continuously and violently so as to bruise or shatter'). This is exactly the use which God has to make of the hammer in order to break the imperfect metallic vessel.

This same verb has a second military meaning (OED 2 'to operate against walls, fortifications etc. with artillery, or in ancient times with a battering ram, with the purpose (and result) of breaking down or demolishing them). This is exactly what the heart/town of the poet needs in order to be liberated from its usurper.

It finally has a third figurative meaning which could refer to the third image of the poem. Its violent action (3 trans. and fig. 'to subject (persons, opinions, etc.) to heavy crushing or persistent attack') could denote the procedure which may bring about the end of a relationship between the woman and her enemy (break that knot).

The *heart*, which is the object of the verb "to batter" may simultaneously symbolize:

- a) the seat of the soul which has to be purified and turned to gold.
- b) the door of access to the woman/town, which has been made captive.
- c) the place which is traditionally associated with affections.

The two lists of verbs present in this quatrain (*knock, breathe, shine; break, blow, burn*), which have already been commented upon in regard to the metallurgical image, may at the same time be read in connection with the woman/town image

As we have already seen, there exists a close relationship between both lists, both syntactically and semantically. They occupy the same position within the line, and in all three cases the verbs of the second list imply a greater degree of force.

The first enumeration would be addressed to the woman/town as a whole. God so far has been '*knocking*' at her door in order to gain admittance to it (OED 1 intr. to rap upon a door or gate in order to gain admittance). He has also '*breathed*' (OED II.trans. 'to exhale, to emit by expiration(out). fig. to send or infuse into, communicate by breathing') his grace and '*shined*' (OED 9 'to cause (light) to shine, emit (rays). Also fig. (ex. God ... shines forth his wisdom ... upon the world), that is, illuminates her.

The stronger actions which the poet claims in the second list of verbs would apply the town image as follows: God is asked to '*break*', that is (OED IV) 'to make a way through the town. He is then to '*blow*' it, that is to say (OED 24 trans.' to shatter, destroy, or otherwise act upon by means of explosion', and finally '*burn*' what is left of it, so as to destroy it completely.

The same verbs could perhaps be read in sexual terms which anticipate the third image of the poem. God would be asked to '*break*', that is (OED IV) 'to make a way through; to penetrate' the woman, and '*blow*' her in a metaphorical sense which recalls a possible use of the verb which can be applied to horses. (OED 8 (causal of n.) to cause to pant, or put out of breath'). Given the phallic symbolism of horses, this meaning could be transferred to the erotic image. The third verb

‘to *burn*’ would refer to the resulting fire of passion (‘burn’ OED 1b fig. of persons, of the heart etc. ‘to be on fire (with desire, lust, passion, wrath); to glow, pant. To desire ardently’).

The paradox of line 3 (‘That I may rise and stand, o’erthrow me’) affects the town/woman image, since the verb ‘o’erthrow’, which is to bring about her renewal, can allude both to the woman (1. trans. ‘to throw(a person or thing) over upon its side or upper surface) and the town (1. trans ‘to knock (a structure) down and so demolish it).

Its outcome (‘*rise and stand*’) brings to mind the New Jerusalem after God’s fury had purified it:

Awake, awake,
Stand up, O Jerusalem,
You who have drunk at the hand of the Lord
The cup of his fury.
You have drunk the dregs of the cup of trembling,
and drained it out (...) (Isaiah, 51, 17)

Shake yourself from the dust, *arise*,
And sit down, *O Jerusalem*;
Loose yourself from the bonds of your neck,
O captive daughter of Zion. (Isaiah, 52, 2)

The idea expressed in this paradox doesn’t limit its appearance to the third line of Donne’s *Batter my heart*. We can find it also in *A Litany, I. The Father*:

and *re-create* me, now grown *ruinous* (l. 4)

And later:

O Father, *purge away*
All vicious tinctures, that *new fashioned*
I may *rise up* from death, before I am dead.

This general paradox anticipates the double paradox expressed in the final couplet of *Batter my heart*, where the second and third images of the poem come together.

Although the first line of the couplet gives the solution to the town image (*except you enthrall me, never shall be free*) and the second line expresses the paradoxical solution to the amorous image (*Nor ever chaste, except you ravish me*), the polysemy of ‘*enthrall*’, ‘*free*’, ‘*chaste*’ and ‘*ravish*’ tightens the relationship between both images.

The verb ‘to *enthrall*’ can be applied to both images. In the town image, it would be used with the meaning of ‘enslaving, bringing into bondage’ (OED 1 trans.), which would be the only way of setting the town free from its enemy. At the same time, the verb can be used figuratively, and it would then suit the woman image. She could only obtain her liberty if God ‘enslaved her mentally or morally; if he captivated her’ (OED 2 fig.). This meaning of the verb ‘to *enthrall*’ would naturally lead to a possible interpretation of the verb ‘to *ravish*’, in the second line of the couplet.

The woman can only be chaste if God ravishes her. Although the verb ‘to *ravish*’ has a primary sexual meaning (OED 2 ‘to carry away (a woman) by force (sometimes implying subsequent violation)’), which could suit the amorous image, and the need of God’s “bending his force” to “make the soul new”, there is still another possible meaning of a more spiritual nature which would be intimately connected with the verb ‘to *enthrall*’. In this line, (OED 3c) ‘to transport with the strength of some feeling; to carry away with rapture; to fill with ecstasy or delight; to entrance; would describe the soul’s spiritual seduction. This image, besides, falls within the calvinistic central belief that the soul is unable to gain its own salvation unless God ‘rapes’ her, so that she cannot resist His divine grace. (Stachniewski, 1981: 690).

In line 2 of the couplet the central verb can also be read in terms of the town image, in the same way as the main verb of the first line could be applied to the second image. ‘To *ravish*’, then,

could be read as (OED 4) 'To seize and take away as plunder or spoil; to seize upon (a thing) by force or violence'. The town, then, would be chastened, i.e., subdued (*chaste* OED 8) after being ravished.

This idea of chastening brings us back to the beginning of the sonnet, where the poet asked God to overthrow him and bend his force, so that he could rise and stand, and be renewed. It brings to mind the *Book of Revelation* (3, 13-20), where God chastens those he loves, and asks the soul to let him in when he knocks at her door:

As many as I love I rebuke and chasten.
Therefore be zealous and repent.
Behold, I stand at the door and knock.
If anyone hears my voice and opens the door
I will come in to him and dine with him,
and he with me.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bedford, R. D. 1982: Donne's Holy Sonnet Batter my Heart. *Notes and Queries* 29: 1. 15-19.
- Clements, A. L. 1961: Donne's Holy Sonnet XIV. *Modern Language Notes* LXXVI, June: 484-489. (Repr. Clements, A. L. ed. 1966: *A Norton Critical Anthology*. New York, Norton: 251-255.)
- Cornelius, K. 1965: Donne's Holy Sonnet XIV. *Explicator*, XXIV, November 25.
- Craik, T. W. ed. 1986: *John Donne: Selected Poetry and Prose*. London, Methuen.
- Herman, G. 1953: Donne's Holy Sonnet, XIV. *Explicator* XII, December, Item 18. (Repr. Clements, A. L. ed. 1966: *A Norton Critical Anthology*. New York, Norton: 247-248.)
- Knox, G. 1956: Donne's Holy Sonnets, XIV. *Explicator*, XV, October, Item 2. (Repr. Clements, A. L. ed. 1966: *A Norton Critical Anthology*. New York, Norton: 249-251.)
- Levenson, J. C. 1953: Donne's Holy Sonnets, XIV. *Explicator*, XI, March, Item 31. (Repr. Clements, A. L. ed. 1966: *A Norton Critical Anthology*. New York, Norton: 248-249)
- Parish, J. E., 1963: No. 14 of Donne's Holy Sonnets. *College English*, January. (Repr. Clements, A. L. ed. 1966: *A Norton Critical Anthology*. New York, Norton: 255-259.)
- Romein, T. 1984: Donne's Holy Sonnet XIV. *Explicator*, Summer 42: 4. 12-14.
- Schwartz, E. 1967: Donne's Holy Sonnet XIV. *Explicator*, XXVI, November 25.
- Smith, A. J. ed. 1971: *John Donne: Complete English Poems*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Stachniewski, J. 1981: John Donne: The Despair of the Holy Sonnets. *ELH*, Winter, 48: 4. 677-705.

* * *

John Donne: The New Turn of Classical Tradition

Laura Lojo Rodríguez

UNIVERSIDADE DE SANTIAGO

John Donne (1572-1631) “committed” a mistake that neither his contemporaries nor later critics would forgive him: being born in the age of the greatest master of English Literature, William Shakespeare. Donne himself was aware of the oddity of the situation, as well as of the totally new kind of poetry he was creating, utterly different from what had been previously made by, namely, Sidney and Spenser. His conception of poetry also differed a great deal from that of his contemporaries: he supposed that his poetry would be understood only by those friends for whom he wrote, and even in 1614, when he was thinking of publishing his poems, this was to be not for a public view, but a few copies at his own cost. Donne himself was, therefore, aware of the difficulty that his poetry conveyed; however, far from choosing a tendency towards simplification, he would continue to create poetry for an elite of educated people trained in the same tradition as his.

Any twentieth-century reader who is, for the first time, confronted with Donne’s poetry, has to be aware of the limitations to be undergone if not acquainted with the main issues of discussion in classical Rhetoric and Dialectics, Ramistic Logic, the Aristotelian distinction between body and soul, Renaissance Magic, Astrology and Alchemy, and, of course, those current issues related to Elizabethan Philosophy. Donne proves to his contemporaries to be ahead of his time: he considered his verse a suitable vehicle, in the same way Latin had been before, to use those devices borrowed from the classical tradition, those taken from the troubadour poetry and those which converged in the use of imagery drawn out from the new-born science. All this kind of poetry was, in 1600, an unexpected challenge for the English language.

To begin with, it would be accurate to say that John Donne did not conceive a work of poetry outside the rhetorical canon, which would turn out to be the one and only means to express what his conceptions of Love, God and the Universe were like.

Donne, the same as Ben Jonson or William Shakespeare, shared what modern scholars call the “Elizabethan World Picture”, which emphasized, above all, the principle of order. According to this, the world order would be appointed by God and would operate through the whole creation. In the natural world, the principle of order would be understood in terms of hierarchy, as a continuous “chain of being”, ascending in a scale from inert matter to God. The central link of the chain would be formed by man, connected by means of his mortal body to animals, vegetable and inanimate matter below him, and, on the other hand, man would be connected by his immortal soul to the various degrees of angels ranged above him. Donne makes up a whole set of imagery based on this picture of universal order. In “Air and Angels”¹, Donne makes up a whole theory of love, consciously subverting the order of the above mentioned scale to point out a difference: although both air and angels are pure, air is less pure than the angel which assumes it. Male love is associated with “angels” whereas female love is coupled with “air” and, therefore, male love is purer than its female counterpart:

Then as an Angell, face and wings

¹ All references henceforward are taken from: Smith, A.J. ed. 1986: *John Donne. The Complete English Poems*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Of aire, not pure as it, yet pure doth weare,
 So thy love may be my loves speare;
 Just such disparitie
 As it twixt Aire and Angels puritie,
 'Twixt womens love, and mens will ever bee¹.

The influence of what came to be named as “The New Science” is much related to the previous theory. Magic, Astrology and Alchemy utterly permeated the Renaissance imagination and Donne, therefore, borrowed a large set of imagery, theories and lexicon from this field of knowledge. The three arts are closely related to man’s dream of achieving power over nature: Magic had become very popular as a result of Ficino’s work, who had translated the so-called *Hermetic Text*. Magic, or Ancient Wisdom - *Prisca Sapientiae* - would have been given to man by God in order to improve human conditions after Adam’s Fall. This is particularly clear in “Love’s Alchemy”, where Donne develops this theory and uses more specific alchemical language:

Hope not for mind in women; at their best
 Sweetness and wit, they are but mummy, possessed²

There are two senses in which, at least, the word “mummy” is used. It could refer to a medicinal preparation of the substance of mummies and, therefore, it could be an unctuous liquid, or it could be used in the jocular sense, that is, dead flesh. Donne uses the word in the sense that Paracelsus did, to mean any dead body which retains its preservative balm. According to this theory, the best mummy is the fresh corpse of a man killed suddenly, in whom the balm has not been depleted or distempered by illness. The only difference between that and a living being is that the corpse lacks mind and soul. On a deeper level, one should infer that females, and like a mummy, lack mind and soul in spite of their life-like appearance.

The fusion of logical thought and passionate feeling is also another remarkable feature in Donne’s poetry. Thus parting, he made a whole theory regarding contemporary beliefs about the universe, the scale of beings, the human soul, the malleable properties of gold and remote astronomical phenomena. Fragments of the cosmos, magnified and made more terrifying by their isolation, haunted the poets of the late Renaissance and provided them with a rich store of poetic images. Donne himself was aware that the whole traditional picture of the universe was in question:

'Tis all in pieces, coherence gone³

The whole Universe and nature itself would be conceived as a riddle given to man by God for its solution by means of the observation of its processes. The task of the Renaissance *virtuoso* was to bring about change to improve human conditions by operating with the new sciences. Again, Donne would have his own theory about the order of the Universe: the macrocosm, in many of his poems, would be reflected in the microcosm by means of little things such as, for instance, the lovers in “The Sun Rising”:

Busy old fool, unruly sun,
 Why dost thou thus,
 Through windows, and through curtains call on us?
 Must to thy motions lovers’ seasons run?⁴

Love poets had traditionally invoked the sun or dawn, and Ovid and Petrarch offer celebrated examples⁵. However, these morning songs would commonly address their subject with reverence

¹ “Air and Angels”, ll. 23-28.

² “Love’s Alchemy”, ll. 23-24.

³ *Anatomy of the World*. The work was published in 1611, and Donne was already able to analyse a dramatic change in the traditional earth-centered conception of the universe. The quote may be found in: Grierson, Herbert ed. 1967: *John Donne: Poetical Works*. London: Oxford University Press.

⁴ “The Sun Rising”, ll. 1-4.

⁵ *Amores* I, xiii, *Almo Sol*, *Canzonere* 188.

as a flushed young goddess or a life-giving god. Donne reverses the traditional pattern to address the sun as “busy old fool”. The lovers become the reflection of the macrocosm, represented here by the sun.

Donne’s strong religious education provided him with vast knowledge of theological theory. The Thomistic view, for instance, was supported by Petrarchism and, as a whole, by the Catholic poets of Mediaeval Italy and sixteenth-century Spain, where similar lines had been experimented upon without altogether abandoning the Neo-platonic tradition. Donne does not totally accept the interaction body - soul supported by those theoretical frames: basically he differs from Dante in not accepting the Thomistic system of ideas as ultimate truth. However, he still uses the Thomistic method as a way of disciplining his mind and developing logical arguments. In spite of his accepting new criteria, the Petrarchist tradition cannot be completely discarded of his poems: he often reacts against the set of topics which had become common place in poetry and reuses the imagery to construct mockery reversals:

Alas, alas, who’s injured by my love?
What merchant’s ships have my sighs drowned?
Who says my tears have overflowed his ground?¹

Drama, being one of the commonest literary resources, cannot be absent from Donne’s field of exploration and therefore he takes some elements which he was especially interested in. In this respect, the serio - comic monologue or, more plainly, the modulation of tone, is probably one of the most obvious resources drawn out from this field. Donne would experiment with tone by changing it according to the topic he would be dealing with, whether it be self-tormenting, perverse or serene. Donne’s exhilaration often springs from a challenging opening line, but rests upon the infinite variety of wit and conceptual structure of poems:

I wonder, by my troth, what thou, and I
Did till we loved?²

One of the most striking features of the so-called “Metaphysical Poetry”³ is what came to be known as “strong lines”. This specific stylistic feature belongs to the rhetorical tradition and it allows language to represent directly the immediate play of mind. Style would be, therefore, an instantaneous expression of thinking. Strong lines epitomized the literary qualities which were most prized in this period, and involved the cultivation of the “Silver Latin” style in the late Renaissance, i.e.; *difficilia quae pulchra*. Jacobeans felt a special kinship towards silver Latin writers and, therefore, cultivated obscurity and sparsity of style which, with a wit of their own, produced strong lines. The use of conceits is very much related to this conception of poetry. A conceit is basically a comparison where the two members which are being compared share no apparent likeness:

Our two souls, therefore, which are one,
Though I must go, endure not yet
A breach, but an expansion,
Like gold to aery thinnes beat.

If they be two, they are two so
As stiff twin compasses are two,
Thy soul the fixed foot, makes no show

¹ “The Canonization”, ll. 10-12.

² “The Good Morrow”, ll. 1-2.

³ The term “Metaphysical Poetry” came into being long after the poets to whom it applied (Raleigh, Donne, Jonson, Dryden, etc.) were dead. It was the scholar Samuel Johnson who coined it, and gave it to these poets as a sort of “nickname” with pejorative connotations due to the obscurity of their poetry. Metaphysical poetry is said to be inspired by a philosophical conception of the universe and the role assigned to the human spirit in the great drama of existence.

To move, but doth if the other do¹

Compasses would be in the late Renaissance a common emblem for constancy in change. However, Donne uses the imagery to compare lovers with its legs: though apart, they are just one body. Renaissance scholars, however, would consider as “violent” the analogy between such two heterogeneous terms. The Methaphysical poets, on the other hand, considered the Universe to be a network of universal correspondence which unites all the apparent dissimilar elements of experience and so, disparity of elements would be thus justifiable. The new theorists of the conceit justify the predilection of the “school of wit” for recondite and apparently strained analogies by maintaining that even more violent couplings of dissimilars were simple expressions of the underlying unity of all things. The use of conceit would allow Metaphysical poets to recreate thoughts into feelings and, therefore, they would be able to account for any kind of experience.

As we have argued above, Donne strictly followed rhetorical processes and two main steps can be drawn out of his method: systematization or lineal arrangement of the creative process into steps, in this case, from shaping to vocalizing it and, on the other hand, impersonality, a quality which was seen as most natural to the condition of thoughts. The use of Dialectis should be seen thus under this light. In Donne, it works above all as a motion of ideas towards ends that he would have previously determined, in such a way that a logical argument is developed in order to persuade the reader / audience. When definitions are employed in a steady way i.e.; in kinetic fashion, one may encounter the Dialectis of Metaphysical poetry. The motion and order of different arguments is what makes Donnian definitions so utterly different from, let us say, Petrarchan ones. In this respect, the poem “The Flea”² works within the recognition of a complicated syllogism: the flea’s enjoyment before wooing proves that the lovers enjoyment before wooing would not be sin, shame or loss of virginity:

Oh stay, three lives in one flea spare
(...) and sacrilege, three sinners in killing thee³

Then a positive definition, after the negative one, comes: the flea is the lover, the beloved and their marriage bed. Therefore, to kill the flea would be to commit suicide, murder or sacrilege, since the flea has sucked the beloved’s blood and by doing so it has become a part of her. But by mingling the two different types of blood, the flea has also become a symbol of marriage. The beloved, therefore, disapproves of the lover’s argument and kills the flea in order to prove to him that by doing so she is not to destroy themselves. The lover takes the argument back to state that thus their enjoyment before wooing would not be a loss of honour. One must admit that the use of these rhetorical devices makes the poem complicated but, at the same time, incredibly rich and amusing with its various layers of meaning interacting on different levels.

As a conclusion, Donne was not probably liked at his own time for not being understood. As a most creative genius, he was by far ahead of his time, in contact with a large set of different new theories which were ignored by many of his contemporaries, and these were recreated as suitable elements for his new kind of poetry. It was not until the arrival of the French Symbolist Poetry and the attention paid by T.S. Eliot on the one hand, and the rise of the so-called New Critics, much interested in the sole study of the text, on the other hand, that John Donne was somehow rediscovered and considered as one of the great masters of the English language.

He proves throughout his work to be capable of recreating and reconciling the many different traditions in which he was brought up in order to build a new conception of poetry in which, as he himself said, “all words are measured, numbered and weighed”¹.

¹ “A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning”, ll. 21-28.

² The flea subject provided a popular subject matter for love poetry in the sixteenth-century Europe. The poet would envy the flea’s freedom to touch freely his mistress’ body, or its death at her hands while in the ecstasy of its contact with her. By having the flea bite both him and his mistress, Donne discovers a variation - *variatio* - of the subject.

³ “The Flea”, ll. 10, 18.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Enkvist, Nils Erik 1975: *Style and Text*. Stockholm. Sprakförlaget Skriptor.
- Gardner, Helen ed. 1962. *John Donne. A Collection of Critical Essays*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.
- Grierson, Herbert, 1967: *John Donne: Poetical Works*. London, OUP.
- Lausberg, Heinrich 1975: *Manual de Retórica Literaria*. Madrid, Gredos.
- Leech, Geoffrey 1976: *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. London, Longman.
- Lodge, David 1972: *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism*. London, Longman.
- Miner, Earl 1969: *The Metaphysical Mode from Donne to Cowley*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Praz, Mario 1974-75: *Studies in the Seventeenth-Century Imagery*. Roma, Storia e Letteratura.
- Smith, A. J. ed. 1986: *John Donne: The Complete English Poems*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.

* * *

¹ Grierson, Herbert ed. 1967: "Sermons", *John Donne. Poetical Works*. London, Oxford University Press.

Blurred Contours: An Attempt
to Deconstruct the Female Character in
Books I and III of Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*

Ana María Sánchez Mosquera

UNIVERSITY OF SANTIAGO DE COMPOSTELA

Medieval asceticism configured a pattern of glorification for the female founded upon the Virgin Mary as the supreme teacher of all virtues; this pattern coexisted with that other obsession of the female as the source of all evil, the edenic Eve. Thus, the female represented the most destructive and gentlest aspects of natural creation--prey to sin and to idealization, the bride of Christ and the devil's gateway. These traditional patterns of feminine stereotypes continued to be apparently stressed in the Renaissance. Thus, there was, on the one hand, a current of courtly idealism which glorified the female: purity, chastity and virginity are highly praised; and, on the other hand, there was an exultation of the female body as a sensual object (i.e. Donne's poems). Nevertheless, these apparent clear demarcations commenced to give way to a new type of conception of the feminine in Renaissance literature and culture:

For since in the Renaissance period, Love was at the centre, and since the days of idealistic peredasty had gone with the Greeks, so it followed that the female principle was at the centre, invested with a new sanctity which came not so much from the Cult of the Blessed Virgin as from the mystery religions of the ancient world, supposed to have been founded by Orpheus. (Davies 4)

The feminine emerges as an all-inclusive ideal where "vulnerability" cohabits with "stout hardiment" (Heale 81), and female stitching labours are substituted by battlefield enterprises: "She is the coincidence of opposites in person, Venus and Diana, war and love, male and female: numinous, mysterious, carrying unaccountable energy, all power and all gentleness" (Davies 6). Stevie Davies refers to Edmund Spenser's heroine, Britomart, in book III of *The Faerie Queene*: Britomart, androgynous in nature, represents that new type of woman where cosmogonic forces seem to converge, and, where the "Idea of woman" is to be revalued as "a constituent part of the God-reflecting universe" (Davies 6). Indeed, we encounter in *The Faerie Queene* a new type of woman that differs from the traditional patterns of medieval configuration of the "feminine."

On the one hand, female glorification and female degradation apparently conform to the binomial antagonism in which female characters seem to be immerse in Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* (1590): "The angel, the radiant figure of precise contours, glittering chastity of form ..." (Paglia 43) such as Una, Florimell or Belpheobe, or the evil, loathsome, misshapen being--Error, Duessa, Argante--who dwells in the shadows of the Averno or "in the sinister fogs that frequently blanket the landscape" (Paglia 43). On the other hand, that clear demarcation is blurred as the reader pierces through this blanketed landscape the poetic voice displays in "faerie land," and, as a result, traditional dichotomies become unstable.

It is my purpose to deconstruct, and by this, I mean that, through Derrida's concept of "differ¹ance", I will attempt to deny the existence of absolute opposites in the configuration of female characters in Books I and III of Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*: "The poem's opposites always flow towards and occasionally enter deeply into one another, like strong currents meeting" (Davies 39). This analysis will equally allow me to disclose, "by an activity of semantic 'freeplay'" (Lodge 108), the paradoxes and contradictions arising in the depiction of such female characters.

To aim at this, it is necessary to bear in mind, first that "the transparency of language is an illusion" (Belsey 4), and that "a masking, disguising, personating vision is the typical Spenserian style" (Paglia 48). In Duessa's words, a malefic hag, we can suggest the play going on in the long poem: "I that seem not I, Duessa am" (I.v.26.6)². Alchemy, magic and deceit operate on the inhabitants of the Spenserian realm of faeries, offering, sometimes, a world of seeming that it is not the world it seems--for example, Duessa assumes other's physical appearance in an attempt to confuse, tempt and deviate the characters from their quest. Books I and III have been chosen as focus for discussion: Book I establishes the parameters and coordinates that will regulate the rest of the work as far as the depiction of women is concerned. These parameters are based upon the supposition that manichean divisions of good and evil seem to initially rule the poem's thematic structure: for example, Una is said to allegorically represent truth and purity; she is, consequently, enveloped in an aura of brightness and light; Error is presented as a filthy monster that inhabits the earth's entrails, and, represents the evil and dark side which the Redcross Knight must overcome in his pilgrimage to holiness. These opposites are, nevertheless, undermined and exploited subversively through the poem's thematic axes in the depiction of the distinct female characters. Book III has been chosen because Britomart's hybrid nature provides the focus to study the "Idea of Woman," using Stevie Davies' expression (p. 56), in the Renaissance period:

In Book III Spenser locates the most powerful and terrible mystery of the whole *The Faerie Queene*, founding a pastoral world which is not casually Arcadian, for it mingles blood and soil, the earth as simultaneous womb and burial chamber.

The first "stereotype" of female angelical figure is Una, the Red Cross Knight's leman. She is the ministering damsel, the angelic figure that accompanies him, devoted to embellish the world with her chastity and virginity. She is the inactive type of fragile beauty with a special gift for tears, and, she fits perfectly into the medieval type of "bride of Christ" (she allegorically symbolizes the Church of England). Una, as most of the cherubic faces in Faerie Land, makes us question the traditional ideal of the female only to be valued by her face, and, whose "character [is] rubbed out" (Davies 35) from the hi/story to give way to the Knight's heroic deeds. Contrary to these expectations, it is Una who sets the world of chivalric knights in motion: she demands the Redcross Knight's help. Overall, in *The Faerie Queene*, women are often presented as the "deus ex machina" of the narrative structure.

Una's entrance in the poem underlines her statuesque character and her proclivity to immobility: she is pictorially described in a context of action. The Redcross Knight's appearance is teleologically directed to fulfill Gloriana's orders, but, Una seems to be framed by the language that presents her. Nevertheless, the stereotype commences to crumble in the language and imagery deployed. Una, supposed to be an emblem of unity and indivisibility, is fragmentarily presented through her outward appearance: "vele," "blacke stole," "whiter." Her bright-like nature--presented through images that evoke whiteness--is obscured, somehow, by the proximity of the "lowly ass," and accentuated by her veil-covered face. Una's purity is questioned by the presence

¹ Derrida's concept of "differ¹ance" ("differing and deferring") implies that the presence of one term immediately calls out the absence of another, absence is made visible through presence: "For 'difference' puts in motion the incessant play (*jeu*) of signification that goes on within the seeming immobility of the marks on the printed page" (Abrams 269).

² The edition used and quoted is the following: Spenser, E. ed. 1978: *The Faerie Queene*. London, Penguin. My pattern of quotation for the primary source follows this order: Book, canto, stanza and line.

of the animal element as belonging to the realm of instinct, and, therefore, outside the sphere of temperance, prudishness and self-abnegation. Thus, the chiaroscuro imagery signals a fuzzy borderline where conflicting elements--light and dark--'endanger' the sifting of the 'stereotype'.

Una is also interestingly accompanied by a dwarf: Una's beauty coalesces with the dwarf's physical deformity; the contours are diffused through the presence of contrasting elements. Moreover, the dwarf evokes a world of comic buffoonery and ludicrous entertainment which immediately leads us to the consideration of carnival as a potential power for the female character:

Carnival with all its images, indecencies, and curses affirms the people's immortal, indestructible character. In the world of carnival the awareness of the people's immortality is combined with the realization that established authority and truth are relative. (Bakhtin 256)

Una's passivity is once again deflated by the witnessing evidence of language and imagery.

The spirit of carnival and the implications it portends--as a source of potential power for the female--are stressed by Una's proximity to the grotesque¹. Later in the book, Una is, thus, captured by a group of satyrs and fauns, half-animal and half-human, and she is proclaimed their Queen². David Evett comments that the art of the grotesque was a favourite among well-to-do Elizabethans³. Una's proximity to the grotesque and her initial presentation through dismemberment contribute to relate her to the Rabelaisian world of carnival such as Bakhtin understands it. Carnival imagery in the figure of Una inverts the logic of female passivity into that of a potential for action and power. Duessa enacts Una's counterpart in Book I. Her name "signifies doubleness and falsehood" (Heale 30) and her first apparition--in gold and red--reminds one of the whore of Babylon as opposed to the angelical Una: "The imagery of scarlet, gold and jewels is from the description in Revelation (12.4) of the Whore of Babylon" (Heale 30). The way she appears and the order followed in her description can be contrasted with that of Una--they are both described first through their clothes and then, in relation to the knight they accompany. The paralleled description puts them in a one to one correspondence. Moreover, as Una represented the powers of light, Duessa represents the powers of darkness. Nevertheless, Duessa acquires, by means of magic, Una's appearance, and uses it for purposes of deceit: like Una, Duessa can also dazzle and deceive the spectator; magical effects erase, once again, the demarcated contours of the stereotype and accentuate their invalidity by playing out the reader through the confusing glimmers of deceit. Duessa's protean-like nature backs the supposition that beauty is only a cosmetic quality which cannot ultimately point to moral righteousness. Indeed, other moments in the book point to the fact that women's beauty is unreliable as a token of moral perfection. In *Faerie Land*, beauty becomes synonymous with paralysis and superciliousness. Paglia manifests that women are overall icons "cunningly worked with gold and coldly glittering" (Paglia 45). Belphoebe's physical description in Book III is the epitome of denaturalization of beauty as a divine attribute: her ideal perfection suggests that of a lifeless statue. David Evett suggests that if we take the description of Belphoebe's physical attributes (II.ii.21-31) literally, it turns out to be grotesque:

¹ David Evett talks about the nature of the grotesque and comments that one of the purposes of the grotesque is that, although confined to the surface, its effect is not to confirm the surface but to render it ambiguous. Precisely, the obtrusiveness of the grotesque as it is depicted in painting and sculpture (arts where it first found its origins) blurs the clarity, the transparency of forms and perfect delineation.

² Elizabeth Heale interprets this scene in a different way: deviating the focus of idolatry from Una to her ass makes of this moment a scene of "comic ignorance" (28). Nevertheless, I consider that there are further implications as she is previously proclaimed their queen and the festive pagan rituals inevitably allude to the world of carnival and to the grotesque, as fauns and satyrs are hybrid types. One of the characteristics of the grotesque is precisely the overlapping of different motifs.

³ The grotesque is initially connected to visual arts: "The word appears in Europe after the discovery in Rome during the early sixteenth century of ancient apartments decorated with bizarre animal and plant formations. As these rooms were, by this time, all underground, they were called caves or "grottoes" and their decoration, grotesque" (Rhodes 7).

She has ‘antickes’ on her buskins (st. 27). She also has roses in her cheeks, lamps for her eyes, a forehead of ivory, engraved with the triumphs of love, pearls and rubies for teeth and lips, gold wire instead of hair, and marble pillars instead of legs ...; furthermore, her eyelids are populated by a whole flock of little Graces. (203)

Eveit comments that her attributes will “appear ludicrous or deformed if set in a naturalistic context” (203). These qualities are probably a parody of Petrarchan idealization of the female as perfection. Therefore, the exultation of female physical attributes must be cautiously regarded as it turns the female into a petrified sign to be read, and exploited by the male. The play going on between doubles denaturalizes beauty as an intrinsic quality of feminine righteousness and contributes to our aim of deconstructing absolute stereotypes. This idea is also backed by the presupposition that, if the morally virtuous woman is the one characterized as physically perfect--since the evil and the misshapen always correspond to a flaw of character--morality turns out to be a cosmetic quality, confined to the surface. More than once, Spenser has shown discontent to the hypocritical ongoing of court life that caused him more than one misfortune in his desire to climb up.

Una is not exempted from an aesthetic of evil that humanizes her and pairs her up to Duessa who “alegorically” represents the wicked. Towards the end, Una chastises the witch by disclosing her filthy “nether parts” to public eye, that is, by stripping her off her masks in an act of cruel mastering the situation. This proves, once again, that Spenser does not conceive purely good or evil characters but tests them to the limits of their preconception through these hybrid attributes.

Cloning, duplicity and transformation continue to obfuscate the female stereotype and render the female characters equally ambiguous in Book III. Chastity is the heading virtue of Book III, but, chastity here can be viewed more as a means of enduring the rapist rather than as an intrinsic quality of female virtuousness. As an axiomatic label that introduces us in the poem, the idea of chastity seems to be lost in the variagated thematic crossings of book III, which suggest more a deviation of that chastity than the actual virtue itself. Indeed, in book III, male imagination tries to busily “dominate and possess woman’s will by art, by magic, by sensory illusions and threats--by all the instruments of culture except by means of persuasion” (303). Paglia interprets the frantic persecution of chastity and this predatory attempt to violate and rape the female in this way:

The rapist has not incorporated a feminine component and therefore pursues that fleeing malleable femininity with a headlong ferocity which represents a hunger for self-completion. (57)

Interestingly, the epicentre of this book is not a hero, but a heroine who has precisely incorporated the male and the female element: Britomart¹ constitutes the embodiment of fairness and masculine strength (Davies 34):

The androgynous Britomart is not a *lusus naturae* but the representative of an original free and heroic womanhood entitled to rule and adjusted to forceful action.

Britomart debates between gentleness and violence, fairness and “stout hardiment.” Her armour conceals her femininity, but, occasionally her hair evades the helmet’s confinement to catch the sun-beams and present her in blooming femininity. She shows determination to run into the battlefield, but she is a lovesick “silly Mayd” (III.ii.27.7) who suffers girlish pangs of love for Artegall. Her volition is just a reflection of other’s wishes as she takes up knighthood propelled by Artegall’s love: “The warlike maid was never trained in arms until she trained her eye in a glass...

¹ Simon Shepherd points to the different consideration the Elizabethans attributed to the conception of “fighting woman” and to that of the amazon. Amazon was a pejorative term in Elizabethan culture, and, it was normally associated to “aggressive lust, unbridled will, disobedience” (14). On the contrary, the idea of the fighting woman, such as it is incarnated in Britomart, was full of moral significance, “she is not simply someone who dresses up as a man and who behaves hereafter as a man ... Armour is not just a token of honorary maleness. The aggression is not worn like a disguise, but is something inner” (Shepherd 8).

she will lose the fixed familiar contours of self only to find herself in a stranger” (Gregerson 18). The book celebrates Britomart as an emblem of chastity, but, she frequently indulges herself in forbidden pleasures by means of her glancing, looking and observing (her eyes are the only visible thing through the armour), breaking thus, the laws of chastity. For example, she remains chaste and impervious to Malecasta’s temptations, but, she is wounded by Gardante’s piercing eyes: “It is significant that Britomart is wounded only by Gardante (eye-glances; Ital. *guardante*, looking), indicating her susceptibility to Artegall’s image glimpsed in the glass” (Heale 79). Therefore, it is also by looking into the mirror that she desires Artegall, and her passion is compared with Aetna’s spitting fire, whereas Malecasta’s--her antithesis in virtue--is just a spark of fire. Finally, in Busirane’s house, “a place of delusion and art in which natural and passionate impulses of chaste love are transformed to fears and imagination” (Heale 92), her eye lingers on the tapestries full of erotic motifs. The poetic voice does not condemn Britomart for these deviations from a chaste behaviour, on the contrary, she is made real as she is tested in these situations. The contradictory aspects of her personhood exult her as a complete being who, eluding archetypes, “questions the simple antithetical labels of male and female, and looks for a new definition” (Shepherd 8). Britomart crosses out gender borders in her quest for an orderly society.

Florimell is Britomart’s counterpart in book III, and, she represents the frailest aspects of womanhood as she is constantly threatened by the rapist’s predatory eye. Despite their opposing characters, Britomart and Florimell are both united in their potentiality to exert power:

Opposites within the feminine principle (the extreme of activity, the extreme of passivity) reveal one divine power. Both have the power to terrify, like demonic portents in the sky which no one understands. (Davies 51)

Britomart embodies the principle of battle, strength and active power, and, Florimell exerts her power tacitly as she frantically attracts the rapist; she magnetically draws the iron-hearted rapist who experiences her beauty as a temptation. Both heroines share paralleling attributes which makes us think of the possible connection between both: their hair is said to resemble the sun, and seems to be endowed with the caustic potentiality of consumptive fire. This apocalyptic fire purges and kills, tempts and repels, is also ready to lighten the way of the righteous and to destroy the morally flawed.

Florimell’s beauty is misread in terms of “*materia*” rather than “*spiritus*” (Davies 72). This misreading leads to the construction of a false Florimell. A fake version acts as a catalyst for the true Florimell to escape the rapist’s eye. Only a parodic enactment of her perfection can redeem her from the plundering her beauty suffers. The false Florimell “substitutes for the faithfulness and chastity of the displaced Florimell the rolling eyes and the “wicked Spright” (viii.8) of unchastity” (Heale 82):

In stead of eyes two burning lamps she set
In silver sockets, shyning like the skyes,
... ..
In stead of yellow lockes she did devise,
With golden wyre to weave her curled head:
Yet golden wyre was not so yellow thrise
... .. (III.VII.7. 1-7)

Lust and idolatry are put side by side: “Petrarchan idolatry” (in the figure of the true Florimell) versus “frustrated Ovidian lust” (the false Florimell) proving that one is as bad as the other. Cheney argues:

men see a beautiful woman and they react to her in one of two ways: either as a Neoplatonist by depersonalizing her into something higher than she is, an abstract ideal, beauty; or as an Ovidian, by depersonalizing her into something lower than she is, a beast to be defiled by beastly lust. (317)

Both preconceptions are false: Florimell is neither an abstract ideal nor an eroticized object. Her name suggests--“*flor*”--that she is vinculated to the earth, and therefore, to death and renewal;

these images elude idealized abstractions. The necessity of a sublimated object of lust to canalize the rapist's desires proves that the real Florimell avoids this other reading as an eroticized object. Again, the reader's expectations are debunked by the poetic voice's playful manipulations in the construction of feminine characters.

The disruption of stereotyped absolutes contributes to humanize the characters and to envision a perfection that abides in that Platonist idea of the "One"¹: the reconciliation of opposites is conceived within the visionary capability of the poem in the figure of the androgynous or through separate entities that complete each other. Moreover, we encounter a new conception of the female who abandons the indoor toils and jumps on to the battlefield in order to inscribe her name in the Annals of History.

WORKS CITED

- Abrams, M. H. 1995. The Deconstructive Angel. *Modern Criticism and Theory* ed. by David Lodge. London, Longman.
- Bakhtin, M. 1984. *Rabelais and his World*. Trans. by Helène Iswolsky. Bloomington, Indiana UP.
- Belsey, C. ed. 1980. *Critical Practice*. London, Routledge.
- Cheney, P. 1989: *And Doubted Her to Deeme an Earthly Wight: Male Platonic Magic and the Problem of Female Identity in Spenser's Allegory*. *Studies in Philology* 86: 310-339.
- Davies, S. 1986. *The Idea of Woman in Renaissance Literature: The Feminine Reclaimed*. Brighton, Harvester.
- Evelt, D. 1982. Mammon's Grotto: Sixteenth-Century Visual Grotesquerie and Some Features of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. *English Literary Renaissance* 12: 180-209.
- Gregerson, L. 1991. Protestant Erotics: Idolatry and Interpretation in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. *ELH* 58: 1-34.
- Heale, Elizabeth 1987. *The Faerie Queene: A Reader's Guide*. London, Cambridge UP.
- Lodge, D. ed. 1995. *Modern Criticism and Theory*. London, Longman.
- Rhode, N. 1980. *Elizabethan Grotesque*. London, Routledge.
- Paglia, C. A. 1979. The Apollonian Androgyne and the Faerie Queene. *English Literary Renaissance* 9: 42-63.
- Shepherd, S. 1981. *Amazons and Warrior Women: Varieties of Feminism in Seventeenth-Century Drama*. Brighton, Harvester P.
- Spenser, E. 1978. *The Faerie Queene*. London, Penguin.

* * *

¹ Elizabeth Heale comments on Spenser's fascination with numbers, "like all Platonists he was forever trying to make these numbers add to One" (39).

Knowledge and Science in *Paradise Lost*

Rosa Flotats

ESTUDIS UNIVERSITARIS DE VIC

Ours is an age in which science is of various trends and each is isolated from the others. The study of human knowledge, once in the general scope of all fields and sciences, now seems to be the exclusive property of philosophy. The 20th century will be studied in the future as a century of technology and of linguistics. Improvements and new technologies are the real cause for this well established separation into different fields with their corresponding experts who often isolate themselves from the reality of the rest of knowledge. It is as if such “otherness” were a kind of threat to their possibilities within the field they have dived into. This was not the case in the Renaissance period when “curiosity” and the “will to learn and to discover” new things was a common factor among the intelligentsia. However, it was precisely a more universal conception of human learning and general interest that made sciences reach the status they hold today.

After the Dark Ages, new scientific discoveries became part of a chain of facts belonging to the history of humanity, which was brought about with such a force that events like Galileo’s imprisonment and the burning of Giordano Bruno could not stop the whole process. The development of science went together with the development of social issues such as welfare, religion, and others. All of these were reflected in the literature of the time, which was used to convey and communicate new hypotheses and opinions under no constraint or fear, and to encourage the continuation or improvement of more aspects in need of research. Hence the eclectic product so typical of this inquisitive age¹. Concerned with all the fields of culture related to Man, the humanists gave special emphasis to human values and dignity. They introduced to the curriculum of the *studia humanitatis* a wide range of subjects that varied greatly from that of the Scholastics, and which included grammar, rhetoric, history, poetry, and philosophy, both moral and natural. The study of new scientific discoveries and inventions like Galileo’s telescope, and the perfection of the printing press, together with new developments in astronomy such as Copernicus’ theory of the rotation of the earth, which inspired Kepler and Galileo, and which opposed the traditional Ptolemaic system; interest in mathematics and in the use of experimental and observational procedures, etc., were all bound together under the concept of “natural philosophy”. Milton, who was influenced by the humanist trend, dealt with all these issues, constraining them at the same time to reason. We see thus how his approach to knowledge is very close to rationalism. Milton not only accepted new theories, or at least the study and development of them, but he also encouraged a constant questioning and further dealing and thought². Milton’s system was based on human freedom, on the Fall and on the Scriptures, using all of them to interpret experience.

The return to the classical writers in their original languages encouraged the revision and retranslation of the classics permitting new interpretations under a freer approach that went together with a widespread eagerness for acquiring new knowledge and discovering new things. Could we not believe that the rediscovery of Plato and Aristotle under this new light without the misunderstandings of the Scholastic interpretation was the real cause and origin of modernity? A

¹ See John Arthos, “Poetic Diction and Scientific Language” *ISIS*, Vol. XXXII, 1940: 324-338.

² James Holly Hanford “Milton and the Return to Humanism” *SP*, Vol.XVI, No.2, April 1919: 137-147.

straightforwardly positive answer might not be applicable here, however, we may certainly believe that a great deal of modernity owes its existence to the will to return to the great masters of antiquity. The fact of reviewing, questioning, and reformulating old ideas anew, with a more open mind, allowed for more variety within different fields. To find the truth became a main objective of this period, and the search for it was done through wide discussion. The influence of classical ideas and approaches was mixed with religious beliefs and with a new sense of beauty encouraged by postulating the contemplation of nature. Cicero became an influential figure, his approach of uniting wisdom with eloquence was dominant in the literature of the time. Poetry became the special means to express the truth which is after all an individual interpretation of each poet and/or thinker with a final didactic intention¹. To use art as a means for teaching and for communicating new discoveries became a common factor. Sidney's *Defence of Poetry* is a clear example of this widespread use during the Renaissance period. In this way, interest in science was mixed with the art of the word, thus the presentation of new theories or hypotheses of interest for the author were expressed by means of the pleasure of the musical tone and used at the same time as metaphors, allegories and many other poetical tropes. Within the field of natural philosophy, astronomy was one of its more widely discussed topics. There are several reasons that need to be highlighted here: firstly, the popular belief that the universe evinces the greatest perfection and order and it should be imitated if real art was to be produced². Secondly, under the influence of Plato's *Timaeus* and Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, mathematical concepts were given an outstanding role in artistical composition; as Man was thought to be a microcosmos, a mere reflection of the perfection of the universe, everything about him should present exact proportions in order to obtain the harmony of the macrocosmos³. Finally, and linked with the latter, there is special emphasis on the need that such harmony should be applied to all fields related to Man. C.A.Patrides, in his article "The Numerological Approach to Cosmic Order during the English Renaissance", mentions the fact that many of the writers believed in an established order in the Universe which distinguishes its entire structure:⁴

During the English Renaissance, no commentator writing within the current of Christian thought failed to become enraptured by the order pervading the universe.

And he continues:

The widespread belief in cosmic order was enforced in various ways, principal among which was the establishment of a multitude of correspondences connecting the various levels of existence into a unified whole. These, according to Dr. Tillyard, resolve themselves principally into analogies between the divine, the cosmic, the human and the political planes.

These reasons account for the abovementioned eclecticism of the age, which unites different trends of thought and fields of knowledge due to the characteristic interdisciplinarity of the period. Poetry bestows such eclecticism as well, and in the case of Milton it becomes very syncretic, especially in *Paradise Lost*, which seems to be one of the most outstanding examples. We understand by syncreticism the ability to condense multiple ideas into a few lines, thereby achieving a rich and varied conceptual result, and as Patrides points out, this is also obtained with the use of analogies, as for example, "the analogy elaborated between the sun and the heart of man" (392) or the analogies involving numbers, such as number seven with the seven planets to signify the harmony of the universe.

¹ Schmitt & Skinner eds, *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* Cambridge University Press, 1988. Last pub. 1992.

² E. M. W. Tillyard *The Elizabethan World Picture* Penguin Books, 1943. Reprinted, 1984. See especially chapters two, six, and seven.

³ Op.Cit. Schmitt & Skinner eds, *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*: 60-70. 1992.

⁴ C. Patrides: "The Numerological Approach to Cosmic Order in the English Renaissance. *ISIS* 49: 391-397, 1958.

In order to convey the beauty of the macrocosmos in poetry, there was the widespread use of exact proportions supplied in the syllabic combination, prosody, and in the number of lines, which, when added up, acquire a significance that goes far beyond the words themselves. All these factors are directly related to Biblical exegesis, ancient philosophy, and Jewish mysticism. Cicero's union of philosophy with rhetoric gave a positive value to the latter; Ficino added a religious character to ideas and, eventually, influenced the following century¹. The controversy caused by the Reformation of the Church encouraged the writing of moral philosophical texts, and religious questions were set in relation to scientific controversies with the belief that the answers would be found in the Bible.

With *Paradise Lost* (PL),² Milton exemplifies such enriching mixture and shows the pre-occupation of an age and of a mind to find the truth. The concepts of order-harmony, knowledge-science and freedom depend on each other and are constantly intertwining. The equal combination of these conditionings constitutes the basic requirement for Man's happiness and welfare. The poem's length and its breadth of thought allows for the application of such combination to all the fields in a very explicit and visual way that became characteristic of Miltonic poetry. An example of syncretic union between order and ethics is found in the line from Book VI of PL: *God and Nature bid the same* (vi, 176), which should be interpreted as an indication of the need to obey and contemplate nature, the most perfect and harmonious work of the Divinity.

Even Milton, so eager for knowledge and curious for new discoveries, realised the dangers or obstructiveness that too many books might cause. What matters is the kind of learning one acquires, and wisdom consists in seeing the truth, the limits of our possible knowledge. Irene Samuel, in "Milton on Learning and Wisdom"³, analyses Milton's view of learning by focussing on three examples where the poet seems to reject knowledge. She states that these passages need to be read within context and they indicate the belief in knowledge determined by ethical habit. She emphasizes the interpretation of Raphael's admonition in Book VIII (66-178) as "learning desirable only as it finds its context in life" (710). It was characteristic of Milton to constrain every aspect related to human life, to reason, a virtue which will get different naming according to the field it is applied to. The need for reason understood as order was a widely shared belief of the period. Milton, no exception to the rule, uses it as signifying the inherent capacity of Man to discern between good and evil, and therefore as his capacity to reestablish an internal order, and the equilibrium between opposite factors. Oppositeness is another issue that is constantly encountered in Milton's writings as it is considered a necessary requirement for the distinction of each category. We could not postulate or explain "heat" if its contrary "cold" did not exist, as we would not be able to distinguish its quality and effect. Therefore, the need of contrasts appears as an absolute condition and principle in terms of showing the veracity of a formulated hypothesis. If we expand the existence of contrasts to a moral level, we then find the need to postulate the existence of "evil", which is the opposing quality of "goodness".

A mixture of scientific ideas, analogies and terminology is used throughout the poem, and its organization also seems to indicate a willing mathematical structure with the intention of widening its conceptual content. This structure allows for the intertwining of a great variety of sub-plots within the general plot of the poem, the Fall of Man. Such combination of events and ideas is also encountered within the underlying scenery, thus presenting the three worlds of Platonism. The intermediary world, represented in the poem by the angels' domain, evinces the cause and consequences of the first Fall, Lucifer's - to be called Satan ever after. The concept of disordered multiplicity - numberless throng/multitude - was constituted at the moment the very first

¹ J. E. Seigel *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963. See Part I: "Philosophy and the Humanist Defense of Rhetoric."

² Henceforth the abbreviation **PL** will be used to refer to *Paradise Lost*.

³ Irene Samuel "Milton on Learning and Wisdom" PMLA, Vol.64, No.1, 1949: 708-723.

separation from the One is produced and the Dyad sees its initiation (PL, V.604-17)¹. Two opposing energies were required for the creation to take place, and this is allegorized in Book VI where the War between fallen and unfallen angels is narrated. It can easily be understood as the destruction produced by uniting matter with anti-matter; this will produce a creative and developing energy. The fact that the narration of the actual creation takes place immediately after the War in Heaven reinforces this interpretation. This War allegorizes disorder and reaches its end at the moment order is reestablished by the Son. This is done by giving a place for each category of angels, the fallen angels are sent down to the world of darkness in the “bottomless pit”, or Hell, below Chaos; the unfallen have their place in the world of light, a higher Heaven near the divinity. Thus the concept of space is clearly determined in Book VI, time has already been established during the war, which lasted three days “as they are counted in heaven”². Once time and space are established, the creation of the organic world will follow.

In the middle books of PL, Raphael informs Adam of everything he needs to know to avoid falling. The poem evinces Milton’s belief about the meaning of the Fall, which seems to follow the Plotinian belief that to fall is to forget God. This hints at moral philosophy and ethical knowledge, leading to a more perfect management of life and therefore happiness. As mentioned above, Irene Samuel very specially emphasizes Milton’s will for learning and she points out that he did not really change his mind about it, since his youth when he wrote the *Prologues* he subjected it to being acquired without idolatry³. Although in *Areopagitica* Milton defends the publication of any books, he does not state that all readings are good, but that they are constrained to the use the reader makes of them. It is his intention to make people think and analyse what they are reading. Such beliefs are repeated in Milton’s prose and constitute a commonplace in Miltonic thought.

The passage under analysis presents the moment when Adam asks Raphael about the stars and planets, it belongs to their conversation on astronomy. As stated above, astronomy was widely discussed at the time Milton composed PL due to the contemporary differences between theories concerning the movement of the planets. Many scholars were influenced by the traditional Ptolemaic theory and felt very sceptical towards the relatively new Copernican system and the theories of Galileo and Kepler. The way Milton presents this dialogue shows his awareness of the controversy and his conviction that it was very important. However, he once more gave preference to a reasoned and unconceited analysis of the issue; truth is beyond the actual movement and situation of the stars and planets. What really mattered was to see the order and harmony of the universe as a reflection of God’s rule. This order is linked with the concept of “temperance” in Milton.

When I behold this goodly Frame, this World
Of Heav’n and Earth consisting, and compute
Thir magnitudes, this Earth a spot, a grain,
An Atom, with the Firmament compar’d
And all her number’d Stars, that seem to roll
Spaces incomprehensible (for such
Thir distance argues and thir swift return
Diurnal) merely to officiate light
Round this opacous Earth, this punctual spot,
One day and night; in all thir vast survey
Useless besides; reasoning I oft admire,

¹ This is the moment when God anoints the Son King and Satan felt deep envy. It was at this moment that the Dyad can be thought to have been initiated.

² For explanation on Milton’s use of “time” and “space” see, Harris F. Fletcher *Milton’s Rabbinical Readings* New York: The Gordian Press, 1967.

³ See Irene Samuel “Milton on Learning and Wisdom”: 708-723.

How Nature wise and frugal (Book viii, 15-25)¹

Adam is presented as a sceptical astronomer in these lines. He asks about something he ignores, maybe because the issue is beyond his possibilities or because certain knowledge is forbidden to him. McColley in his article “The Astronomy of *Paradise Lost*” explains how “the seventeenth century was an era of profound scientific transition”, one in which many theories were active and important:

Milton was well aware of this situation, and proposed to discuss, not the Ptolemaic and Copernican hypotheses, but theories of celestial motions, in which he included these two conceptions, together with the idea of diurnal rotation of the central earth, and the doctrine of a plurality of worlds.²

McColley states that Milton manifested clear interest in the diurnal rotation of the earth and in the doctrine of the plurality of worlds; he adds that the poet respected Copernicus and ironized about the Ptolemaic hypothesis. In this extract the idea of celestial motions is presented together with the conception of diurnal rotation of the earth and the plurality of worlds. It is easy to deduce that it had to be difficult for Milton to choose between one theory or another. Galileo’s telescope was the reason for many changes in different theories and it established many doubts. Knowing Milton’s intention, we can easily think that he aimed at presenting them to promote more study and to awake curiosity.

The following extract from the same Book evinces language that, mixed with an outstanding stylistic beauty, seems to be moving from one theory to another:

But this I urge,
 Admitting motion in the Heav’ns, to show
 Invalid that which thee to doubt it mov’d;
 Not that I so affirm, though so it seem
 To thee who hast thy dwelling here on Earth.
 God to remove his ways from human sense,
 Plac’d Heav’n from Earth so far, that earthly sight,
 If it presume, might err in things too high,
 And no advantage gain. What if the Sun
 Be Centre to the World, and other Stars
 By his attractive virtue and their own
 Incited, dance about him various rounds?
 Thir wandering course now high, now low, then hid,
 Progressive, retrograde, or standing still,
 In six thou seest, and what if sev’nth to these
 The planet Earth, so steadfast though she seem,
 Insensibly three different Motions move? (viii, 114-130)

Perhaps Milton’s own belief can be traced here since he put the Copernican theory in Raphael’s mouth. The angel is supposed to know better than man; however, the entire dialogue leads to the importance of controlling knowledge, or the will to know the unknowable. There is the risk of falling into the blindness of not seeing that “which lies before the eyes”, and which directly influences “daily life”, for the simple reason of seeking much more knowledge. The paradox is that by not seeing one’s most immediate reality, access to what there is beyond seems impossible.

¹ All the quotations are from Merrit Y. Hughes ed. *John Milton. Complete Poems and Major Prose* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1957.

² Grant McColley “The Astronomy of *Paradise Lost*” SP, Vol. 34, 1937: 209-247.

Till warn'd, or by experience taught, she* learn
 That not to know at large of things remote
 From use, obscure and subtle, but to know
 That which before us lies in daily life,
 Is the prime Wisdom; what is more, is fume,
 Or emptiness, or fond impertinence,
 And renders us in things that most concern
 Unpractic'd, unprepar'd, and still to seek. (viii, 190-197)
 (* the mind or fancy)

Milton warns against the danger of mere speculation when the mind lacks the power to grasp true reality. Temperance and contemplation will undoubtedly prevent the acquisition of a supposed knowledge which might be the result of fancy and speculation¹. It seems that Milton was arguing in favour of experimental and empirical knowledge against the inherent tendency of Man toward speculation, which is a way of boasting. Hence the use of words such as *fume*, *emptiness*, *impertinence*. He emphasizes the daily things in life, since they are considered to be *prime wisdom*. When this wisdom is not possessed the person is left "unpractised, unprepared, and still to seek (deficient)".

To conclude I would like to point out once more the organization of the poem; it is presented according to a numerical structure following a concrete symmetry. Notwithstanding the lack of apparent chronology of events, these are narrated in relation with the worlds they belong to and the themes they convey. Right in the middle of the poem, which falls in Book vi, we find a message of hope highlighted by the imposition of order within chaos. The fact that the creation and origin of the universe is explained in Book seven seems to suggest an intentionality of the author: number seven was used to refer to the number of planets, additionally indicating a strong Biblical influence that hints at a final ethical objective. Books six, seven and eight have a very special global significance that allows the extension of content by means of the poetical force it implies. Milton's intention to compose his work according to a very structured order seems to indicate his will to imitate the beauty of the cosmos in order to increase pleasurable reading. Preoccupation for the truth of knowledge and for the welfare of human life are aspects one cannot miss when reading PL, and scientific analogies and references have been used to highlight the importance of "knowledge within bounds" to avoid "fume, impertinence". PL is the mature result of what Milton thought in his youth, and a defence of "a universal interaction of all things."²

March 1996

REFERENCES

- Arthos, J. 1940: Poetic Diction and Scientific Language. *ISIS* 32: 324-338.
 Baldwin, E. C. 1920, 1963: Milton and Plato's *Timaeus*. *PMLA* 35: 210-217.
 Banville, J. 1976, 1990: *Doctor Copernicus*. London, Minerva Paperbacks, 1995.
 Fallon, S. 1991: *Milton among the Philosophers*. Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press.
 Fletcher, H. F. 1967: *Milton's Rabbinical Readings*. New York, The Gordian Press.

¹ See Alastair Fowler's note to his edition of *Paradise Lost*. A. Fowler ed. *Paradise Lost* Longman, 1968: Book viii, notes to lines 15-38: 396. Fowler includes the idea of mystical contemplation when acquiring knowledge.

² See *Prolusion II* in Merrit Y. Hughes ed. *John Milton. Complete Poems and Major Prose*.

- Fowler, A.ed. 1968: *Milton. Paradise Lost*. London, Longman.
- Fuente, P. de la, Granados, X. & Reus, F. eds.1986: *Galileo. Cartas Copernicanas*. Madrid, Editorial Alhambra.
- Gilbert, A. H. 1922: Milton and Galileo. *Studies in Philology* 19, No.2: 152-185.
- Hanford, J. H. 1919: Milton and the Return to Humanism. *Studies in Philology*, Vol.XVI, No.2: 137-147.
- Hawking, S. W. 1988: *A Brief History of Time. From the Big Bang to Black Holes*. New York, Bantam Books. Miguel Orduño, trans. 1990, 1994: *Historia del tiempo. Del big bang a los agujeros negros*. Madrid, Alianza Editorial.
- Hughes, M. Y. ed. 1957: *John Milton. Complete Poems and Major Prose*. New York, Macmillan Publishing Company.
- McColley, G. 1937: The Astronomy of *Paradise Lost*. *Studies in Philology* 34: 209-247.
- McColley, G. 1937: Milton's Dialogue on Astronomy: The principal Immediate Sources. *PMLA* 52, No.3: 728-762.
- McColley, G. 1940, 1941: Literature and Science. *ISIS* 33, No.80: 285-287.
- Navarro, V.ed. 1991: *Galileo. Antología*. Barcelona, Ediciones Península.
- Patrides, C. A. 1958: The Numerological Approach to Cosmic Order in the English Renaissance. *ISIS* 49: 391-397.
- Seigel, J. E. 1963: *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism*. Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press.
- Samuel, I. 1949: Milton on Learning and Wisdom. *PMLA* 64, No.1: 708-723.
- Samuel, I. 1947: *Plato and Milton*. Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press.
- Schmitt, C. B. & Skinner, Q.eds. 1988: *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*. Cambridge, CUP, 1992.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. ed. & Tillyard, P. trans. 1932: *Milton. private Correspondence and Academic Exercises*. London, CUP.
- Tillyard, E. M. W. 1943: *The Elizabethan World Picture*. Penguin, 1984.

* * *

Death in northern Africa: The Battle of Alcazar and its theatrical representation

Juan E. Tazón Salces

UNIVERSITY OF OVIEDO

On the 25th of August, 1578, the correspondent in Lisbon of the Fugger bankers sent these sad news to his master:

I cannot hide from you the regrettable and unheard-of disaster which befell our King and his whole army in Africa. On the 3rd day of this month, our King marched forward to encounter the enemy, meaning to arrive at Alcazar on the same day.¹

Needless to say, that king never returned. He was King Sebastian of Portugal, a man who thus met the glorious death he perhaps had so ardently sought, leaving as a result the doors of his country open to ambitious and greedy neighbours, like Philip II of Spain, who saw in the outcome of such an ill-fated expedition the great opportunity to add to an already flourishing empire the other half of what had been the Papal division of the world, as established in the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494.² Portugal, thus, lost a man, a king and its independence, though it gained, in return, a legend. For this was a death with a mystery. The Fugger correspondent explained it with the following words:

Our King bore himself right bravely, and, so it is said, killed many Turks with his own hands, but at last, after he had mounted the third horse, he disappeared so that no one has found him either alive or dead until this hour.³

Many years later, as late actually as 1599, another chapter was added to the general story: the “dead” king had made its appearance once again. He was alive and well, though moving on a different stage:

The news now comes very hot that Sebastian, King of Portugal, that was said to be slain in the battle of Alcazar in Barbary in 1578, is now at Venice and hath made so good trial of himself that the Venetians allow him and maintain almost fourscore persons about him at their charge. They say he tells very strange stories, how he with fourteen more escaped from the battle and got up into the mountains, and so by many adventures, he went and he went until he came to Ethiopia, or Prester John’s land, meaning from thence to have gone into the East Indies.⁴

Somebody, and we know very little about him, had started a performance which was to last for rather a while. His “acting to the life”, his discourse and his brilliance on the Venetian stage, must

¹ Von Klarwill, V. ed. *The Fugger News-Letters*, New York, 1926, p. 25.

² The next king in Portugal was Cardinal Henry, who reigned until 1580. In that year, and after a successful campaign by Alva, Philip II succeeded him.

³ Von Klarwill, V. ed. p. 26.

⁴ Harrison, G. B., *An Elizabethan Journal*, Vol. 3, p. 4

have been astonishing, for in fact that personation of the royal figure blinded the audience to the fact that the protagonist was simply an impostor. A month later, for instance, the news was:

We are still fed with rumours of Don Sebastian that he is 'ipsissimus', and that the Venetians have sent ambassadors to the King of Spain to signify so much to him; and that there have been some great men executed of late in Portugal about this business.¹

Even a year later, in November 1600, and despite the fact that the given "actor" had by then spent a considerable time in prison as a result of the "lack of faith", or the "lack of taste" in realistic drama, of some Venetian authorities, the reports were that many were still inclined to believe that the whole episode was no pantomime, but rather an example of the cruel injustice with which some men react when confronted with the truth. Truth, however, was what the event demanded, and truth some would have, even if it meant searching for almost impossible proofs. These, however, could apparently in the end be found:

There is a constant report that he which hath been so long a prisoner at Venice is now discovered to be the true Sebastian by many secret tokens upon his body, confirmed out of Portugal by those which knew him both child and man.²

The "play" thus continued for a little longer, though with one addition of the utmost relevance: by March, 1601, the performance had lasted for so long that a "chorus" was needed which could fill in the gaps for latecomers. A body of literature was thus born, with precisely that purpose, in which one work stood above the rest, *The Strangest adventure that ever happened*, either in ages past or present, being a discourse of Don Sebastian from the time of his voyage into Affric, when he was lost in the battle against the infidels in the year 1578 unto the 6th of January last past; a discourse full of divers curious histories, some ancient prophecies, and other matters to show that he whom the Signiory of Venice hath held as prisoner for more than two years is the true Don Sebastian.³ The legend did not therefore need any other ingredient. In fact, the most important one for its eternal survival was already there, the fixed written form, which meant that secondary actors like the one who had originated it all were no longer necessary. Of his end we know very little: he was released in Venice only to be cast into prison again in Naples. After this, he was sent to the galleys and probably ended his days in San Lucar in Spain, telling his incredulous neighbours, we can well imagine, strange tales of Africa, Venice, kings, prisons, books and forced rowing for the Crown.⁴ A life for a leading role... but not the only one.⁵

The power of the character, however, did not disappear with that anonymous life, for this was not the case of "a king making progress through the guts of a beggar". The world might after all be a stage, and this might have lost one of its actors, but the character of Sebastian was too good a creation to die with the impersonator, too well shaped to be forgotten; in short, too full of promising literary material as to be discarded by the world of drama and its shrewd impresarios. And none like the English ones to see the benefits behind it.

Sebastian himself, for a start, could claim to descend from the House of Lancaster. Secondly, his death had meant a Spanish succession to the Portuguese crown, a fact in itself relevant enough to provoke a reaction of fear and hatred in a country like England that readily welcomed and backed a native Portuguese pretender, Don Antonio, for more than a decade after Sebastian's disappearance in Northern Africa. The former's involvement in the ill-fated expedition of Drake and Norris of 1589 against La Coruña and Lisbon, and his propaganda campaign, carried out

¹ Harrison, G. B., Vol. 3, p. 10.

² Harrison, G. B., Vol. 3, p. 125.

³ Harrison, G. B., Vol. 3, p. 175.

⁴ Harrison, G. B., Vol. 3, p. 301.

⁵ No fewer than four such claimants eventually appeared, all claiming to be the same person. They thus contributed to the power of the legend which so much inspired John Dryden in his composition of *Don Sebastian*. See, A. R., Braunmuller's *George Peele*, Boston, 1983, p. 67.

through books like *The Explanation of the True and Lawfull Right and Tittle of the Moste excellent Prince Anthonie*, (1585) published in English, French and Latin, all contributed to the outstanding place occupied by Portuguese affairs in the Elizabethan world. In the third place, King Sebastian's cause had been that of a Christian king fighting against the "infidels", but he had not been alone in the crusade. In fact, English hands had actually helped him and perished in his company. Lastly, the name of Alcazar echoed not only an exotic location for a battle, but a battle itself with what was probably an unprecedented characteristic, three kings had died in it: two members of the Moroccan royal house, Abdelmelec and his usurping nephew, Muly Mahamet (The Moor), and the Portuguese monarch; a sad record, but undeniably one full of theatrical possibilities.

The world of drama, therefore, jumped at the chance, and no fewer than three plays were staged in London with more than moderate success. Of the three, two occupy a most relevant position, George Peele's *Battle of Alcazar* and the anonymous *The Life and Death of Captain Thomas Stukeley*. A third one by Chettle and Dekker, *King Sebastian of Portingall*, staged in 1601¹, seems to have been much shadowed by the other two and probably owed much to them.

Of the works mentioned, it was undeniably Peele's play the one to prove more successful. Probably written just after the English expedition of 1589, the Lord Admiral's Men performed it several times with the famous Edward Alleyn taking the role of the Moor. The quarto edition of 1594 in fact claims in the title page, "as it was sundrie times plaid by the Lord high Admirall his servants". And undeniably, the play had all the ingredients to become a success. Right from the start, for example, the audience is told:

Sit you and see this true and tragicke warre,
a modern matter full of bloud and ruth,
Where three bolde kings confounded in their height,
Fall to the earth contending for a crowne... (49-52)²

Lines, in fact, which prove, especially if we take into account the second one, a basic characteristic of the text: the influence of Marlowe, and more precisely of his *Tamburlaine*, which had also been recently staged by the company with also Edward Alleyn in the leading role. As Braunmuller states:

High-flown speeches written in blank verse, an exotic locale, scenes of cruelty and violence- all these elements show Peele's attempt to overgo the earlier play.³

Peele's authorship, however, rests on inconclusive information. Some lines of the play, for example, appear as his in the anthology *Englands Parnassus* (1600), and critics have assumed for a long time a connection between the play and also Peele's *Farewell to... Norris and Drake* (1589), which seems to contain an advertisement for *The battle of Alcazar*, but these few bits of information are not totally reliable. This last piece of evidence, however, does provide us with another fact which is worth taking into account. It reads:

Bid Theaters and proude Tragaedians,
Bid Mahomets Poo, and mightie Tamburlaine,
King Charlemaine, Tom Stukeley and the rest
Adiewe: to Armes, to Armes, to glorious Armes ... (20-23)

A second character in the plot thus makes his appearance, Thomas Stukeley, whose importance is going to be comparable to that of the Portuguese king, and with good reason, for he too is presented by the playwright as a living legend. Daring, brave, and above all enterprising, the character agrees in Peele's play "to die with honor for Sebastian" (712). Convinced by the monarch and under the spell of his own ambition, Stukeley sees Morocco as a stage where glory can finally be gained: "Saint George for England, and Irelande nowe adue, / For here Tom Stukley

¹ Harrison, G. B., Vol. 3, p. 189.

² Dyce, A. ed., *The Works of George Peele*, 2d rev. ed., London, 1829-1839.

³ Braunmuller, A. R., p. 68.

shapes his course anue" (735-736). And like the King, he too meets his end while trying to find a place in the sun, for, as he confesses, he would rather be "*King of a mole-hill... than the richest subject of a monarchie*" (465-466).

But he too, the same as Sebastian, and this is what makes him truly interesting for our purpose, is a character with a real background, to the extent that Peele must have had in mind for his shaping the several ballads and the numerous tales that circulated in London in which this Quixotic figure appeared as the main protagonist. Exact and detailed biographical information, however, must have been scant, a fact that explains what appear to be mistakes on the part of the author. The one touching birth is perhaps the most apparent. In Peele's play he is made a Londoner, whereas in reality he seems to have been the son of a knight in Devon, one Hugh Stucley, whose father had in turn been a Knight of the body to King Henry VIII. But even this might be wrong, for Philip O'Sullivan in his *Compendium of the Catholic History of Ireland* put forward other views:

By some [he] was said to be an illegitimate son of Henry VIII, king of England; by others, son of an English knight and an Irish lady; by others, Irish by both parents, who either from anger at the English, or from religious motives, or desiring war and revolution in hopes of gain, or aspiring to reign, being perhaps a man of royal blood, was supplicating in the name of the Irish for succour against the English.¹

English or Irish, of royal birth or not, the truth is that Stukeley's first appearance in history presaged what would be a remarkable career but also one of ultimate failure. In 1562 he was put at the head of a joint Anglo-French enterprise for the settlement of Florida, following the return of the French Jean Ribault from that land and the publishing of a translation into English of his report, the first detailed account of a visit to North America to appear in English. Stukeley, for reasons not very well known, failed the test, giving Laudonnière the chance for the planting of the French Huguenot colony that would later on be cruelly extirpated by Menéndez de Avilés. Queen Elizabeth, whom he would call "my sister" given time, thus discovered one of the most unpleasant creatures of her gallery. Stukeley had failed her, and in the most disagreeable manner for that matter, for he had employed the means at his disposal in an erratic and short career as a pirate in the waters of the Gulf of Biscay. All this, however, was only the prologue to the story of a relationship which increasingly deteriorated with the passing of time.

By 1571, the rupture between Queen and subject was a well-established fact. Stukeley had by then left behind his office of seneschal of Kavanagh's country in Ireland in exchange for what most probably appeared to him as a golden opportunity, that of serving Philip II and the Catholic cause. Vivero, in Galicia, witnessed that year his landing on the Continent and heard, for the first time, the title with which he was to embellish his entrance upon the Spanish political scene, "Duke of Ireland". That same year Philip II received the first complaints about him:

... y lo que se dize es que V. Ser. (sin esperar lo ni pensarlo yo) me quiere hazer una grande injuria, procurando tomarme el Reyno de Irlanda, y leuantar alli sedicion, fomentando nros. sediciosos contrarios y desposseyendonos del Reyno que nros. padres y abuelos han tenido... [tratando y favoreciendo] a Thomas Stucley, nro. fugitivo y rebelde, hombre desbaratado, perdido y gastador, que ha consumido y comido torpemente toda su hazienda y la de sus mugeres, assi lo que en Inglaterra pudo en algun tiempo alcançar, mas por fauor de la fortuna que por algun merito suyo, como lo que tenia en Irlanda.²

They came, as can easily be imagined, from an enraged English Queen who, also by then, was beginning to feel the consequences of the Papal bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, which declared her a heretical figure, and realise that the relationship between the two courts was reaching the point of no

¹ Quoted by Richard Simpson in *The School of Shakspeare*, London, 1878, p. 5.

² Archivo General de Simancas, Estado, Legajo 823: "De la Reyna de Inglaterra a XX de Março, 1571."

return. The storm had begun to gather in the horizon, and her words in that sense could be prophetic:

... estando en el suauissimo curso de nra. amistad (como por la mayor parte suele acaesçer que no ay cosa humana estable y duradera) en estos pocos años se leuanto una como nubezilla, no por culpa nra, sino de los ministros de V. Ser.¹

Stukeley, needless to say, did not make things easier. He was accompanied by several other “rebels”, all asking for an army and a chance to prove the Catholic monarch that they could be taken for what they claimed to be, loyal subjects of the Spanish crown. Whether Philip II believed it or not is something that historians have still not fully disclosed, though one relevant episode seems to indicate that the former might be true, the pension of several thousand ducats given to him by the King. The army, however, which the Englishman also asked for, with the aim of invading Ireland and making of that country part of the Spanish empire, did not come with the money, a fact which in itself may in turn show the lack of trust of the “prudent” king towards such a weird character.

Be it what it may, the truth is that Stukeley finally abandoned Spain bound for a new destination, Rome, full of hopes in what Pope Gregory could do for his person. And if this was the case, he was not wrong, for it was in Rome where his dream finally took shape thanks to the help of the Pontiff and the Jesuits who assisted him in recruiting an army of almost 1000 Italian and Spanish brigands with which to carry out the planned invasion. By the 28th of May, 1578, this was well under way, with a victorious Stukeley making his entrance in Lisbon and proclaiming for everyone to hear his vision of a Catholic Ireland, free from the grasp of the woman who had rejected him in the past.

Lisbon thus witnessed the encounter of the two dreamers, though it also became the stage upon which a dark bargain was carried out. Steven G. Ellis sees it in the following way:

Stukeley recruited 1,000 Italian swordsmen, but after reaching Lisbon he was persuaded by King Sebastian of Portugal to support an expedition to Morocco where he fell in battle.²

Apparently, a matter of persuasion, though ambition might also have played a part. William Pillen, a British merchant who witnessed the arrival of Stukeley’s ship in Lisbon, reported the affair to England supplying details which cast some light into the whole affair:

While there, a great ship of 800 tons also arrived, wherein was Stuckley and about 700 soldiers, as Stuckley himself gave out... They were mustered before the King of Portugal and well liked by him, there being 80 who were very expert soldiers. Stuckley was called by no other name than Marquis, and he brought with him one Irish bishop and three or four priests. For a fortnight after his arrival, he kept on board, and there entertained resorters, but afterwards a house was prepared for him in Lisbon, where he kept house. When he first came to the King of Portugal, he humbled himself to have kissed the King’s hand, but he would not suffer it, and embraced him and received some letters which he brought from the Pope.³

A royal welcome in a moment of need, but also, to the eyes of the witness, a great opportunity to forget old plans and join a new enterprise which appeared to be very promising indeed. Ireland, in comparison, could only mean very little:

¹ Archivo General de Simancas, Estado, Legajo 823.

² Ellis, Steven G., *Tudor Ireland*, London, 1985, p. 279.

³ Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, April 1578. “Deposition of William Pillen”.

He knew Ireland as well as the best, but there was nothing to be got but hunger and lice.¹

Stukeley thus added a basic ingredient, his mysterious decision, to what had already emerged as a personal legend known not only in Spain and Italy, but also England, where his steps were closely followed by all those on whom the security of the country rested. With this background, therefore, the fact that his memory still survived years after his death, should not be surprising. In fact, it was on the contrary so much alive that, as we have already mentioned, the literary tribute was not scant. Peele's play is indeed a significant part of it, but equally also, a play entered on the Register of the Stationer's Company on 11 August 1600 as follows:

history of the life & Deathe of Captaine Tho. Stuclely, with his Mariage to ald Curtis his daughter, & his valiant endinge of his life at the battell of Alcazar.²

The date of composition is uncertain. Philip Henslowe, for example, recorded a play called "Stewtley", described as "ne" on December 11, 1596, which could be the same one. If indeed it was, it must have been quite a hit, for the Lord Admiral's Men performed it no fewer than ten times between that date and June 27, 1597.³ Quite a record, which may in turn explain the publication in 1605 of a Quarto edition, entered by Thomas Pavier. As for the author of the same, nothing is known with certainty, though one thing is clear: he knew, or worked in close connection with somebody that did, Gaelic; rather a surprising fact in itself, but more so when we consider that it is more accurate than any to appear in any other play of the period.

Once again, however, and the same as had happened with Peele's work, this play contains a number of what appear to be clear biographical mistakes. Stukeley, for instance, is made this time a Law student at London. There he leads, maintained as he is by an ignorant father, a life that has little to do with books and a lot with weapons, which fill up his study. The old qualities of the real character, however, as described by Queen Elizabeth, are still to be seen: arrogant, corrupt, and, above all, extravagant, Stukeley marries Alderman Curtis's daughter with the aim of using her money for his own exclusively personal benefit. Left behind by a husband who has soon forgotten her, Anne Curtis dies when Stukeley has already made clear his intention of leaving the country and seeking adventure and honour abroad. Once in Spain, and free from the bondage of marriage, the protagonist meets a Machiavellian Philip II, who has already heard about King Sebastian's plans for Northern Africa, and who simply awaits for the dreadful outcome that will set him on the Portuguese throne. As his adviser Davila says in the play:

Your highness knows, Sebastian once removed,
The way is open solely for yourself,
Either by force or by corrupting gold,
To step into the throne.⁴

And it is in the Spanish court where Stukeley finds himself playing a new role, ambassador of the Spanish king before the Pope. Thus, and through much invented material, the unknown author makes his character cover the basic steps that the real Stukeley took in real life. Finally, and on his return from Rome, the Englishman meets a credulous Portuguese king who ignores the wicked plans of the Spanish rival, and who, on the contrary, firmly believes in the Spanish help:

I tell thee cousin, never Christian king
Came with so proud a power to Africa.⁵

All is ready, therefore, for the final tragedy on African soil. Sebastian perishes with his dreams of a Christian conquest. Stukeley, killed by his own men, who do not forgive the decisions of a

¹ Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, April, 1578.

² Levinson, Judith ed. *The famous history of Captain Thomas Stukeley, 1605*, Malone Society Reprints, 1975: v.

³ Greg, Walter, W. ed. *Henslowe's Diary*, London, 1904, p. 50.

⁴ Simpson, R., p. 219.

⁵ Simpson, R., p. 245.

mad leader which have finally put them in a desperate situation. The end ... but only in fiction, for in Venice somebody claimed to be the real King, come to life again. And in Ireland, one of Stukeley's captains in Africa, Sebastian de San Giuseppe, kept his memory alive with his landing on the Dingle Peninsula, which set the Irish nightmare going in 1579. Fiction and reality mingled in one indivisible whole.

* * *

‘A more familiar straine’: puppetry and burlesque,
or, translation as debasement in Ben Jonson’s
Bartholomew Fair

Rui Carvalho Homem

UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO

Amidst the several aspects which have traditionally been part of Ben Jonson’s rather uncertain literary reputation, one of the most persistent and - it is fair to say - most difficult to counter may be the depiction of this Poet Laureate as a paradigm of the pedantic Classicist¹. His much quoted strictures on some of his contemporaries’ less solid Classical scholarship, combined with the tradition of a clichéd and always disadvantageous comparison with Shakespeare, have continued to turn what Jonson and most of his contemporaries and immediate followers would have regarded as an asset and a source of authority - his unquestionable scholarship - into a liability, or, at best, into a target for what Eliot famously called ‘the praise that quenches all desire to read the book’².

It is not, however, the purpose of this paper to secure the continuity of another long-standing, and almost as wearisome, critical tradition - that of the complaint about Jonson’s unfair critical reputation. Its aim is rather to point out how in one of Jonson’s best-known, and today most-valued, comedies the satiric purpose can be guided by Jonson’s assumption of the Classics as reference and yardstick; and, further, to argue that, in the same comedy, Jonson construes the practices he denounces in such a way that they become a case in point for such present-day critical concerns as the interest in the modes of rewriting and the study of the strategies involved in translation.

The comedy in question could seem, however, the unlikeliest place in Jonson’s *oeuvre* to look for a consequence of his unremitting admiration for classical standards: after all, *Bartholomew Fair* has in recent years become the centre of a reassessment of Jonson’s dramatic vitality, and it has become so precisely on the basis of values antithetical to those - riot rather than order, profusion and dispersion rather than economy and discipline, a reconciliation with popular culture rather than a forbidding assumption of high culture. Alternatively to, or rather complementing, this predominantly Bakhtinian reappraisal of Jonson centered around *Bartholomew Fair*³, this comedy has convincingly been presented as a decisive step in a development of his work which may have

¹ On this aspect of Jonson’s reputation, see Haynes, Jonathan 1992: *The Social Relations of Jonson’s Theater*. Cambridge, CUP: 1.

² Eliot, T. S. 1932: Ben Jonson (1919). *Selected Essays*. London, Faber: (147-160) 147.

³ See Bakhtin, Mikhail 1968: *Rabelais and his World*, trans. Helene Iswolsky. Cambridge, Mass, MIT Press. As part of a growing interest in the study of festive traditions, and for readings of Jonson in that light, see: Bristol, Michael D. 1985: *Carnival and Theater: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England*. New York and London, Methuen; Hayes, Tom 1985: *The Birth of Popular Culture: Ben Jonson, Maid Marian and Robin Hood*. Pittsburgh, PA, Duquesne U.P.; Hutton, Ronald 1994: *The Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year 1400-1700*. Oxford, OUP; Laroque, François 1991: *Shakespeare’s Festive World: Elizabethan Seasonal Entertainment and the Professional Stage*, trans. Janet Lloyd. Cambridge, CUP; Marcus, Leah S. 1986: *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the defense of old holiday pastimes*. Chicago, Ill, Univ. of Chicago Press; and the final chapter in Haynes 1992: 119-138.

brought him nearer to, rather than confirmed a distance from, Shakespeare and romantic comedy - a critical trend decisively buttressed by Anne Barton's 1984 study *Ben Jonson, Dramatist*¹.

It has to be acknowledged, however, that, from the outset, Jonson places *Bartholomew Fair* under the aegis of a balanced consideration of the learned and the popular, trying to draw the line by drawing up a formal compromise between both. The 'Indvction on the Stage' acknowledges the inevitability of the play being staged in a place which shares the status of a theatre and a bear-pit - but it also suppresses the impertinence of a 'Stage-Keeper' who would like the comedy to pander to the less demanding aspects of popular taste and the easiest strategies to elicit the audience's laughter. It will be up to the 'Booke-holder' to represent the author in the formal proposal of a 'Covenant' which will commit each member of the audience to respect the theatrical event, and to have the humility not to get 'about his wit'; but such a contract will in exchange promise an amusement whose acknowledged forms, in characters and situations, represent a willingness to compromise which might be difficult to find in the majority of Jonson's previous plays and critical statements. The terms of the 'Covenant' show a Jonson concerned with establishing clear limits to his giving in - or, in the words of Jonathan Haynes (1992: 135), feeling that '[his] art envelops the fair, but the Fair must not envelop his art.'

It will prove particularly relevant to the concerns of this paper that, in the terms of that covenant, the author's most extreme concession will refer to *puppets* - at the end of a passage more often quoted with regard to the dismissive allusions in it to Shakespeare's romances:

[the *Author*] is loth to make Nature afraid in his *Playes*, like those that beget *Tales*, *Tempest*, and such like *Drolleries*, to mixe his head with other mens heeles, let the concupisence of *Iigges* and *Dances*, raigne as strong as it will amongst you: yet if the *Puppets* will please any body, they shall be entreated to come in. ('The Indvction on the Stage' 129-34)²

And the puppets will indeed come in, by the hand of a character who, to the extent that he is an author of sorts (and very much proud of that quality), and that he is by profession a *proctor* (i.e., someone who acts on behalf of others), could be an on-stage surrogate for the dramatist. But the character in question will be allowed to be so only in the diminutive and demeaning sense conferred by his name, Littlewit, the name being a first and immediately obvious feature of a characterization which will expand from the character's intellect to the kind of entertainment - puppet plays - which propels him to the Fair, and will expand further to the judgment the play will unfold on the role to be played by writing, learning and morality in an environment of popular amusement and transgression.

In fact, the first words on Littlewit (which are virtually the first words in the play), when the stagekeeper comes forward to apologise for a delay, since 'He that should beginne the Play, Master *Littlewit*, the *Proctor*, has a stitch new falne in his black silk stocking' ('Indvction' 2-4), ascribe to him a fastidiousness with clothing (later to be confirmed as an obsession with fashion) which is often the sign of a fool in Jonsonian comedy. And when Littlewit finally does come on stage his first words will take up again the image of the silk thread to give voice to a delighted self-assessment in the use of language which may be as decisive as his vanity for his exposure as would-be author:

A Pretty conceit, and worth the finding! I ha' such luck to spinne out these fine things still, and like a Silkeworme, out of my selfe. (I-1: 1-3)

Littlewit's delight in a mode of creation which rests, as is the case here, on the 'witty' discovery of verbal coincidences, is, from Jonson's cultural perspective, a clear sign of a diseased use of language and a diseased imagination, guided by 'Opinion' - the consequence being that words are generated by words rather than by 'sense' or 'substance', as he would put it in several

¹ Published by Cambridge University Press.

² The edition used is: Herford, C. H. and Percy Simpson eds. 1938: *Ben Jonson*, vol. VI. Oxford, Clarendon Press. Henceforth cited by act, scene and line numbers.

passages of *Timber, or Discoveries*, his collection of maxims and reflections¹. The same passage can be read also as a satiric indictment of an attitude to creation which prizes originality above dutiful *imitatio*². And it characterizes this author of puppet-plays, and all those who have as little wit as he, as easily seduced by the surface of things - as of language - and as unable to see beyond it. This limitation, and his penchant for fashion, will lead him to parade his wife and her new clothes before the gallants who come to his house, and prevent him from seeing any harm in their familiar treatment of her (I-2: 1ff); and, combined with his obsession with the success of his puppet play, the same limitation will make him later abandon her to the pimps in the Fair, mistaken for 'good company', 'honest Gentlemen' (IV-5: 3, 8).

This unwitting assumption of the role of a pimp will converge with Littlewit's irresponsibility when, already in the puppet booth, he declares: 'I would not haue any notice taken, that I am the *Author*, till we see how it passes' (V-3: 23-4). And the faults of this puppet playwright will be fully confirmed in his play and in the diminutive theatre where it will be performed. It is a booth where pretensions to learning expose themselves in a promiscuous mingling of historical and cultural references, and in the puppet master's utter inability to discriminate between different sources and times. The biblical and the contemporary, the remote and the familiar, moral *exempla* and instances of misrule - all are muddled up in Leatherhead's personal and theatrical memory, and all prostituted for an easy, though petty, profit:

O the *Motions*, that I *Lanthorne Leatherhead* haue giuen light to, i' my time (...)! *Ierusalem* was a stately thing; and so was *Niniue*, and the city of *Norwich*, and *Sodom and Gomorrah*; with the rising o' the prentises; and pulling downe the bawdy houses there, vpon *Shroue-Tuesday*; but the *Gunpowder-plot*, there was a get-penny! (V-1: 6-12)

It is true that Jonson's dramatic practice will seldom match point by point his critical pronouncements, and that *Bartholomew Fair*, the development of its plot coinciding with the discrediting of all those who claim authority, has convincingly been argued to be the culminating point in the mollification of Jonson, the satirist; moreover, Jonson was trained, as Creaser puts it, in 'the pervasive rhetorical culture of the sixteenth century in which minds were trained to argue *in utramque partem*, on both sides of any question'³. However, in that clearest possible denial of all literary decorum which is Leatherhead's description of his theatrical experience, a possible sympathy for the zest with which it is presented does not invalidate the judgment which derives from the puppet booth's neighbourhood of thieves, pimps and prostitutes. The diminutive nature of this theatre is another implicit judgment passed on the quality and on the moral and cultural dimensions of everything it will be concerned with - ultimately, through all the characters which converge to it, the world as the Fair allegorically (re)presents it; but Jonson will have as a specific satiric target a cultural self-confidence of which he makes Leatherhead the spokesman, associating it, from the outset, with overweening ignorance.

The revealing passage comes immediately after the one last quoted, when Leatherhead claims:

Your home-borne proiects proue euer the best, they are so easie, and familiar, they put too much learning i' their things now o'dayes: and that I feare will be the spoile o'this. (V-1: 14-17)

It is as if, by putting this defence of native cultural production in the voice of Leatherhead, Jonson were questioning the whole ambition to promote the dignity of vernacular literary culture which pervades a great deal of English Renaissance writing - an ambition and a purpose, it should be added, to which Jonson, concerned in particular with redeeming dramatic literature from a

¹ Herford and Simpson eds. 1947: *Ben Jonson*, vol.VIII. Oxford, Clarendon Press: 555-649. Henceforth cited as *Discoveries*, followed by line numbers.

² For Jonson's praise of *imitatio*, see *Discoveries* 2466ff.

³ Creaser, John 1994: *Enigmatic Ben Jonson*. > Corder, Michael et al. eds. 1994: *English Comedy*. Cambridge, CUP: (100-118) 115

menial position, was to commit himself personally with his 1616 Folio publication of his *Works*, at the time seen by many as weirdly pretentious¹. Leatherhead's rejection of 'too much learning' is equally damning, but Littlewit's play will be ultimately denounced not so much for an aversion to learning, but rather for its incompetent handling - an incompetent *imitatio*.

Having read the puppet play's title, whose incongruities and weird connotations promptly denounce Jonson's burlesque strategy -

'The ancient moderne history of *Hero*, and *Leander*, otherwise called *The Touchstone of true Loue*, with as true a tryall of friendship, betweene *Damon*, and *Pythias*, two faithfull friends o' the Bankside' (V-3: 6-10)

Bartholmew Cokes, a character whose limitations will make him the ideal spectator in the puppet booth, will ask the crucial question: 'But doe you play it according to the printed booke? I haue read that' (V-3: 106-7). The 'printed book' would in this case be Christopher Marlowe's narrative poem *Hero and Leander* (1598), which, together with George Chapman's additions to it (1598-1613), had proved a considerably popular instance of the Elizabethan taste for Ovidian-style brief epics of erotic and mythological content - here probably conflated with Richard Edwards's *The Excellent Comedie of two of the most faithfulest Freendes, Damon and Pithias*². But even if it is probable that Jonson would hardly find such works congenial, his satiric target is rather, in this case, a disrespect for them which he might fear to amount to a more generic disrespect for the integrity of the written word, of the inviolable source. Leatherhead's answer to Cokes's query is unequivocal - also in its direct quotation of passages from the first lines of Marlowe's poem:

By no meanes, Sir. (...) A better way, Sir, that is too learned, and poetically for our audience; what doe they know what *Hellespont* is? Guilty of true loues blood? or what *Abidos* is? or the other *Sestos* hight? (...) No, I haue entreated Master *Littlewit*, to take a little paines to reduce it to a more familiar straine for our people. (V-3: 108, 110-13)

The point will be made even clearer by Littlewit himself:

I haue onely made it a little easie, and *moderne* for the times, Sir, that's all; As, for the *Hellespont* I imagine our *Thames* here; and then *Leander*, I make a Diers sonne, about *Puddle-wharfe*: and *Hero* a wench o' the *Banke-side*, who going ouer one morning, to old fish-street; *Leander* spies her land at *Trigsstayers*, and falls in loue with her: Now do I introduce *Cupid*, hauing *Metamorphos'd* himselfe into a Drawer, and hee strikes *Hero* in loue with a pint of *Sherry*, and other pretty passages there are, o' the friendship, that will delight you, Sir, and please you of iudgement. (V-3: 120-30)

And the satiric point is surely a mistrust of rewriting. As André Lefevere puts it, 'rewriting manipulates, and it is effective', and works have often been 'rewritten to bring [them] in line with the "new" dominant poetics'³ - in this case, the doubtful poetics of the Fair, or rather a pattern of taste for which Jonson's scorn, in the context of all the characteristic pronouncements which reveal his cultural perspective, is only to be expected.

As Lefevere also adds (1992: 9), 'translation is the most obviously recognizable type of rewriting', and so it should come as no surprise that the issues raised by the passages just quoted should easily lend themselves to consideration in the light of some of the most persistent *topoi* in Translation Studies. One such *topos* which has recently gained a renewed relevance, after having been available since at least the early nineteenth century, concerns the opposition between

¹ See Dutton, Richard 1983: *Ben Jonson: to the First Folio*. Cambridge, CUP.

² See Dutton, Richard 1983: *Ben Jonson: to the First Folio*. Cambridge, CUP.

³ Lefevere, André 1992: *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London, Routledge: 9, 19.

'foreignizing' and 'nativising' strategies of translation. The German philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher is credited with having provided one of the first and most memorable formulations of this opposition in his 1813 essay 'Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens' ('On the Different Methods of Translating')¹. For Schleiermacher, only two possibilities are available for the 'genuine translator' to further his concern with bringing author and reader together:

Entweder der Übersetzer läßt den Schriftsteller möglichst in Ruhe, und bewegt den Leser ihm entgegen; oder er läßt den Leser möglichst in Ruhe und bewegt den Schriftsteller ihm entgegen. (Schleiermacher 1813: 47)

Either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader toward him. Or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author toward him. (Lefevre ed. 1992: 149)

Schleiermacher further argues that the two methods are mutually exclusive, requiring the translator to make a fundamental option for one or the other, and that they are an all-embracing alternative, to the extent that other supposedly diverse methods can be proved to be encompassed by those two basic strategies. On the first, or 'foreignizing' method, and insofar as it will involve keeping the tone of the text 'strange' or 'foreign' (*fremd, ausländisch*), Schleiermacher (1813: 54-55) points out how difficult and even 'humiliating' it can be for a writer to have to give up the best forms of his mother tongue for a discourse patterned after the foreign language - the very literalness of the rendering inviting charges of clumsiness. He further argues that:

diese Methode des Uebersetzens nicht in allen Sprachen gleich gut gedeihen kann, sondern nur in solchen die nicht in zu engen Banden eines klassischen Ausdrucks gefangen liegen, außerhalb dessen alles verwerflich ist. (Schleiermacher 1813: 56)

this method of translating cannot thrive equally well in all languages, but only in those which are not the captives of too strict a bond of classical expression outside of which all is reprehensible. (Lefevre ed. 1992: 157)

And, as another *sine qua non* condition for this method, Schleiermacher postulates the need for a nation to acknowledge as positive the access to, and the understanding of foreign works (Schleiermacher 1813: 58).

As to the opposite method, it is described as that which expects no effort on the part of the reader, since the foreign work is brought over to him:

wie es sein würde, wenn der Verfasser selbst es ursprünglich in des Lesers Sprache geschrieben hätte (Schleiermacher 1813: 58-9).

as it would have been if the author himself had originally written it in the reader's language (Lefevre ed. 1992: 159).

This nativising method is acknowledged to allow an adequate cultivation of the beauties of the translator's mother tongue, and it is found to work ideally when the level of sophistication of the source and target languages is similar. But Schleiermacher's misgivings about this user-friendly strategy become clear when he considers the reply an imaginary reader might give on being offered a text translated in such a way that it could have been originally produced in the target language:

Ich bin dir eben so verbunden, als ob du mir des Mannes Bild gebracht hättest, wie er aussehen würde, wenn seine Mutter ihn mit einem andern Vater erzeugt hätte. (Schleiermacher 1813: 67)

¹ Schleiermacher, Friedrich 1813: Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens. > Störig, Hans Joachim herausg. 1973: *Das Problem des Übersetzens*. Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft: 38-70. Passages in English will be quoted from the translation provided by Lefevre, André ed. 1992: *Translation / History / Culture: A Sourcebook*. London, Routledge: 141-166.

I am so much obliged to you, just as I would have been if you had brought me a picture of the author just as he would have looked if his mother had conceived him by another father. (Lefevere ed. 1992: 167)

The implication is that when one nativises a text, one is somehow bastardizing it, and Schleiermacher's limited sympathy for this method reveals itself further in considerations on how one can thus 'disfigure' the original work.

Misgivings of a different nature, but likewise directed at the nativising strategy, would recently be voiced in Lawrence Venuti's 1995 *The Translator's Invisibility*, a book which explicitly derives its point of departure and its argumentative design from Schleiermacher's essay.¹ Underlining how 'the ethnocentric violence of translation' will become most obvious in 'a domesticating method, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values', and also explicitly concerned with countering the hegemonic, centripetal drive of 'Anglo-American culture (...) [which] has long been dominated by domesticating theories', Venuti sponsors the notion that, out of a respect for 'the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text', for its otherness, 'foreignizing translation (...) is highly desirable today'.

A similar concern with the respect for otherness, and with the role to be played in furthering that respect by the culturally predicated 'notion of translatability', as also by 'translation' in a sense broader than the inter-linguistic one, informs Wolfgang Iser's 1994 lecture 'On Translatability: Variables of Interpretation'. For Iser, the plurality of inter-cultural contacts characteristic of 'a rapidly shrinking world' requires constant alterations in one's frame of reference, 'the various modes in which otherness manifests itself [being] already modes of translation', and the many changes of viewpoint entailed by cultural encounters 'run[ning] counter to the idea of one culture being superior to another (...) hence translatability emerges as a counter-concept to cultural hegemony', 'to the otherwise prevailing idea of cultural hierarchy'.

At this stage, the question may legitimately arise: what have these characteristic late twentieth-century concerns to do with an instance of the burlesque in an early seventeenth-century play? We have already suggested that Jonson's satiric representation of what happens when a text is transposed from a learned cultural register with Classical antecedents into the language of popular culture could be seen as an instance of translation. To the extent that such a 'translation' is coincidental with the production of a burlesque - i.e., a degraded and risible version of the original text - translation will mean, in this case, debasement, disfigurement, bastardization (to use a few of the words employed above). And it will already have become obvious too from the juxtaposition of a few passages from *Bartholomew Fair* descriptive of the puppet-play-within-the-play with some remarks on an opposition famous in Translation Studies that what Jonson satirizes is something analogous to a domesticating, nativising strategy. There will be no doubt either that Jonson bases his satiric attack on the wish to see the source literature and culture respected. But these analogies should not obscure the equally enlightening fact that there is a world of difference - of historic and cultural difference - between the assumptions on which Jonson bases his attack and the present-day critique of a 'domesticating' translation method. Whereas the latter is carried out in the name of a denial of the superiority of any one culture to another, Jonson would hardly entertain doubts as to the superiority or inferiority of some cultures, and some cultural levels - and also as to which would be superior and which inferior. Even if we cannot take for granted that his stance would be at all times coherent throughout the different genres he cultivated, the satiric or lamenting treatment given in several of Jonson's plays, poems and epigrams to the possible consequences of a 'democratisation' of taste and of the authority to pass judgment on poetry is sufficiently similar to his pronouncements in several passages of *Discoveries*² on the vulgarity of the crowds, and on the ignorance of many pretenders to learning, to allow us to infer that such pronouncements would represent a consistently-held view. Furthermore, the present-day critique of the nativising method in translation (in particular as we find it in Lawrence Venuti) sets out its

¹ Venuti, Lawrence 1995: *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London, Routledge.

² E.g. *Discoveries* 228-35, 273-96, 587-668, 730-1, 756.

'ethnocentric violence', meaning to denounce, from the inside of an imperialistic language (English), the hegemonic designs it supposedly has on the texts from peripheral languages it 'domesticates'; in Jonson's case, on the other hand, the 'violence' of a misappropriation is represented as inflicted, by the (by Jonson much despised) low-culture English aspirers to a petty power and a petty learning, on a cultural level and legacy (the Classics or their learned reception) whose effective cultural power Jonson would like to go unquestioned and to see expanded.

The debasement involved in 'translating' *Hero and Leander* to the Fair, already anticipated in Leatherhead's and Littlewit's description of the puppet-play, will be confirmed in performance by the effectiveness of a burlesque in which the subtle rhetoric of sensual titillation proper to Marlowe's poem is 'translated' into low-life situations and language. Cokes, a mockery of the ideal spectator, promptly salutes the adequacy of the translation strategy by declaring, in the midst of an exchange of insults between some of the puppet characters: 'He sayes he is no *Pandar*. 'Tis a fine language; I vnderstand it, now' (V-4: 163-4). That no character or reference will escape debasement is made clear when Hero is 'translated' from priestess to prostitute - '*Mistresse Hero's a whore*' (V-4: 330) - and a Cupid turned publican takes on a momentary oracular function and declares, amidst generalised insults and aggressions: '*Whore-masters all!*' (V-4: 352).

This general indictment could, of course, be the ultimate utterance of the satirist who, despairing of the possibility of reforming mankind, abandons the curative purpose and turns misanthrope - a change which satirists have often been suspected of undergoing, Jonson being no exception. In the context of the final scenes of *Bartholomew Fair*, however, Cupid-the-publican's judgment is indeed a global denial of authority, but, rather than signalling despair and misanthropy, it heralds a shoulder-shrugging acknowledgment of an inescapable and flawed humanity on the part of the austere Classicist submerged by the Fair. As suggested earlier in this paper, this play is now broadly accepted to be the site where Jonson surrenders his satiric acerbity - in a *finale* where Judge Overdo, who in his inflexibility, his willingness to pass judgment on others, and his proneness to invoke grand Classical precedents, could be the clearest *alter ego* for his creator; a *finale* where Overdo has to let go of his previous stance and accept an injunction to forgiveness, drunken forgetfulness and conviviality:

remember you are but *Adam*, Flesh, and Blood! you haue your frailty, forget your other name of *Ouerdoo*, and inuite vs all to supper. There you and I will compare our *discoveries*; and drowne the memory of all enormity in your bigg'st bowle at home. (V-5: 96-100)

Having dealt with the punitive side of an author who laid his most explicit claim to authority in a volume he called *Discoveries*, but may in this passage have signalled his own dis-authorization, allow me to salute that shift, at the end of my paper, by paraphrasing a famous passage from a totally different comedy by another playwright - or should I perhaps say *the* other playwright? - and declare: 'Bless thee, Jonson, thou art translated!'

* * *

Hamlet and the invention of Tragedy¹

Helen Cooper

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD

The first thing that should be said about Hamlet is that he is a serial killer. He kills off a higher proportion of the speaking cast list, either directly with his own hand or indirectly, than any other Shakespearean character, including Richard III and Macbeth.

To begin with, his victims include the entire Polonius family. He kills Polonius deliberately, though it is true that he believes him to be someone else at the time; but such an instance of mistaken identity, of killing B when one had set out with the intention of killing A, is not acceptable as an excuse for murder in a court of law. Laertes he kills with his own hand, though inadvertently; the text leaves open the opportunity, taken up in many productions, to have Hamlet engineer the change of swords deliberately as result of realizing that Laertes' is unbated, but he cannot know that it is poisoned. Ophelia's death he causes indirectly, but there can be no question but that he carries total moral responsibility for it, first tendering her affection, then proceeding through public humiliation to private violent abuse, and finally murdering her father. The First Quarto has Laertes make the double accusation of responsibility for the catastrophes to both Polonius and Ophelia explicit:

Griefe upon griefe, my father murdered, My sister thus distracted:
Cursed be his soule that wrought this wicked act.²

At no point, however, does Hamlet acknowledge his own role in bringing about her death, nor does he show any compunction over it. The only apology he feels he owes is to Laertes, and that is more because he 'forgot [him]self' than because he caused the death of Laertes' sister.³

Hamlet also engineers the deaths of his two fellow-students, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern - not killing them with own hands, but he certainly wills and arranges their deaths, without bothering to check, and apparently without minding, whether or not they are aware of Claudius's own plot to murder him. Even Horatio is taken aback by Hamlet's casualness over the murder:

So Guildenstern and Rosencrantz go to't.
Why, man, they did make love to this employment.

¹ An earlier version of this paper was presented at a Renaissance workshop at Jadavpur University, Calcutta, and is being published there in that earlier form. The present version has profited from the discussion after its presentation at the SEDERI congress, in particular from the comments of Jesus Tronch.

² The *Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmark*, Shakespearean Originals: First Editions, ed. Graham Holderness and Brian Loughrey (New York and London, 1992), D. 87.

³ Hamlet goes on to acknowledge that Laertes' cause is the 'portraiture' of his own (5.2.78-9), but this must refer to the fact that he killed Laertes' father just as Claudius killed Hamlet's; Hamlet has no dead sister to offer as portraiture of Laertes'. Unless otherwise specified, quotations from *Hamlet* are from the edition by G. R.. Hibbard (Oxford, 1987; reprinted in the World's Classics series, 1994), since it is based on the Folio text; for reasons given in the paper, I have avoided using as evidence for my arguments passages that do not appear in the Folio.

They are not near my conscience. (5.2: 7-9)

His assertion that they died because they came between ‘the fell incensed points / Of mighty opposites’ almost makes it sound as if their murder is something he can be proud of, by reason of having concerns so far above it.

And finally, of course, he kills Claudius, both with his own hand and deliberately: Claudius who is the murderer of his own father, but also his mother’s husband, therefore his own stepfather, and, given that Denmark is an elective monarchy, the rightful king. Claudius may have ‘popped in between th’ election and my hopes’ (5.2.66), but he has none the less been duly elected, and so the killing is a full-scale regicide.

Claudius’s own tally of corpses is rather lower. Before the play starts, he has killed old Hamlet, with own hand and on purpose. He kills the Queen, with his own hand but accidentally: like Hamlet with Polonius, he means to kill *somebody*. And he kills Hamlet himself, intentionally but indirectly (in his first failed attempt, by means of the King of England; in the second, successful, attempt, using Laertes actually to strike the blow). His own tally of corpses in the play is therefore only half of Hamlet’s - three against six.

Macbeth disposes of a mere four characters with speaking parts: Duncan, Banquo, and Lady Macduff and one of her children. (Young Siward admittedly makes a fifth, but he kills him in fair combat, so he constitutes a rather different case). Other bloodshed is spoken of, but, except for whatever a director may do with the Macduff household, it does not happen in front of our eyes as it does in *Hamlet*; yet we think of *Macbeth* as a bloody play, and Hamlet as an intellectual one. Hamlet himself, notoriously, is the character that people are most likely to identify with, especially intellectuals, and therefore especially also critics; and since they do the writing about the play, it is easy to get the sense that almost everyone finds their alter ego in Hamlet - ‘I have a smack of Hamlet about me, if I may say so,’ as Coleridge put it.¹ If he had said instead that he had a smack of Macbeth about him, everyone would have been very worried indeed. Hamlet, despite his bloody hands, is held to be a man of thought rather than action; Macbeth, despite his much greater agonizing at least over his initial murder, is regarded as a man of blood. The Laurence Olivier film of *Hamlet* goes so far as to describe the play, in its initial voiceover, as the tragedy of a man who could not make up his mind - and who presumably just happened to kill half a dozen people along the way while he was trying to do so.

Hamlet must be the most extreme instance of where the action within a play - what *happens* - and the perception of what happens by readers and audience are at odds with each other. (Actors, who have to experience the pragmatics of the role rather than just the idea of it, are more likely to get it right: one National Theatre actor recently commented, ‘You can’t do *Hamlet* like you are living it, otherwise you go around killing people.’)² It is as if Shakespeare were creating some giant optical illusion: he draws a mass murderer, and makes us see an indecisive intellectual. How does he do it? more particularly, *why* does he do it?

This paper will attempt to offer a possible answer to those questions. The answer I shall put forward suggests that *Hamlet* actually creates the modern understanding of tragedy, at least for the whole anglophone tradition - that it marks the moment when *tragedy* as a literary structure that can be defined and described gives way to the larger idea of the *tragic* as, precisely, something that goes beyond definition and description. It is therefore an argument, ultimately, about the whole English critical tradition, as well as about tragedy; and also an argument about the play as a work that marks the point of transition from a medieval to a Romantic and post-Romantic understanding of the individual within the world, and how that can be expressed in literary form.

¹ Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Table Talk recorded by Henry Nelson Coleridge* ed. Carl Woodring (London and Princeton, NJ, 1990), II.61.

² National Theatre: unnamed actor quoted in *The Independent Magazine* issue 347, 13 May 1995, p. 16 (Garry Jenkins et al, ‘Disparate Dan’).

Why Shakespeare should have written the play in the way he does is not altogether answerable: the question in that form is in effect asking what was going on in Shakespeare's mind, and for that the only evidence we have is the text of *Hamlet* itself. We cannot get beyond that to any of Shakespeare's more covert thoughts and intentions, certainly not to any subconscious desires or fears that are not contained in the text and therefore already transformed and controlled by their dramatic context. And we can no more safely take Hamlet as representing Shakespeare's own mind than we can take Macbeth, or indeed Claudius. To imagine Shakespeare himself drawing Hamlet as a kind of self-portrait (I have a smack of Hamlet about me myself) is a sentimental fantasy, however seductive a one it may be - not least to us intellectuals and critics. But it is possible to see something of *why* in relation to the play itself and how it is written; and most particularly, in the contrast between what the original audience might have been expecting as against what Shakespeare actually gave them. A reconstruction of the horizon of expectation of a playgoer arriving at the first performance of *Hamlet* will, at the very least, show up what Shakespeare is not doing, and so help to define what he does.¹

That paragraph, however, begs a crucial question before one looks at audience expectation: the question of what text 'the first performance of *Hamlet*' might have staged. The three texts preserved in the first and second Quartos and the First Folio are very different from each other, and give different results in any analysis. Without wishing to rehearse all the arguments, I would accept the conclusion of the editors of the *Oxford Shakespeare* that the Folio text, 'whether at one or more removes, reflects a theatrical manuscript of 1600-3',² and can therefore be taken as the best witness to that first performance; that is accordingly the basis of what follows. If, as seems likely, the First Quarto represents a memorial version of staged performances, it gives a unique insight into how an actor's set of conventional expectations can override Shakespeare's own rather different text. Its explicit emphasis on Hamlet's responsibility for Ophelia's death, quoted above - on Hamlet as mass murderer - is one example of that process in action.³

To return to the playgoers, with their blissful ignorance of textual complications. Foremost among their expectations would be those raised by the fact that the play is a tragedy. It seems from the start to have announced itself as such in its title, either as a 'tragicall historie' as in the first two quartos, or as 'tragedy' in the third. Presumably it carried some similar designation for its staged form, but in any case it would have been known as a tragedy from the earlier dramatization of the story.

We probably believe that we know what a tragedy is, or at least what one looks like; and for most people that notion would probably be a kind of abstraction or amalgamation of *Oedipus Rex* and *Hamlet*. That, however, will not do for the Elizabethans coming to see *Hamlet* for the first time: they did not have *Hamlet* to set their expectations, and the great majority of them did not have *Oedipus* either. There is no evidence for its being known outside the universities at this date in England, and very little evidence for its being known there. If we were in a similar position to those early playgoers, without access to those key examples of the genre, we would probably fall back on the definition of tragedy as given in Aristotle's *Poetics*: tragedy as the fall of a moderately

¹ My enterprise is therefore rather different from that of Roland Mushat Frye, *The Renaissance Hamlet: Issues and Responses in 1600* (Princeton, NJ, 1984), who looks at the contemporary context for individual motifs in the play but not at the larger issues raised by the nature of the play as a whole.

² Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (Oxford, 1987), p. 400.

³ The argument that follows needs to be displaced sideways if, as has alternatively been argued, the First Quarto represents the staged version of the play more closely than the Folio: Q1 would then show even more sharply the contrast between the play written or adapted to meet the set of audience expectations discussed below, and the fuller conception, represented by the later texts, that breaks with those expectations. If that were so, the contrast between playgoers' expectations and the Q2 text would first have been evident to readers of Q2 rather than to the theatre audience. The case for the authenticity of the First Quarto as representing the staged text is argued by Holderness and Loughrey in their introduction to *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet*. Giorgio Melchiori argues that Q1 represents a cut-down version of the full text, 'Hamlet: The Acting Version and the Wiser Sort', in Thomas Clayton ed. *The 'Hamlet' first published (Q1: 1603)*, (Newark, Delaware, 1992), pp. 195-210. Wells and Taylor accept the case for the memorial reconstruction of the Q1 text, *Textual Companion*, pp. 398-401.

good man because of some fatal flaw. But the *Poetics* too constituted esoteric knowledge in England at this date. The work had only resurfaced a century or so earlier, and had not excited much interest before 1549, when the first commentary on it was published, in Italy; and the Italians indeed then proceeded to give it a lot of attention, with three further Latin commentaries and two in Italian by 1579. The English did not follow suit. Sidney, who had probably read Castelvetro's translation and commentary, alludes to the *Poetics*, but we know of few other Englishmen who were familiar with it; certainly it was not at all easy of access to the theatregoing world or to playwrights without a university education.¹ Furthermore, the concept of the fatal flaw received little stress from anyone in the Renaissance - or, it has to be said, from Aristotle himself. Scaliger, who knows his Aristotle and writes his own *Poetics* in seven long books, never mentions it; Castelvetro spends several pages denying that the tragic hero should be moderately good (he prefers villains or tyrants), and devotes a mere two lines to *ajmartiva* which he translates simply as 'errore'.² The 'fatal flaw' sense of the word only emerges much later. The speech in *Hamlet* that looks a bit similar, on the 'vicious mole of nature' (itself missing from the Folio), has abundant sources and analogues much nearer home, as any modern edition will testify; and Hamlet himself thinks he is talking about the Danes' drinking habits.³ There seems to be no conceivable means of transmission by which Shakespeare could have known of the 'fatal flaw' definition of the tragic hero. Our own ideas of Aristotelian tragedy would not have been part of the mental equipment of a typical member of the audience at the first performance of *Hamlet*. nor part of Shakespeare's.

So if in 1600 such an Elizabethan playgoer had been asked what 'tragedy' meant, and what examples he knew, what answer might he have given?

First, the definitions; and there were several available. Perhaps the least academic of those current at the time *Hamlet* was written identifies tragedy as a spectacle of blood: the principle that when the blood flows, the tragedy is good. Shakespeare had himself written tragedy of that sort, most notably in *Titus Andronicus*, a revenge tragedy of the bloodiest variety which is very bloody indeed. The plot, notoriously, includes a heroine who is raped and has her tongue cut out and her hands cut off by the sons of the villainess; and they in turn are murdered and served to their mother in a pie, - or rather *as* a pie, since, as we are informed twice in case we missed it the first time, even their bones are ground up to make the pastry. Killing the children as an element of revenge and serving them up to the parent was quite a popular motif: it also occurs in *Thyestes*, the play of Seneca's that seems to have been best known to the Elizabethans, and in Marston's *Antonio's Revenge*. *Hamlet* does not, of course, go that far, yet the 'spectacle of blood' definition fits the play very accurately, both in terms of gore along the way and, most particularly, in the size of the heap of corpses on stage at the end: there are four of them, those of Claudius, Gertrude, Laertes, and Hamlet himself. The Q1 redactor makes just this point when he has Horatio call attention to the 'tragicke spectacle' of the bodies. *Titus* itself only manages four actual dead bodies in its last scene, though also on stage is Aaron, whose imminent execution is described in some detail, and also of course the pie - so, in a manner of speaking, seven corpses. *King Lear* also manages four, if the stage direction is followed that stipulates that the bodies of the evil sisters should be brought on stage - a stage direction that has little point except to underline the 'spectacle of blood' element in this tragedy too (though Edmund's off-stage death spoils the chance for a still

¹ See Lane Cooper, *The Poetics of Aristotle: Its Meaning and Influence* (London, 1923), pp. 99-118 (Italy), 129-35 (Renaissance England); and Marvin Theodore Herrick, *The Poetics of Aristotle in England* (New Haven, 1930), pp. 14-33.

² *Julius Caesar Scaliger: Poetices Libri Septem* (Lyon: 1561), facsimile intro. August Buck (Stuttgart, 1964), I.vi, viii-xi, xvi (pp. 11, 24-5); *Poetica d'Aristotele vulgarizzata et sposta per Ludouico Castelvetro* (Vienna, 1570), 146v-167v, esp. 157v.

³ The Olivier film uses the passage as voiceover-cum-epigraph, concluding with the definition of Hamlet's vicious mole of *nature as* indecision. The 'fatal flaw' definition of the tragedy of *Hamlet*, like the 'thinker' model, is more popular with academics than actors: cf. the short review by 'RS' of the actor Michael Pennington's *Hamlet: A User's Guide*, in the *Times Literary Supplement* for 22 March 1966, which castigates Pennington for being 'untroubled by Hamlet's apparent lack of a tragic flaw' and his ascription to him of cleverness - that is, of acting deliberately rather than accidentally.

bloodier spectacle). Only one death (Lear's own) actually takes place in front of the audience in the last scene of *Lear*, whereas all four killings occur on stage in the last scenes of both *Titus* and *Hamlet*. None of Shakespeare's other works matches the spectacle of blood offered at the end of these plays; but the bloodiness of the conclusion is something we would be least likely to mention in explaining why we think of *Hamlet* as something like quintessential tragedy. 'Real' tragedy, to us, lies precisely in what distinguishes *Hamlet* from *Titus Andronicus*, not in what they have in common.

One suspects that a good many Elizabethan playgoers measured the tragicness of the tragedies they saw by the quantity of the blood spilt; but there were less gory definitions around too. One of the best known defines tragedy in terms of its unhappy ending, making it the antitype of comedy. 'Comedies begin in trouble, and end in peace; tragedies begin in calm, and end in tempest' - that formulation is in fact slightly later, from Thomas Heywood's *Apologie for Actors* of 1612 (sig. F1v, translating Donatus), but the idea was familiar enough; it goes back at least 250 years, as far as the *Epistle to Can Grande* ascribed to Dante, and had been around in England since the early fifteenth century. Shakespeare had himself written tragedies that conform to that definition too, most obviously in *Romeo* and *Juliet*. This starts in calm to the point where it looks indeed much more as if it is going to be a comedy; indeed the first three acts of the play could allow it to go either way. It is only at the end of the third act that Fortune, here presented solely as chance, the stars, with no element of poetic justice or retribution about it, makes things go wrong. This kind of tragedy is given an early dramatic definition in *Lochrine*:

O fickle fortune, O unstable world,
 What else are all things that this globe containes,
 But a confused chaos of mishaps?
 Wherein as in a glasse we plainly see,
 That all our life is but as a Tragedie.¹

Hamlet conforms to this definition in so far as it has an unhappy ending, but in other respects it is much more problematic. It hardly begins in calm: its story is initiated by the sudden death of the previous king, and its first scene offers one of the jumpiest openings in all Renaissance drama. And whatever happens in *Hamlet*, chance does not have very much to do with it, nor, despite our tendency to identify with the hero, do we think of 'all things that this globe contains' as being tragedies on the *Hamlet* model. Coleridge did not ascribe a smack of *Hamlet* to himself on the grounds that he illustrated a commonplace.

The third major definition of tragedy familiar to Elizabethan playgoers refers not just to the ending but to structure and content: tragedy as the fall of a great man from the top of Fortune's wheel - the story of the man who reaches the peak of earthly prosperity and comes to a miserable end. This may sound rather like Aristotle's principle of the prosperous or great man undone by a fatal flaw, or indeed of Fortune's governing of all things by chance, but there are key differences from both. In this kind of tragedy of Fortune, the protagonist is great in the most direct political sense: by rank, not by mind or personality. One can thus measure the tragic fall almost in the literal terms of height: greatest for an emperor, almost as great for a king. More importantly, the Elizabethan definition says nothing about the fatal flaw of an essentially good man. The central characters in some Renaissance tragedies, in which Fortune functions purely as chance, may be completely innocent; but in this kind of tragedy as fall, in which Fortune takes on a much more retributive role, they are much more commonly very bad. Their badness is indeed the point of tragedy of this kind, for their falls give direct moral warnings about how kings should act. Sidney, despite his acquaintance with Aristotle - or because of his acquaintance with Castelvetro speaks of tragedy as the genre 'that maketh Kinges feare to be Tyrants, and... teacheth vpon how weake

¹ *Lochrine* (Malone Society Reprints) 2116-20.

foundations guilden roofes are builded';¹ the *Revenger's Tragedy* comments that 'heaven likes the tragedy' when a lustful prince dies (V.iii.49-50). This definition of tragedy as the retribution visited on a tyrant brings the form much closer to being a tragedy of state than the tragedy of an individual.

This is the most analysed of the Renaissance definitions, and I hope a brief summary of its history may be excused. It goes back as far as the *Consolation of Philosophy* of the early-sixth-century writer Boethius, familiar to the Elizabethans both in Latin (the Queen herself produced a translation in the 1590s) and in Chaucer's translation: 'What other thyng bywaylen the cryinges of tragedyes but oonly the dedes of Fortune, that with an unwar strook overturneth the realmes of greet nobleye?'² - tragedy as tragedy of state. This definition of Boethius's had dominated medieval ideas of tragedy, but not the least interesting thing about it is that it makes no mention of the stage - it separates the notion of tragedy from the notion of drama, and opens the way to a whole tradition of narrative tragedies that feed into Elizabethan ideas of the genre in a very specific way. That process was set in motion in the mid-fourteenth century, when Boccaccio wrote his great Latin compilation *De casibus virorum illustrium*. 'of the falls' (or, alternatively and significantly, 'of exemplary stories') 'of great men'. This is collection of non-dramatic tragedies, though he does not use the term /tragedy' to describe his own work. They take the form of first-person narratives (told by the ghosts of the people concerned) of the disasters that befall the great - almost all male, and almost all in some way wicked - and that hurl them from the top of Fortune's wheel. Chaucer imitated the form (though without making retribution a necessary element) in the Monk's Tale, with the addition of the generic title and an explanation, since 'tragedy' was not at this date a recognized English word:

Tragedie is to seyn a certeyn storie
Of hym that stood in greet prosperitee,
And is yfallen out of heigh degree
Into myserie, and endeth wrecchedly. CT VII.1973-7

Inspired by that, the early-fifteenth-century poet John Lydgate set out to translate Boccaccio's *De casibus* (or at least, a French translation of it) into English, as the *Fall of Princes*; and in the mid-1550s, an enterprising publisher hit on the idea of updating Lydgate's work with a new series of tragedies - falls of great men - from English history, to bring it more closely up to date. The result was the work entitled *The Mirror for Magistrates* - one of the smash hits of Elizabeth's reign. The first part appeared in 1559, but further supplements appeared every few years over the next three decades, and further editions for another three decades after that. The first version consisted of a compilation of verse histories from recent English history, from the time of Richard II through the Wars of the Roses to the advent of the Tudors. A later supplement added tragedies from the legendary history of Britain, 'from the coming of Brute to the Incarnation', and included figures such as Cordelia. The full title of the work offers an effective definition of tragedy of this type: 'The Mirror for Magistrates. Wherein may be seen by example of other, with how grievous plagues vices are punished: and how frail and unstable worldly prosperity is found, even of those whom Fortune seemeth most highly to favour.'

The tragedies of the *Mirror* may not have been dramatic, but they very soon became so. It has been calculated that the work provided the plots for at least thirty Elizabethan plays, and it served as the model for many more. If you asked had asked an Elizabethan in 1580 what tragedies he knew, then the answer might well have been, the *Mirror for Magistrates*; if you had asked the same question fifteen years later, perhaps even ten, then the answer would probably have come in

¹ Sir Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry* in G. Gregory Smith ed. *Elizabethan Critical Essays* (Oxford, 1904), I.177.

² *The Riverside Chaucer*, general ed. Larry D. Benson (Boston, 1987; Oxford, 1988), *Boece* II pr. 2.

the form of a list of plays - but a good number of the plays named might well be based or at least modelled on the *Mirror*.

This definition of tragedy as the fall of the great was backed by Seneca, who also tends to stress the retribution element, not least in that Elizabethan favourite *Thyestes*. One couplet from that play could indeed almost serve as an epigraph to Elizabethan tragedy of this kind:

Quem dies vidit veniens superbum
Hunc dies vidit fugiens iacentem.¹

It is quoted verbatim by Marlowe in *Edward II* (IV.vi.53-4), alluded to by a number of other playwrights, and translated literally by Ben Jonson, as the closing couplet of *Sejanus*:

For whom the morning saw so great and high,
Thus low and little 'fore the even doth lie.

The couplet maps the rise and fall of the tragic protagonist onto the movement of the sun, in an image taken up again and again by Shakespeare and most other Elizabethan tragedians: the tragic fall is imaged as the descent from midday to night, from summer to winter. It is so commonplace as almost to serve as a defining image for this kind of tragedy.

Again, Shakespeare himself had written tragedies that conform to this fall-of-princes didactic model, most notably the plays that appeared in quarto under the titles of 'The Tragedy of King Richard the Third' and 'The Tragedy of King Richard the Second'. It was the innovation made by the editors of the First Folio, in their decision to create a distinct category of 'histories', that has led to Shakespeare's own classification of these plays as tragedies being so often downplayed or overlooked. Three of his five early histories were indeed originally cast as tragedies, if one accepts the quarto of 'The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York' as representing *Henry VI Part 3*; and they are indeed much closer to the Elizabethan idea of tragedy than *Hamlet* is. They share, for instance, in that rhetoric of the cycle of the sun - in the opening lines of *Richard III*.

Now is the winter of our discontent
Made glorious summer by this sun of York,

a statement that invokes by irony the continued turning of the cycle. Richard II falls from the height of his power to a miserable death to the accompaniment of just such imagery: he had once had a 'face / That like the sun did make beholders wink' (4.1.281-2); and he envisages his descent into the base court of Flint Castle as a metaphorical fall,

Down, down I come like glist'ring Phaeton. 3.3.178

Richard III was explicitly a tyrant; Richard II is never described as such in the play, but he surely represents seriously flawed kingship. As the *Mirror for Magistrates* has its ghost of Richard point out,

Woe to him whose will hath wisdom's place.

¹ *Thyestes* lines 613-4 in vol. 2 of *Seneca's Tragedies* ed. Frank Justus Miller, Loeb Classical Library (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1961).

Macbeth is another tyrant, and Shakespeare's play again comes close to fulfilling this Elizabethan definition of tragedy. We think of it as being less of a quintessential tragedy than *Hamlet*, largely because Macbeth comes too close to being evil; but for the first audience of *Macbeth*, that was precisely the point: tragedy is the genre that maketh kings fear to be tyrants.

Hamlet has the potential for being this kind of tragedy; but if it were, its title would be the *Tragedy of Claudius*, not of Hamlet. As the *Tragedy of Claudius*, it would have fitted Elizabethan tragic expectations very nicely; as the tragedy of Hamlet, it does not. Hamlet has no significant political power, for a start - at best, he is heir presumptive; and his career does not give any clear moral teaching to anybody, least of all tyrants, because of his lack of any kind of public or political role.

So - Shakespeare had already written three different kinds of tragedy that fitted recognized Elizabethan definitions and models; then he wrote *Hamlet*, which does not. Whatever is going on in the play, it is clearly something new; something different enough, and powerful enough, for it to have changed our own notions of tragedy sufficiently to make *Hamlet* the archetype in our minds.

The most useful starting-point for understanding what that was is this idea of tragedy as fall: the fall of a great man off Fortune's wheel. That definition locates tragedy in the event, in what happens to you. In *Richard II*, however, Shakespeare doubles that movement with something else: with what happens *in the mind* of the tragic protagonist. Richard is great in the sense of being politically powerful at the start of the play; he becomes great as a dramatic protagonist - as what we would recognize as a tragic hero - in proportion as he loses that outward power. His political fall is paralleled by his rise within the play. To the Elizabethans, Richard is tragic because he falls; to us, it is his capacity for mental and emotional growth that makes him so, his capacity for suffering that increases as his outward power falls away.

Hamlet takes this same process a large step further. His fall in any political sense is not an issue here (though it is of course still important that things don't work out, that Hamlet should die): tragic action is now decisively relocated in the mind of the hero, and it is precisely that interiority that makes him so centrally a tragic hero in our own eyes. The interiority can indeed be brought out even more unequivocally in modern media than on the Elizabethan stage: film and television versions regularly present the soliloquies as voice-overs, words spoken not in any sense aloud for the audience to overhear, but within the mind. Even in a stage production - and presumably in Elizabethan productions as in modern ones - Hamlet is likely to spend much of the play downstage, in closer communication with the audience than the other actors even if he is not directly addressing them. Many productions will thus tend to have the action going on literally in the background, behind the prince, as if the events were secondary to the currents of his own mind. It is this phenomenon that Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead* exploits so brilliantly, when it turns the action inside out, to put Hamlet himself in the background - an effect that is seriously disorienting precisely because we take the opposite phenomenon for granted. It isn't just the story that is inverted; it is like having your mind turned inside out too. We know very little about how the Elizabethans staged *Hamlet*; but it is at least possible that the actor would have come forward on the great apron stage of the Globe, inviting association with the audience, while the court action proceeded further back. The existence of the reconstructed Globe may help to illuminate such stage practices. But however it is done, the first court scene isolates Hamlet sharply: socially, because he is dressed in black, a misfit, not playing the polite games prescribed by etiquette; and theatrically, in his first soliloquy, when he is left alone on stage to reveal the inside of his mind.

If you were to play the psychoanalysts' word-association game in which you are given one word and instantly have to produce the next word that comes to mind, then I would guess that the word 'Hamlet' might elicit 'ghost' as a first response, but the second might well be 'soliloquy'. Soliloquies do of course have a long history in drama before Shakespeare, right back to the earliest layers of Greek drama with its single character and a chorus; and they also had a well-established function, most commonly to inform the audience about the action of the play as well as about the speaker. Richard III's opening soliloquy at once tells you the action so far, what you need to know to understand what happens next; informs you as to the nature of Richard himself, that he is

‘determined to prove a villain’; and outlines the action to come, in the shape of a list of those who stand in the way of his ambition to take the crown. A more sophisticated use of the soliloquy is for speaking thoughts aloud, thoughts intended as private rather than being designed for the benefit of the audience: this is the kind that Shakespeare gives to Brutus as he wonders whether to kill Caesar. Here it is a moral, largely intellectual debate - a soliloquy almost in the technical, academic sense, of a *soliloquium*, a debate with one’s self rather than with an opponent.¹

Hamlet’s first soliloquy, however, is about his feelings, not about the action of the play, nor representing structured thought; or at least it is set us that way:

O that this too too solid flesh would melt. 1.2.129

It does contain information that we have not been given by any other source; but its facts are framed within passionate feeling -

But two months dead - nay not so much, not two - 1.2.138

- so that we get the sense of individual response, of the inside of Hamlet’s mind, as the foremost thing, while the information being conveyed about the appalling speed of his mother’s remarriage again gets mentally upstaged, just as the activities of the court are likely to have been literally upstaged in the earlier part of the scene. In this play, the inside of the protagonist’s mind consistently takes precedence over outward event; and that shift is clearly marked in the shift in the function of the first soliloquy, from *telling* - the direct giving of information, ‘this is what has happened’, or even ‘this is what I think’ - to *showing*, the display of a mind on edge that expresses itself not in the traditional fashion of formal exposition but in broken syntax and exclamations. The information it gives is enclosed and coloured by the intensity of the speaker’s response to it: ‘Heaven and earth, / Must I remember?’ And so the information - the facts that initiate the action of the play, come to us as already deeply unsettling; we never get them objectively. We know from the start why Hamlet is so troubled because we never see the reasons for it independently of the emotional suffering they have caused him.

At the start of this paper I described the optical illusion created by the play - that we don’t think of Hamlet as a mass murderer, that we are quite prepared to think of ourselves as having a smack of Hamlet when we wouldn’t dream of having a smack of Macbeth. That, I think, is largely to do with that readjustment of focus: that our view and our understanding of the action are Hamlet’s own. This is of course a critical commonplace - you cannot see the play at all without realizing how closely it follows the movement of his mind; but it is not so often observed that Hamlet is a fallible narrator. This is an effect that should be impossible in drama, where the actions take place in front of our eyes: they should appear as objective fact, without any possibility of colouring by a partial point of view or an unreliable narrative voice. But the reception history of *Hamlet* shows that that is not true even of the actions we do see on stage, and certainly not of actions that take place offstage. I would guess that most of you who have followed my arguments so far will also have been making excuses for Hamlet to remove some of the blood from his hands: that Ophelia did not give him the support he needed (but what did she need from him?); or that Polonius or Rosencrantz and Guildenstern deserved it (but would we think that of such victims if they were murdered by anyone else?). The occasional production may try to gesture towards such qualifications, but there is no continuing stage tradition that opposes Hamlet’s own reading of events.

Hamlet replaces dramatic objectivity precisely with subjectivity, in both senses: of giving a personal angle on things, taking sides, not offering an impartial study of the facts; and in the more

¹ The term in this sense goes back to St Augustine; for a concise history, see Raymond Williams, ‘On Dramatic Dialogue and Monologue (particularly in Shakespeare)’, in his *Writing in Society* (London, [1983]), pp. 40-50, and, on *Hamlet*, pp. 57-60.

modern critical sense of being based within the individual mind - the premises of the play as Shakespeare writes it lie entirely in what Hamlet calls 'this distracted globe'. Almost his very first words mark his difference from earlier tragic protagonists: 'I am too much i'th' sun.' It is, of course, a pun on 'sun' and 'son'; but it insists on Hamlet's discontent with the position assigned to him, and so makes an immediate contrast with that image deeply familiar to the first audience of the play, of the sun as representing the hero at his highest point. The dominant images of this play establish themselves in the first soliloquy: images of corruption and sickness, for the condition of Denmark and of the world. Such images, though, are perceptions rather than statements, as Hamlet himself will point out:

This brave o'erhanging firmament, this majestical roof fretted with golden fire -
why, it appears no other thing to me than a foul and pestilent congregation of
vapours. 2.2.298-301

What is happening here is a radical recentring of drama inwards; and with that goes the radical recentring of tragic experience.

The degree to which Shakespeare succeeds in this can be measured by the critical history of the play: by all those studies that present Hamlet as thinker, as Romantic, as an idealist betrayed by his society; studies that show him as being every age's icon. They can result only from the readers' and audiences' acceptance of the optical illusion of the play; for the objective unfolding of events that contradicts such readings does happen too Hamlet's vicious stabbing of Polonius, his callous account of dispatching his fellow-students to their deaths, Ophelia's madness, the whole trail of blood that he leaves.

And even the soliloquies are not what they seem. The first does give essential information about the plot as well as revealing Hamlet's state of mind. The final one, 'How all occasions do inform against me', is the passage that is largely responsible for creating the reading of Hamlet as having the fatal flaw of hesitancy, but its textual status is nothing like so central: it appears only in the Second Quarto, so presumably Shakespeare did not see it as the key passage of the play it has tended to become. Even the most famous of the soliloquies, 'To be or not to be', is not the great piece of introverted psychological realism often assumed: that it is so often taken as such is perhaps the biggest optical illusion of all. Hamlet never says 'I' in it, or uses any form of the first person, until the very end when he sees Ophelia and stops soliloquizing Hamlet moreover is a student, a trained intellectual; and this soliloquy is a soliloquy in the precise technical sense, an argument in which one person takes the parts normally divided between disputants. It is a one-man debate, moreover, on a specific *quaestio*, the technical term for the doubtful proposition that constitutes a debate topic; and the soliloquy is set up precisely as such: 'To be or not to be: that is the question', the *quaestio*, the issue for debate. The formula was, moreover, a familiar one: an understanding of when *being* and not being are absolute contradictories and when they are merely contingent is one of the basic steps in all Renaissance logic, whether in the schemes of Aristotle or Melancthon or Ramus. So Marlowe's Dr Faustus' farewell to the whole study of logic epitomised as *ovjn kaiv mhv ovjn*, being and not being;¹ 'To be, and not to be, are terms of contradiction which never fall together into one and the same thing' (Hooker, in a casual statement of the obvious in manuscript notes²); or Melancthon, the great Reformation scholar of Hamlet's university of Wittenberg, writing a logic textbook that went through forty-six editions before 1600, and noting that God has set in our minds the principle *Quodlibet est. aut non est.* and that resistance to this law is madly to bear arms against Heaven.³ For an actor now, the first line of that

¹ *Faustus* 1.12, 'Bid Oncaymaeon farewell. Galen come'; see R. W. Dent, *Ramist Faustus or Ramist Marlowe? Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 73 (1972), 63-74; the formula is widely found in both Latin and Greek logic texts.

² Dublin Fragments #22, p. 126 in *The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker* vol. 4: *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity: Attack and Response*, ed John E. Booty (Cambridge, Mass., 1982) (general ed W. Speed Hill, 4 vols 1977-82).

³ *Philippi Melanthonis Opera quae supersunt omnia* ed Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider (*Corpus Reformavorum* XIII, Halis Saxonum, 1846), *Erotemata Dialectices* II, cols. 585-6: 'Deus... inseruit nostris mentibus hoc prin-

famous soliloquy is a difficult one because it is too well known, and there is a risk that the audience will start singing along. Many in that first audience would also have recognised it, but for entirely different reasons. The line sets Hamlet up, not as an individual agonizing over whether to commit suicide, but as the pattern of the intellectual; it spells a rationalizing detachment from his emotional situation rather than passionate involvement.

The logical modelling continues throughout the speech, with the divisions of the main *quaestio*: is it nobler to suffer, or to put an end to suffering? The crucial moment of the argument is framed as a syllogism: death is like sleep; sleep may bring nightmares; therefore death may bring nightmares - and therefore may be worse than real waking life. And when Hamlet lists the evils of real life, once again the key mood is one of rationalizing detachment: they relate not to his own present state but to broader social injustices that mostly have nothing to do with his own condition - the oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely, the insolence of office and so on. If 'dispriz'd love' might be thought to bring in personal note, Hamlet himself does not seem to notice.

Hamlet, and Shakespeare, are getting into deep philosophical waters. The age of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is also the age of Descartes, who hadn't quite yet said *Cogito ergo sum*, 'I think, therefore I am'; but it was in any case not a new proposition - St Augustine, for instance, had made the same point on several occasions, it appears in some of the logic textbooks, and in any case Shakespeare was probably quite capable of thinking it up for himself. The way in which the initial *quaestio* is set up, with its opposition of *to be* and *not to be*, also implies a Cartesian *to think* or *not to think*: ceasing to be implies a cessation of consciousness. As the *soliloquium* progresses, however, being and thinking turn out not to be commensurable after all, for ceasing to be in the sense of living is no guarantee of ceasing to be in the sense of thinking or feeling. There may be something after death - dreams, a continuing consciousness: and so thinking itself, the condition that according to Descartes and Augustine proves one's being, becomes an agent to maintain an unwanted existence. One can't opt out of *being* by suicide; conscience, the pale cast of thought, interposes between those options of *to be* or *not to be*, rendering them not incompatible contradictories but a non-existence of nightmare consciousness. If the whole play is an optical illusion to suggest the sensitive thinker rather than the cold-blooded murderer, then its most famous speech is perhaps the greatest optical illusion of all, in that it has fooled generations of playgoers into thinking they are seeing someone's inmost heart when the method, at least, is a textbook model of scholastic disputation.

But to go back to the original question of this paper: why did Shakespeare write *Hamlet* like this, with that extraordinary disjunction between the events of the play and their effect on the audience? Presumably not just to get the pleasure of a conjuring trick successfully performed. We can't second-guess Shakespeare's mind, but the answer may be in the play itself. If tragedy is to be located inwards, in the mind rather than the world, in response rather than event, then there needs to be set up a measurable difference between the mind and the world, between response and event; otherwise the play would come over as simply a tragedy of event, only a rather more thoughtful one than usual - as perhaps had already happened with *Richard II*. An Elizabethan audience, however, expecting a tragedy of event or a spectacle of blood, would have been much more alert to those aspects of the play than we are: it would have been its deep subjectivity, which we take for granted, that to them would have been unexpected and startling. They, in fact, would see both sides of the optical illusion - both what is 'really' there in terms of action and event and bloodiness, and the new perspective through which they are invited to view such things. Our own expectations of subjectivity have tended to blind us to what is 'really' there, to the point where we are not able to see it any more.

cipium: Quodlibet est. aut non est. Et pugnare cum hac divina lege ... ut si quis furiosus arma coelo inferret.' On the number of editions, see Peter Mack, *Renaissance Argument: Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic* (Leiden, 1993) p 320, citing W. Risse, *Bibliographica Logica I: 1472-1800* (Hildesheim, 1965). The overlap between the soliloquy and the logic texts has been remarked by e.g. Frye, *The Renaissance Hamlet*, p. 188; and by letter to the *TLS*, December 1993.

I called this paper 'Hamlet and the Invention of Tragedy'. 'Invention' does of course have different meanings in the Renaissance and now. Now, it is a matter of making things up - of originality, of creating something that did not exist before. In Renaissance (and indeed Classical) rhetoric, it is a term that indicates rather some skilful variation on what is already established: the recasting of a subject or a convention, even of a genre. In *Hamlet*, I would suggest, Shakespeare is doing both. He takes the established parameters of tragedy and bends them to new shapes; and he invents, in the modern sense, a form and definition of tragedy so convincing that it is easy to believe it to be archetypal, something so deeply representative of human nature and human understanding that it never needed to be invented at all.

* * *

Dramaturgy of the Acting Version of the First Quarto of *Hamlet*

Jesús Tronch Pérez

UNIVERSITAT DE VALÈNCIA

It is relatively known that the First Quarto of *Hamlet* (1603), the first text ever printed in which the tragical history of the Prince of Denmark is related to the playwright William Shakespeare, presents a version notably different from the one commonly known, from the standard version which is reflected in the texts of the Second Quarto (1604/5) and the First Folio (1623).

Among its most striking differences we could point out the following. It is a much shorter version, 2,220 lines, just over half as long as the Second Quarto (the longest textual version) or any modern critical edition. Variation in dialogue ranges from passages of total similitude, paraphrases, to fragments unique to the First Quarto (about 130 lines), together with a number of transpositions and echoes. Some characters bear different names, for instance, Corambis for Polonius, Montano for Reynaldo¹, or Rossencraft and Gilderstone for Rosencrantz² and Guildenstern. There are important structural differences, especially at two points where the line of action is markedly altered: 1) the soliloquy “To be, or not to be” and the subsequent nunnery episode occur immediately after Corambis plans to “loose” his daughter to Hamlet³, and 2) after Ofelia has become mad, Horatio informs the queen of Hamlet’s return in a scene which is unique to the First Quarto. And finally, characterizations are different, especially the queen who in the closet scene unambiguously denies any complicity with the murder of Hamlet’s father and vows to assist his son in his revenge.

Textual critics have provided various explanations for the origin of this different *Hamlet*, narratives which could be grouped into the following two basic ideas:

- a) It reflects a first conception of the play (so that the version we have in the Second Quarto is a revision of this first version)⁴, either a full play, a sketch, or a partial revision by Shakespeare of the so called *Ur-Hamlet*. This first conception could be either genuine as it stands, or adapted, shortened and degenerated during its transmission.
- b) It is posterior to the Second Quarto version, being the result of short-hand report, of memorial reconstruction, or of revision, adaptation and abridgement⁵ (a

¹ Corambis is the name in the German play *Der bestrafte Brudermord oder Prinz Hamlet*. Reynaldo is the name in the Second Quarto, in the First Folio it is Reynoldo.

² Rosencrantz is a standardization of Q2 Rosencraus and F1 Rosincrance (sometimes Rosincrane).

³ This peculiar arrangement of scenes is also present in *Der bestrafte Brudermord*, and has been adopted by theatre productions such as Laurence Olivier’s at the Old Vic in 1963 (with Peter O’Toole as Hamlet), Ron Daniel’s with the Royal Shakespeare Company in 1989, or by the film version directed by Tony Richardson.

⁴ Among the most important contributions to this view, we should name Furnivall, 1879; Hubbard, 1920; De Groot, 1923; Parrot & Craig, 1938; Craig, 1961; Weiner, 1962; Urkowitz, 1986; Sams, 1988.

⁵ Beside names cited in next note, see Collier (1843) and Tager (1880-2) for short-hand report theory; Poel (1922) and Burkhart (1975) for adaptation and abridgement theory, and Nosworthy (1965) and Melchiori (1992) who maintain that the First Quarto is a memorial reconstruction of an official stage version, resulting from authorial revision and abridgement of the full play reflected in the Second Quarto and the First Folio texts.

process that, on the one hand, could be Shakespearian, collaborative or entirely non-Shakespearian, official or unauthorized, and on the other hand, could be previous to the performance, synchronic to the reporting, or the job of a hack poet after the reporting).

Other arguments deal with the legitimacy of its publication, whether the First Quarto is an unduly published text or was authorized for printing.

A general consensus of the majority of critics¹ sentences this first published Shakespearian *Hamlet* as a “bad quarto”, a reported, pirated, garbled and corrupted text, concocted from memory in order to provide a version for some provincial tour, by an actor or group of actors who performed either in the full play or in some stage abridgement.

Whatever the case, it certainly reflects, or is, a version of the play, a version for the stage, whose dramatic qualities deserve our appreciation. It is then the purpose of this paper to assess the dramaturgy, the art of dramatic composition, of the acting version that the First Quarto of *Hamlet* represents. First I will sum up some of the most significant contributions dealing with different aspects of dramaturgy such as construction of plot and of structure, and characterization; and secondly I will concentrate on one aspect of dramatic composition which is dialogue writing or dialogue adaptation.

Since 1823 when the First Quarto was rediscovered (Furness, 1877, vol.2, p.13), few scholars have unfavourably criticized its theatricality, although few studies have been devoted to analyzing the dramatic qualities of this version. It was praised by the eminent critic Granville-Barker (1930, p. 188-98), and even William Poel, the first modern producer that staged the First Quarto in 1881 (Hubbard, 1920, p. 32) believed that it was the text that represented most truly Shakespeare’s dramatic conception of the play, that possessed more dramatic coherence and was more stageworthy than the Second Quarto, even though this was a greater work of literature (Rosenberg, 1992, p. 242-1)².

Indeed the First Quarto *Hamlet* (Q1) is a dynamic piece of theatre, agile, with a “strong, effective dramatic action” (Hubbard, 1920, p. 32) and brief in comparison with the accepted *Hamlet* represented by the Second Quarto and the First Folio texts. It exhibits a compact, tight structure centred around a turning or climatic point in the famous “play within the play” at almost two thirds of performing time, so that later events briskly roll on to the catastrophe in a vigorous revenge tragedy.

As Giorgio Melchiori (1992) shows, this dramatic agility and expediency —as compared with the structure of the standard *Hamlet*— is achieved by the way episodes follow one another. Schüking stated that the arrangement of scenes in Q1 was “incomparably more logical than in the second quarto” (1935, p. 181). If we look at the sequence of Hamlet’s monologues in the Second Quarto, Hamlet goes from

- 1.— a state of desperation in his soliloquy “O that this too too sallied flesh would melt” (I.ii), to
- 2.— a moment of acceptance of vengeance (I.v), then to
- 3.— a recrimination, “What a rogue and peasant slave am I” , and reinforcement of decision, “I’ll catch the conscience of the king” (II.ii), then
- 4.— back to desperation (III.i) “To be, or not to be”, and

¹ See narratives by Mommsen, 1857; Gray, 1915, p.174; Rhodes, 1923, p.72-81; Van Dam, 1924; Ramello, 1930; Chambers, 1930, p. 408-25; Cairncross, 1936; Duthie, 1941, p. 271-4; Hart, 1942; Nosworthy, 1950; Greg, 1955, p. 300-7; Jenkins, 1982, p. 18-36; Edwards, 1985, p. 24-7; Hibbard, 1987, p. 67-89; Taylor & Wells, 1987, p. 396-8; Irace, 1992; and commentaries in accordance with the above by Wilson, 1934, p. 19-20; Hubbler, 1963, p. 175-7; Campbell, 1966, p. 284; Evans, 1974, p. 1186; Melchiori, 1978, p. 15-6; Spencer, 1980, p. 362-4; Fanego, 1982, p. 37; Jackson, 1989, p. 60-7; Hoy, 1992, p. 102; “Instituto Shakespeare”, 1992, p. 47, y Andrews, 1993, p. xlv-xlvii.

² Other favourable commentaries by Weiner, 1962; Nosworthy, 1965, p. 186-215; Jones, 1988; Urkowitz, 1986, 1988 y 1992; Irace, 1992, p. 90-1 y 1994; McMillin 1992; Loughrey, 1992; Melchiori, 1992, p. 201-8.

5.– recrimination “How all occasions do inform against me” and final resolution (IV.iv) “From now on my thought be bloody or be nothing worth”.

This is a fluctuating, brusque movement that suits a complex puzzling character as is the prince of Denmark we all know. However in the First Quarto, episode 4 (“To be, or not to be”) is transposed before episode 3 (“I’ll catch the conscience of the king”): it is logical that after the shock of the ghost’s demand, Hamlet considers the possibility of suicide (even, I would add, when almost four hundred lines before, he said “I do not set my life at a pin’s fee”, I.iv.65 / TLN 654¹), then rejects it, and plans action (moment 3) “What a dunghill idiot slave am I?”. After this line, moment 5 would be redundant for we had just left Hamlet in another moment of decision, and so it is eliminated.

The succession of events in Q1 then is more lineal, direct, and it has the benefit of condensing the story time from two days and two sequences into one single day and one sequence, thus providing the play with a speedy and agile running. As Melchiori (1992, 203-4) observed, the First Quarto, in referring to the performance of the murder of Gonzago, does not say “weele heare a play to morrowe” (II.ii.529 / TLN 1576) and “Weele hate to morrowe night” (II.ii.534 / TLN 1580), so that the performance takes place at night on the very same day. From the beginning of the seventh scene, where plans are set up to find the cause of Hamlet’s transformation until he is sent to England, less than 24 hours have gone by. In this condensed space of time all the tests by which Hamlet’s madness is observed, follow one another without delay, within the same dramatic sequence: the interview with Ofelia (the nunnery episode), with Corambis (the fishmonger episode) and the interview with Rossincraft and Gilderstone. The test of Ofelia is not postponed to the following day as it is in the standard version.

Another example of compression, of good dramatic economy, is the peculiar scene between the queen and Horatio. In 36 lines we find gathered up different motives that are scattered in three different places and amount to 125 lines in the standard version: the scene between Horatio and the sailors that includes Hamlet’s letter (IV.vi), the beginning of the scene between the king and Laertes (IV.vii) and the beginning the last with Hamlet’s direct account of the voyage to Horatio (V.ii).

The benefit of all this condensation is a more agile, logical and abridged version that solves the inconvenience of the excessive length of the standard *Hamlet*².

Burkhart (1975) studied the processes of abridgement in the “bad quartos” especially in terms of economy of casting, speech-shortening and paraphrasing that involve compression of meaning and purging of rhetoric and discursive or ornamental passages.

As an acting version the First Quarto exhibits most of the features of other acting versions. Kathleen Irace (1994) has compared the Shakespearian “bad quartos”, or what she pointedly calls “short” quartos, with modern stage and film versions, and she has concluded that they share mechanisms of adaptation and abridgment in plot structure, characterization and stage action. As she constantly shows, Kemble, Irving, Olivier, Zeffirelli have carried out analogous omissions, transpositions, changes in speech prefixes, loans from other plays, etc. so as to “shorten the plays in order to speed up performances, simplifying staging, or eliminate characters for casting or other practical reasons” (1994, p. 25).

Looking at characterizations, we find patterns that also prove to be as consistent and as effectively wrought as in other “good” texts. The distrust the queen bears to her second husband is not only constructed by her overt confessions to Horatio in that peculiar scene, but also by the way she

¹ Line references are keyed both to the Alexander Text (1951), in its turn keyed to the second Cambridge edition of W.A. Wright and W. G. Clark (1891-5), and to the TLN (“through line numbering”) set up by Charlton Hinman (1968).

² The 1676 quarto of *Hamlet* qualified the play as “being too long to be conveniently acted” (A3r), and a similar view is held by Chambers, 1930, p. 229; Greg, 1955, p. 318; Nosworthy, 1965, p. 164-5; Melchiori, 1992, p. 195-201.

is shown as submissive during the first part of the play by means of cutting out, in a seemingly coherent pattern, most of her interventions in the standard *Hamlet*.

The king is a more villainous character, less skillful in handling language rhetorically, a more medieval king rather than a Machiavellian Renaissance prince. Notice the omission in Q1 of five lines (III.i.50-4) that displayed a remorseful conscience in the king, or the fact that it is the king that devises the three stratagems to kill Hamlet: the unbated sword, the poisoned cup, and the poisoned point of the sword (which in the standard *Hamlet* was proposed by Laertes instead).

Other aspects of the dramaturgy of Q1 are expounded in contributions of scholars such as Burkhart (1975), Jones (1988), Urkowitz (1986, 1988), Irace (1994), or the ones collected in a seminar lead by Thomas Clayton (1992).

However, one negative quality should be pointed out after so many praises: if language is also part of the dramaturgy of a play, Q1 is indeed verbally deficient, clumsy, sometimes disturbing.

Allowing for this important detrimental aspect of Q1, I would like to add arguments in favour of the theatricality of Q1 *Hamlet* by revealing the dramatic pertinancy of particular moments in the text which may also be explained as the result of a creative intention rather than of an accident, an intention that especially aims to abridge the dialogue.

Let us see the beginning of the seventh scene (II.ii. 1-167, line TLN 1019-1205), until the moment when Hamlet enters the stage "reading on a book". The Second Quarto and Folio version have 180 lines approximately. The First Quarto has 110 lines. Nearly 40% is missing. If we analyze the absent lines in Q1 we will observe that they may have been selected for cutting on various dramatic grounds, and similar reasons may account for paraphrased and new lines.

Let us examine the very first speech of scene II.ii (Second Quarto text in the left column; Q1 text in the right column):

	<i>Florish. Enter King and Queene,</i>	<i>Enter King and Queene, Rossencraft, and Guildenstone.</i>
	<i>Rosencraus and Guyldensterne.</i>	
1	<i>King. Welcome deere Rosencraus, and Guyldensterne,</i>	<i>King</i>
	<i>Moreouer, that we much did long to see you,</i>	<i>Right noble friends, that our deere cosin Hamlet</i>
	<i>The need we haue to vse you did prouoke</i>	<i>Hath lost the very heart of all his sence,</i>
4	<i>Our hastie sending, something haue</i>	<i>It is most right, and we most sorry</i>
5	<i>you heard</i>	<i>for him:</i>

Of *Hamlets* transformation, so call

it,

- 6 Sith nor th'exterior, nor the inward
man
Resembles that it was, what it
should be,
More then his fathers death, that
thus hath put him
So much from th'vnderstanding of
himselpe
- 10 I cannot dreame of: I entreate you
both
That beeing of so young dayes
brought vp with him,
And sith so nabored to his youth
and hauior,

That you voutsafe your rest heere in
our Court
Some little time, so by your compa-
nies
- 15 To draw him on to pleasures, and to
gather
So much as from occasion you may
gleane,
Whether ought to vs vnknowne af-
flicts him thus,
- Therefore we doe desire, euen as
you tender
Our care to him, and our great loue
to you
- That you will labour but to wring
from him
The cause and ground of his distem-
perancie.
- That opend lyes within our remedie.

The first speech by the Q1 king disposes of the basic information and dramatic motives in just 8 lines:

- statement of Hamlet's lunacy: "Hamlet / Hath lost the very heart of all his sence"
- call for help to his school-fellows to find out the cause: "labour to wring from him / The cause and ground of his distemperacie"
- and due thanks: "the king of *Denmarke* shall be gratefull".

There is no welcome and justification for a "hasty sending": lines 1-4 in the Second Quarto version. Instead Q1 begins the scene "in medias res", as if the group were already conversing off the stage: "Right noble friends", says the king as if he were answering Rosencraft and Gilderstone. These characters have already been welcomed off stage, so there is no need to spend seconds in staging a court ceremony with a flourish of trumpets. In the First Quarto version, characters rush on to the stage in brisk action (with no flourish). A similar beginning "in medias res" exists in IV.v and IV.vii, as pointed out by Giorgio Melchiori (1992: 206-7).

Reasons for Hamlet's transformation are not expounded by the Q1 king (lines 5-10 in the Second Quarto version), he just states that the prince has lost his sense. To an audience that now knows the king killed Hamlet's father, these reasons display a subtle cynicism on his part. Their absence in Q1 and the plain style of the speech is in accordance with an alternative characterization of the Q1 king who is less subtle, less Machiavellian, a rather "pasteboard villain", as Irace puts it (1992, p. 105).

The queen's intervention in the standard *Hamlet* (lines 19-26) is almost completely absent:

- 19 *Quee.* Good gentlemen, he hath much
talkt of you,
And sure I am, two men there is not liu-
ing
To whom he more adheres, if it will
please you
To shew vs so much gentry and good
will,
As to expend your time with vs a while,
24 For the supply and profit of our hope,
25 Your visitation shall receiue such thanks Doe this, the king of *Denmarkeshal* be
26 As fits a Kings remembrance. thankefull.

The Second Quarto fragment is only a reiteration of the idea of friendship between Hamlet and his school-fellows, and of the call for help. This, along with the absence of 12 other interventions by the queen in Q1, makes up a consistent pattern, observed by Kathleen Irace (1994, p. 50-1), of shaping the queen as a “more pliable”, “more sympathetic” character, more “in the background”. In our opinion this was deliberately altered with a view to give support to the queen’s overt inclining towards Hamlet in opposition to the king in the second part of the play (especially in the scene with Horatio, unique to Q1). By diminishing the queen’s presence and protagonism and showing her as submissive to her second husband the king in the first part of the play, her change to a stronger attitude in the second part can be better justified.

Note that two lines of thanks-giving (25-6)

“Your visitation shall receiue such thanks
As fits a Kings remembrance.”

are reduced to one and attributed to the king:

“Doe this, the king of *Denmarkeshal* be thankefull.” (parallel to line 25)

After the two paraphrased speeches of Rossencraft and Gilderstone that contribute to characterize them,

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 27 | <i>Ros.</i> Both your Maiesties
Might by the soueraigne power you haue
of vs,
Put your dread pleasures more into com-
maund
Then to entreatie. | <i>Ros.</i> My Lord, whatsoeuer lies within our
power
Your maiestie may more commaund in
wordes
Then vse perswasions to your liege men,
bound
By loue, by duetie, and obedience. |
| 31 | <i>Guy.</i> But we both obey,
And heere giue vp our selues in the full
bent,
To lay our seruice freely at your feete
To be commaunded. | <i>Guil.</i> What we may doe for both your
Maiesties
To know the grieffe troubles the Prince
your sonne,
We will indeuour all the best we may,
So in all duetie doe we take our leaue. |

thanks are given again.

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 35 | <i>King.</i> Thanks <i>Rosencraus</i> , and gentle
<i>Guyldensterne</i> . | <i>King.</i> Thanks <i>Guilderstone</i> , and gent
<i>Rossencraft</i> . |
|----|--|--|

Quee. Thanks *Guyldensterne*, and gentle
Rosencraus.
37 And I beseech you instantly to visite
My too much changed sonne, goe some
of you
And bring these gentlemen where *Ham-*
let is.
Guyld. Heauens make our presence and
41 our practices
Pleasant and helpfull to him.

All this looks necessary in a polite courtly dialogue. But lines 37-41 are utterly dispensable:

And I beseech you instantly to visite
My too much changed sonne, goe some of you
And bring these gentlemen where *Hamlet* is.

that is, reiteration of their duty to see Hamlet, and

Guyld. Heauens make our presence and our practices
Pleasant and helpfull to him.

a reiteratively mannered and refined speech.

Then Corambis enters with his daughter, while in the standard version he enters on his own.

42 *Quee.* I Amen. *Exeunt Ros. and Guyld.*
Enter Polonius. *Enter Corambis and Ofelia*

The presence of Ofelia is necessary to the development of the subsequent action: the Nunnery episode. This entry accords with Corambis' words "Lets to the King" in the previous scene. Polonius in the standard version said "Come, goe with mee, I will goe seeke the King" (II.i.101 / TLN 998) and "come, goe we to the King" (II.i.117 / TLN 1015) but now he enters alone. This has been regarded as a typical Shakespearian inconsistency (Chambers, 1930, p.417), a minor petty fault that Q1 aptly corrects.

On the other hand, Ofelia's presence in this moment when she will silently endure Hamlet's love letter being read aloud and her father's plans to "loose" her to the prince, looks rather awkward. But this awkwardness that Greg pointed out (1955, p. 303) may well emphasize Ophelia's victimization and passivity throughout the play. She is indeed the most wretched of all characters in the tragedy, and the image of Ophelia standing up in silence for 100 lines in which she is treated as an instrument, as a mere decoy, is impressive for its pathos.

43 *Pol.* Th'embassadors from *Norway* my
good Lord,
Are ioyfully returnd.
King. Thou still hast been the father of
good newes.
Cor. My Lord, the Ambassadors are ioy-
fully
Return'd from *Norway*.
King. Thou still hast beene the father of go-
news.

46	<i>Pol.</i> Haue I my Lord? I assure my good Liege I hold my dutie as I hold my soule,	<i>Cor.</i> Haue I my Lord? I assure your grace, I holde my duetie as I holde my life,
48	Both to my God, and to my gracious King; And I doe thinke, or els this braine of mine Hunts not the trayle of policie so sure As it hath vsd to doe, that I haue found	Both to my God, and to my soueraigne King; And I beleeeue, or else this braine of mine Hunts not the traine of policie so well As it had wont to dow, but I haue found The very depth of Hamlets lunacie.
52	The very cause of <i>Hamlets</i> lunacie.	
52		<i>Queene.</i> God graunt he hath.

It is interesting to note that Q1 gives a peculiar intervention to the queen “God graunt he hath” (parallel to line 52). On the one hand, these words prelude her later remark “Good my Lord be briefe” (corresponding to “More matter with lesse art” line 95, TLN 1123), and are a sarcastic succinct commentary on the churlish Corambis that pointedly gives expression to the way the audience receives this foolish busybody. On the other hand, the “addition” of this sentence balances the “cutting out” of the following lines 53 to 61:

53	<i>King.</i> O speake of that, that doe I long to heare. <i>Pol.</i> Giue first admittance to th’embas- sadors, My newes shall be the fruite to that great feast. <i>King.</i> Thy selfe doe grace to them, and bring them in.	
57	He tells me my deere <i>Gertrard</i> he hath found	
59	The head and source of all your sonnes distemper. <i>Quee.</i> I doubt it is no other but the maine His fathers death, and our hastie mar- riage. <i>Enter Embassadors.</i>	<i>Enter the Ambassadors.</i>
61	<i>King.</i> Well, we shall sift him, welcome my good friends, 62 Say <i>Voltemand</i> , what from our brother <i>Norway?</i>	<i>King</i> Now <i>Voltemar</i> , what from our brother <i>Norway?</i>

The motives in these lines are not only easily dispensable elements but details of characterization whose absence in Q1 is related to other characterizing touches. The “omission” of “O, speak of that! That do I long to hear.” (line 53) reveals a king in Q1 that is not really interested in Hamlet’s problem (something that we might suspect from his previous curt remark of sorriness for Hamlet’s distemper, parallel to l. 5. Nor seems he interested in partaking this concern with his wife (lines 57 and 58:

He tells me my deere *Gertrard* ...

(By the way, the Q1 king very rarely addresses her as “dear Gertrard”, the Second Quarto reading, or “sweet queen”, the Folio reading). The Q1 king goes directly to the political affairs that the ambassadors bring:

NowVoltemar, what from our brother *Norway?* (parallel to line 62)

This “Now, Voltemar” is an efficient way to change the subject of conversation.

By means of the sudden entry of the ambassadors, briefly heralded by Corambis' "the Ambassadors are ioyfully Return'd" (lines 43-4), the idea of his discovery of Hamlet's lunacy is forcefully kept in suspense.

And again in lines 59 and 60 we find another "excision" of a speech by the queen.

The ambassador speaks out his news in a speech that is 99% the same as in the standard version. Some acting versions, such as Olivier's, have suppressed the Fortinbras material, depriving the play of its political background. That is not the case with Q1 so the entire information of this speech is necessary and nothing is left out. Upon the exit of the ambassadors, Corambis insists in his discovery of Hamlet's distemper. In the following interventions (lines 90-155) we can also see a pattern of economic abridgement of the dialogue.

89-	[...] <i>Exeunt Embassadors.</i>	[...] <i>exeunt Ambassadors.</i>
-90	<i>Pol.</i> This busines is well ended.	<i>Cor.</i> This busines is very well dispatched.
91	My Liege and Maddam, to expostulate What maiestie should be, what dutie is, Why day is day, night, night, and time is time, Were nothing but to wast night, day, and time, Therefore breuitie is the soule of wit,	
96	And tediousnes the lymmes and outward florishes,	Now my Lord, touching the yong Prince Hamlet,
97	I will be briefe, your noble sonne is mad: Mad call I it, for to define true madnes, What ist but to be nothing els but mad,	Certaine ist that hee is madde: mad let vs grant him then: Now to know the cause of this effect, Or else to say the cause of this defect,
100	But let that goe.	For this effect defectiue comes by cause.

Six lines (91-96) are spared in Q1 in a cut that looks adequate when we see that it is part of Corambis' verbosity that has been reduced. There are still two more occasions in Q1 to show the wordiness of this character. For these six lines, Q1 uses a brief introduction, again beginning with "Now ..." (parallel to line 96)

Three and a half lines (97-100) that state Hamlet's madness are compressed to one: "Certaine it is that hee is madde: mad let vs grant him then" (parallel to line 97), which is a transposition of line 106 in the Second Quarto version.

101	<i>Quee.</i> More matter with lesse art.	<i>Queen.</i> Good my Lord be briefe.
	<i>Pol.</i> Maddam, I sweare I vse no art at all,	<i>Cor.</i> Madam I will: my Lord,
103	That hee's mad tis true, tis true, tis pittie, And pittie tis tis true, a foolish figure,	
105	But farewell it, for I will vse no art.	
106	Mad let vs graunt him then, and now re- maines That we find out the cause of this effect, Or rather say, the cause of this defect,	
109	For this effect defectiue comes by cause:	
110	Thus it remaines, and the remainder thus Perpend,	

	I haue a daughter, haue while she is mine,	I haue a daughter,
112	Who in her dutie and obedience, marke,	Haue while shee's mine: for that we
113	Hath giuen me this, now gather and surmise.	thinke Is surest, we often loose: now to the Prince. My Lord, but note this letter, The which my daughter in obedience Deliu'er'd to my handes.

Continuing this transposition, lines 106-9 are located in an earlier place in Q1, a circumstance that has been explained as the result of the ineffective memory of the reporting actor. However this transposition could also be explained as a compensation for the cutting of the above mentioned six lines (91-96). Otherwise, Corambis' speech would have been too short for the queen's remark "Good my Lord be briefe" (parallel to line 101).

Three more lines that correspond to Polonius' flourishes of verbiage are distilled into the assertive phrase that has already been transposed "Certain it is that hee is mad". Corambis reduces his foolish figures, uses no art, in his "expostulation", so perhaps that is why the queen's remark is not "More matter with lesse art" but simply "Good my Lord be briefe".

However since phrases such as "But let that goe" (line 100), "But farewell it" (line 105) in which Polonius corrects his own digressions, are very interesting from the viewpoint of characterization, and these two examples are eliminated, the First Quarto version seems to rescue this characterizing touch and incorporate it into the funny remark about Ophelia being his father's property: "Haue while shee's mine: for that we thinke / Is surest, we often loose: now to the Prince" (parallel to lines 113-4). Thus the remark "haue while she is mine" becomes explained, at the same time a confusing verbal tangle such as "Thus it remaines, and the remainder thus" (line 110) is removed. A more simpler speech in Q1 then remains.

Let us see now the motive of Hamlet's letter to Ophelia (lines 115-27)

115	<i>To the Celestiall and my soules Idoll, the most beau-</i>	
116	<i>tified Ophelia, that's an ill phrase, a vile phrase,</i>	
117	<i>beautified is a vile phrase, but you shall heare: thus in her excellent white bosome, these &c.</i>	
119	<i>Quee.</i> Came this from <i>Hamlet</i> to her?	<i>King.</i> Reade it my Lord.
	<i>Pol.</i> Good Maddam stay awhile, I will be faithfull,	<i>Cor.</i> Marke my Lord.
121	<i>Doubt thou the starres are fire, Letter.</i>	Doubt that in earth is fire,
122	Doubt that the Sunne doth moue, <i>Doubt truth to be a lyer,</i>	Doubt that the starres doe moue, Doubt trueth to be a liar,
124	<i>But neuer doubt I loue.</i>	But doe not doubt I loue.
125	O deere <i>Ophelia</i> , I am ill at these num- bers, I haue not art to reckon	To the beautifull <i>Ofelia</i> :
126	my grones, but that I loue thee best, o most best belieue it, adew.	
127	Thine euermore most deere Lady, whilst this machine is to him (<i>Hamlet</i>).	Thine euer the most vnhappy Prince <i>Hamlet</i> .

145	Lord <i>Hamlet</i> is a Prince out of thy star, This must not be: and then I prescripts gaue her That she should locke her selfe from her resort, Admit no messengers, receiue no tokens, Which done, she tooke the fruites of my advise: And he repell'd, a short tale to make,	Lord <i>Hamlet</i> is a Prince out of your starre, And one that is vnequall for your loue: Therefore I did commaund her refuse his letters, Deny his tokens, and to absent her selfe, Shee as my childe obediently obey'd me. Now since which time, seeing his loue thus cross'd,
150	Fell into a sadnes, then into a fast, Thence to a watch, thence into a weak- enes, Thence to lightnes, and by this declen- sion, Into the madnes wherein now he raues,	Which I tooke to be idle, and but sport, He straitway grew into a melancholy, From that vnto a fast, then vnto distrac- tion, Then into a sadnesse, from that vnto a madnesse,
155	And all we mourne for.	And so by continuance, and weaknesse of the braine Into this frensie, which now possesseth him: And if this be not true, take this from this.

we observe 20 lines in the standard version that are compressed into 14. Then we find another transposition,

156	<i>King.</i> Doe you thinke this?	<i>King.</i> Thinke you t'is so?
157	<i>Quee.</i> It may be very like. <i>Pol.</i> Hath there been such a time, I would faine know that, That I haue positiuely said, tis so,	<i>Cor.</i> How? so my Lord, I would very faine know That thing that I haue saide t'is so, posi- tiuely,
160	When it proou'd otherwise?	And it hath fallen out otherwise.
161	<i>King.</i> Not that I know.	
162	<i>Pol.</i> Take this, from this, if this be oth- erwise; If circumstances leade me, I will finde Where truth is hid, though it were hid in- deede Within the Center.	Nay, if circumstances leade me on, Ile finde it out, if it were hid As deepe as the centre of the earth.

“And if this be not true, take this from this” (parallel to line 155) which in the standard *Hamlet* occurs five interventions later (line 162). This circumstance seems to be in connection with the omission of the king’s “Not that I know.” (line 161), in its turn in connection with the fact that Corambis’ “And it hath fallen out otherwise.” is a statement and not a question, unlike Polonius’ “When it proou’d otherwise?” (line 160).

To conclude with this part of the scene before Hamlet’s entrance,

166	<i>King.</i> How may we try it further?	<i>King.</i> how should wee trie this same?
168	<i>Pol.</i> You know sometimes he walkes foure houres together	<i>Cor.</i> Mary my good lord thus, The Princes walke is here in the galery,
169	Heere in the Lobby. <i>Quee.</i> So he dooes indeede.	

- Pol.* At such a time, Ile loose my daughter to him,
 Be you and I behind an Arras then,
 Marke the encounter, if he loue her not,
 174 And be not from his reason falne thereon
 Let me be no assistant for a state
 But keepe a farme and carters.
King. We will try it.
- Enter Hamlet.*
- 177 *Quee.* But looke where sadly the poore wretch comes reading. *King.* See where hee comes poring vppon a booke.

we should point out two more removals of interventions by the queen (line 157 and 169). Note that the Q1 king's inquiry "Thinke you t'is so?" (parallel to line 156) is addressed to Corambis and not to his wife, and the fact that the notice of Hamlet's "poring vppon a booke." is given to the king (parallel to line 177) and not to the queen, again in accordance with a pattern of giving her a more timid presence on stage in this first part of the play.

To put the whole matter in a nutshell: it is probable that the first published *Hamlet* is a "bad" quarto, but looking at its dramaturgy, and misquoting Polonius' comment on the prince (II.ii. 204/TN 1243-4), "Though this be *badnesse*, yet there is method in't", *dramatic* method in the First Quarto.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

- First Quarto – *The Tragicall Hi•torie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke* By William Shake•peare [...] London printed for N.L. and Iohn Trundell. (facsimiles used: *Hamlet. First Quarto*. Scholar Press Facsimiles. London, The Scholar Press Ltd. 1969, and Allen, Michael J. B. & Muir, Kenneth, ed. 1981: *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto*. Berkeley, University of California Press.)
- Second Quarto – *The Tragicall Hi•torie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke*. By William Shake•peare [...] At London Printed by I. R. for N. L. (facsimiles used: *Hamlet. Second Quarto*. Scholar Press Facsimiles. London, The Scholar Press Ltd. 1972, and Allen, Michael J. B. & Muir, Kenneth, ed. 1981: *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto*. Berkeley, University of California Press.)
- First Folio – Hinman, Charlton, ed. 1968: *The First Folio of Shakespeare: The Norton Facsimile*. New York, Norton and Company, Inc.
- 1676 quarto – *The Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark*. As it is now acted at his Highness the Duke of York's Theatre. By William Shakespeare. London. Printed by Andr. Clark, for J. Martyn, and H. Herringman.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Alexander, P. ed. 1951: *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. London,
- Andrews, J. F. ed. 1993: *William Shakespeare. Hamlet*. The Everyman Shakespeare. London and Vermont, J.M.Dent and Charles E. Tuttle.
- Burkhart, R. E. 1975: *Shakespeare's Bad Quartos*. The Hague, Mouton.
- Cairncross, A. S. 1936: *The Problem of "Hamlet"*. London, Macmillan and Co.
- Campbell, O. J. 1966: *A Shakespeare Encyclopaedia*. London, Methuen.

- Chambers, E. K. 1930: *William Shakespeare: a Study of Facts and Problems*. 2 vols. Oxford, OUP
- Charney, M. ed. 1988: *"Bad" Shakespeare: Revaluations of the Shakespearean Canon*. London and Toronto, Associated University Press.
- Clayton, T. ed. 1992: *The "Hamlet" First Published (Q1, 1603): Origins, Form, Intertextualities*. Newark, University of Delaware Press.
- Collier, J. P. ed. 1843: *The Works of William Shakespeare...* Vol. 7. London,
- Craig, H. 1961: *A New Look at Shakespeare's Quartos*. Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.
- De Groot, H. 1923: *Hamlet, Its Textual History*. Amsterdam, Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Dessen, A. C. 1992: Weighing the Options in *Hamlet* Q1. > Clayton, T. ed. 1992: 65-78.
- Duthie, G. I. 1941: *The 'Bad' Quarto of Hamlet*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Edwards, P. ed. 1985: *Hamlet*. New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge, CUP.
- Evans, G. B. ed. 1974: *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Boston, Massachusetts, Houghton, Mifflin.
- Fanego, T. ed. 1982: *Hamlet*. Clásicos de la lengua inglesa. Madrid, Alhambra.
- Foster, M. E. 1991: *The play behind the play: "Hamlet" and quarto one*. Pittsburgh, Pa, Anne Shirlas.
- Furnivall, F. J. 1879: Forwards to Quarto 1, 1603. *Shakespeare's Hamlet: The First Quarto, 1603*. London, W. Griggs: iii-xii.
- Granville-Barker, H. 1930: *Prefaces to Shakespeare*. London, Batsford Ltd.
- Gray, H. D. 1915: The First Quarto *Hamlet*. *Modern Language Review* 10: 171-80.
- Greg, W. W. 1923: *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements, "The Battle of Alcazar" and "Orlando Furioso": An Essay in Critical Bibliography*. Malone Society Reprints. Oxford, OUP.
- Greg, W. W. 1955: *Shakespeare's First Folio: Its Bibliographical and Textual History*. Oxford, OUP.
- Hart, A. 1942: *Stolne and Surreptitious Copies: A Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos*. Melbourne,
- Hibbard, G. R. ed. 1987: *Hamlet*. The Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Hinman, C. 1968: *The First Folio of Shakespeare: The Norton Facsimile*. New York, Norton.
- Hoy, C. ed. 1992: *Hamlet*. Norton Critical Editions. New York, W.W. Norton & Company.
- Hubbard, F. ed. 1920: *The First Quarto Edition of Shakespeare's Hamlet*. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature. Madison,
- Habler, E. ed. 1963: *Hamlet*. The Signet Classic Shakespeare. New York, The New American Library Inc.
- Instituto Shakespeare (dirigido por M. A. Conejero) ed. 1992: *Hamlet*. Letras Universales. Madrid, Cátedra.
- Irace, K. 1992: Origins and Agents of Q1 *Hamlet*. > Clayton, T. ed. 1992: 90-122.
- Irace, K. O. 1994: *Reforming the "Bad" Quartos: Performance and Provenance of Six Shakespearean First Editions*. Newark; London and Toronto, University of Delaware Press; Associated University Presses.

- Jackson, M. P. 1989: Editing *Hamlet* in the 1980's: Textual Theories and Textual Practices. *Hamlet Studies* 11.i-ii (Summer-Winter): 60-72.
- Jenkins, H. ed. 1982: *Hamlet*. The Arden Shakespeare. London, Methuen.
- Jones, D. E. 1988: The Theatricality of the First Quarto of *Hamlet*. *Hamlet Studies* 10.i-ii (Summer-Winter): 104-110.
- Kirschbaum, L. 1940: The Sequence of Scenes in *Hamlet*. *Modern Language Notes* iv: 382-387.
- Loughrey, B. 1992: Q1 in Recent Performance: An Interview. > Clayton, T. ed. 1992: 123-36.
- Lull, J. 1992: Forgetting *Hamlet*: The First Quarto and the Folio. > Clayton, T. ed. 1992: 137-150.
- McGuire, P. C. 1992: Which Fortinbras, Which *Hamlet*? > Clayton, T. ed. 1992: 151-178.
- McMillin, S. 1992: Casting the *Hamlet* Quartos: The Limit of Eleven. > Clayton, T. ed. 1992: 179-194.
- Melchiori, G. 1992: *Hamlet*: The Acting Version and the Wiser Sort. > Clayton, T. ed. 1992: 195-210.
- Melchiori, G. ed. 1978: *Hamlet*. Vol. 3 I drammi dialettici. Teatro Completo di William Shakespeare. Milano, Arnoldo Mondadori.
- Mommsen, T. 1857: 'Hamlet,' 1603; and 'Romeo and Juliet,' 1597. *The Athenæum* 1528.Feb. 7: 182.
- Munkelt, M. 1992: Traditions of Emendation in *Hamlet*: The Handling of the First Quarto. > Clayton, T. ed. 1992: 211-40.
- Nosworthy, J. M. 1950: *Hamlet* and the Player which could not Keep Counsel. *Shakespeare Survey* 3: 74-82.
- Nosworthy, J. M. 1965: *Shakespeare's Occasional Plays. Their Origins and Transmission*. London, Arnold.
- Parrot, T. M. & Craig, H. ed. 1938: *The Tragedy of 'Hamlet': A Critical Edition of the Second Quarto, 1604*. London, Princeton University Press, OUP.
- Poel, W. 1922: The First Quarto 'Hamlet'. An Elizabethan Actor's Emendations. *Notes and Queries* XI (12th Series): 301-3.
- Ramello, G. 1930: *Studi sugli apocrifi Shakespeariani. The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke, 1603. Con un appendice sul testo anonimo Der bestrafte Brudermord oder Prinz Hamlet aus Dännemark*. Turin.
- Rhodes, R. C. 1923 (1983): *Shakespeare's First Folio*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- Rosenberg, M. 1992: The First Modern Staging of *Hamlet* Q1. > Clayton, T. ed. 1992: 241-248.
- Sams, E. 1988: Taboo or not Taboo? The Text, Dating and Authorship of *Hamlet*, 1589-1623. *Hamlet Studies* 10.i-ii (Summer-Winter): 12-46.
- Schücking, L. L. 1935: *The Meaning of 'Hamlet'*. London, George Allen.
- Sjörgren, G. 1979: Producing the First Quarto *Hamlet*. *Hamlet Studies* 1: 35-44.
- Spencer, T. J. B. ed. 1980: *Hamlet*. The New Penguin Shakespeare. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- Stoll, E. E. 1937: *Hamlet* and *The Spanish Tragedy*, Quartos 1 and 2: A protest. *Modern Philology* 35: 31-46.

- Tanger, G. 1880-82: The First and second Quartos and the First Folio of *Hamlet*: Their Relation to each Other. *The New Shakespeare Society's Transactions* Part I: 109-97.
- Taylor, G. & Wells, S. 1987: [Textual Introduction to] *Hamlet*. > Wells, S. & Taylor, G. ed. 1987: 396-420.
- Thomas, S. 1992: *Hamlet* Q1: First Version of Bad Quarto? > Clayton, T. ed. 1992: 249-256.
- Urkowitz, S. 1986: 'Well-sayd old Mole': Burying Three *Hamlets* in Modern Editions. > Ziegler, G. ed. 1986: 37-70.
- Urkowitz, S. 1988: Good News about 'Bad' Quartos. > Charney, M. ed. 1988: 189-206.
- Urkowitz, S. 1992: Back to Basics: Thinking about the *Hamlet* First Quarto. > Clayton, T. ed. 1992: 257-291.
- Van Dam, B. A. P. 1924: *The Text of Shakespeare's "Hamlet"*. London, J. Lane, Bodley Head.
- Weiner, A. ed. 1962: "*Hamlet*": *The First Quarto 1603*. Great Neck, N.Y., Barron.
- Wells, S., Taylor, G., Jowett, J. & Montgomery, W. 1987: *William Shakespeare. A Textual Companion*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Werstine, P. 1990: Narratives About Printed Shakespeare Texts: 'Foul Papers' and 'Bad Quartos'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41: 65-86.
- Wilson, J. D. 1918: 'The Copy for *Hamlet*' and 'The *Hamlet* Transcript'. *The Library* 9 (3rd series): 153-85, 217-47.
- Wilson, J. D. 1934: *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's "Hamlet" and the Problems of Its Transmission*. 2 vols. Cambridge, CUP.
- Wright, W. A. & Clark, W. G. ed. 1891-5: *William Shakespeare. The Work*. 9 vols. London, Macmillan.
- Ziegler, G. ed. 1986: *Shakespeare Study Today*. New York, AMS Press.

* * *

Emblems of Darkness: *Othello* (1604) and the *Masque of Blackness* (1605)

Manuel José Gómez Lara

UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA

Critical response to *Othello*'s blackness—or moorishness—has centered in many ways the discussion about the play. The “visual signifier of his Otherness” —in Virginia M. Vaughan's words—has been considered from two apparently opposed perspectives. On the one hand, some prefer to underplay the colour references in order to present *Othello*'s tragedy in terms of the essentials of human condition;¹ for them, his blackness needs a symbolic reconstruction in order to be assimilated to the “universal” aspects presented in *Othello*'s *ethos*. On the other hand, neohistoricist and postcolonial readings have assimilated the presence of blackness to a problematized view of racial relations and consider *Othello* as the epitome of Shakespeare's deconstruction of Elizabethan stereotypes about race. This type of interpretation is justified by the compromise of the critic with a political agenda and anatemizes all other positions as racist.

Both approaches, in spite of their apparent opposition, focus the question of blackness in the play from perspectives on race historically constructed and elaborated precisely after its first productions. “Symbolic” readings which have focused on the “universal” aspects of *Othello*'s *ethos* have left aside any specific framing relevant to the hypothetical original audience/s—the variety of London playgoers or the privileged elite at court.

Neohistoricist and postcolonial readings view the problem of race in terms defined after the American experience of slavery and racism, and so tend to manipulate certain aspects in *Othello* to present it as “a tragedy of race” (Lomba, 1989, 61). The problem is, again, that they ignore the premises of reception of a potential original audience which did not necessarily have a familiar perception of black people as slaves because England was too far from the trade routes of black slaves (Jordan, 3-4). Besides, in spite of their value as “exotic” elements in some noble households, the dominant ideological and religious discourses in reformed England presented blackness as a sign of moral condemnation. In words of the presbyterian Thomas Cartwright, writing in 1569, “England was to pure an air for slaves to breath in”. Finally, the concept of European, currently used to describe the potential audience on which the expectations of the racial topic of blackness would work, is simply unacceptable. If we attempt to define the beliefs, social rules and attitudes towards darkness in Europe at the time, we can, at least, find two different perceptions of the matter: the catholic and the reformist.² To insist on the concept of

¹ On the main schools of *Othello*'s criticism see A. Gerald (1957); Karen Newman exemplifies the critical intent of the “symbolic school” on M. R. Ridley's edition of the play (1958, rpt. 1979). For an updated presentation of the critical positions on this question see Virginia M. Vaughan (1994) esp. 51-71.

² Rodríguez Mateos' study of the Blackmen Brotherhood in Seville during the 16th and 17th centuries shows how everyday contact between black and white people within the family household created the necessary conditions to articulate the black other in the social network—at least symbolically. Catholic societies stressed the doctrine of Christ's mystical body as part of a complex answer to the Reformist emphasis on the doctrine of Predestination: “una metáfora que constituye una síntesis ideológica del papel de los hombres en el seno de la Iglesia: todos constituyen miembros de un mismo cuerpo cuya cabeza es Cristo, por lo que han de mantener con Él la misma relación que los distintos miembros del cuerpo mantienen con la cabeza ... bajo esta teoría subyace un profundo mensaje de contestación social, una rebeldía simbólica a la rígida estructura estamental” (572). This view can hardly be included under the same label—eurocentrism—with the English experience of the racial question.

“eurocentrism” modelled after the particular experience of the reformed countries seems an attempt to oversimplify European history of ideas in order to elaborate a “myth of origins” for racism, which curiously enough is made to coincide with the appearance of the myth of the Renaissance —white— man.

In the next pages I will focus on several textual and intertextual connections of Othello’s colour with other historical discourses on blackness. I would like to argue that Othello’s colour is essential in the construction of the *mythos* of the play but as part of a mask that a white actor would carry on stage and, in that sense, a symbolic attribute more than a realistic trait of racial characterization. I would like to suggest a series of discursive frames where Shakespeare’s potential audience could place those ostensive signs made from the stage about Othello’s colour. In order to do so I will proceed on the cotextual frames for the appearance of the word “black” in other Shakesporean works apart from *Othello*. Then I will check if these textual usages can be related to Jonson’s *Masque of Blackness*.¹ And, finally, I will consider some concrete aspects in Othello’s actions and characterization under the light of current symbolic codes present in early Seventeenth Century England.

The most common use of black in Shakespeare’s plays and sonnets is not associated to race but operates within two different semantic frames: either as a moral evaluation or as the natural attribute of an object or phenomenon. In *As You Like it*, Rosalind comments on a letter: “Ethiop words blacker in their effect than in their countenance” (4, 3, 35) and Hamlet identifies his mother as “O, bossom black as death” (3, 3, 67).

But in those texts where this colour receives a more developed treatment for poetic or dramatic reasons, the referential frame is organized after the premise “black is beautiful and desirable”. In *Titus Andronicus*, Aaron, a dark character, uses the modifier to present his son’s merits in terms of a proverbial saying;

Ye whitelimed walls, ye alehouse painted sighs,
Coal black is better than another hue
In that it scorns to bear another hue;
For all the water in the ocean
Can never turn the swan’s black legs to white,
although she lave them hourly in the flood. (4, 2, 97-102).

In *Love’s Labour’s Lost*, Rosaline’s “blackness” is also used as an argument in favour of the quality of her beauty as Berowne says: “(...) Where is a book, / That I may swear beauty doth beauty lack/ If that she learn not of her eye to look?/ No face is fair that is not full so black (4, 3, 248-51). His main argument is that beauty “(...) mourns that painting and usurping hair/ Should ravish doters with a false aspect, / And therefore is she borne to make black fair” (255-7) He then reformulates the proverbial saying: “to wash white an Ethiop” in order to stress blackness as a natural hue against the forged beauty of all other women’s faces:

King: And Ethiops of their sweet complexion crack.
Dumain: Dark needs no candles now, for dark is light.
Berowne: Your mistresses dare never come in rain,
For fear their colours should be wash’d away. (264-7)

According to Lily in *Campaspe* (1581), this was a fashionable topic to commend ladies as it presented a ground for paradoxical argumentation and witticism (David, 104).

¹ Although this connection has already been presented by Karen Newman (1991) it is quite surprising however that Jonson’s masque is read as “a preeminent example of the black and white opposition in the period (...) It is only necessary that the twelve nymphs, negro’s, be revealed —that we see them— for the antimasque to have taken place” (75). To use the term “antimasque” for this play —it only appeared used as such in the *Masque of Queens* (1609) — is to force a dubious binary structure on the text. Even the relation between the masques of *Blackness* (1605) and *Beauty* (1608) is not one of opposed terms but of a paradoxical relation of inclusion associated with the spiritual progression between states.

The same rhetorical device appears in some sonnets addressed to the “Black Lady”. In *S.127*, the reason offered by the poetic “I” to praise his mistress’ blackness is “For since each hand hath put on nature’s power, / Fairing the foul with Art’s false borrow’d face, / Sweet Beauty hath no name, no holy bower, / But is profan’d if not lives in disgrace”. Blackness can be considered beautiful because it shows Nature’s designs as opposed to beauty forged by art or human will. But at the same time this love for the action of nature seems to imply that natural passions are also at stake and so this love may prove “mad in pursuit, and in possession so” (*S.129*). Curiously enough, Desdemona and Iago engage in one of this witty dialogues while waiting for the Moor at Cyprus: “Desd: What would thou write of me, if thou shouldst praise me?” After Iago accepts her challenge, she presents him with the paradox: “What if she be black and witty?”. Iago’s answer takes the conceit into bawdiness, something Desdemona’s “worse and worse” (II, i, 117-134) evaluates in a negative sense as part of a courtly game of wit.

I think there are proofs enough in Shakespeare’s idiom not to dismiss the symbolic implications of blackness in *Othello*. I would argue that emblematic coinages such as Alciatus’ emblem of “Impossibility” played an essential role for the establishment of a wide set of references which articulated the diverse meanings of “blackness” available to a Jacobean London audience; particularly, that at the court. The proximity between the performances of *Othello* and the *Masque of Blackness* allows us to vindicate this level of reading.

Blackness was presented on Twelfth Night 1605, two months after the King’s company performed *Othello* before James I. The fact that the motif of blackness for the masque was “Her Majesty’s will” —as Jonson says in the introduction— indicates that this was a fashionable courtly topic. Although Jonson’s entertainment was restricted to Whitehall while Shakespeare’s *Othello* could also be shown at the Globe, we can argue the existence of an emblematic subtext in the elaboration of both the masque and the tragedy; the potential audience for the complete subtext would be certainly restricted, but parts of it were echoed in more popular registers of discourse — proverbs and sayings mainly but also sermons— and could be accessible to larger sections of the audience.

The plot of the masque is organized on the motif of turning the impossible into real: Niger, the father of 12 nymphs, presents his daughters’ “firm Hue” and claims that “in their black the perfect’st beauty grows”. Then he laments the pernicious influence of “some styled poets” who, by telling Phaëton’s myth, had presented blackness as the degrading result of human pride: Phaëton’s *superbia* brought down the chariot of fire and scorched the Aethiopians. Because of this, Niger’s daughters see themselves now “black, with black despair” and desire to become fair. Finally, their tears has moved him to search for a motif which could bring them patience, as in his argument he has rejected any possibility to change Nature’s action: “To frustrate which strange error, oft I sought, / Tho’ most in vain, against a settled thought / As women’s are, till they confirmed at length / By miracle, what I, with so much strength / Of argument resisted ...” (Morley, 39-40)

At this point, Oceanus tells him where he is: “This land ... is Albion the fair, / So called of Neptune’s son, who ruleth here”. Immediately afterwards Aethiop —the Moon— appears to present the possibility of performing the impossible, directing his attention towards the figure who holds such a power: James as a personified Britannia “whose beams shine day and night, and are of force/ To blanch an Ethiop, and revive a corpse./ His light sciential is, and, past mere nature, / can salve the rude defects of every creature” (Morley, 42). The transformation undertaken is not presented in the masque, but it is concluded that after a year following “the rites prescribed” Niger’s daughters will appear back at court to show their bettering (Morley, 44).

In the play, Jonson makes use of Alciatus’ emblem in order to vehicle an absolutist statement about the king’s powers, who could alone act above natural laws. Stating his uniqueness was also a way to emphasize that all under him were subjected to those laws. The reference to the “rites” links the end of the play and the forthcoming *Masque of Beauty* —shown at court three years later— with several discursive instances where the appearance of blackness may be linked to the presentation of spiritual transformation, either by the action of an almighty human being —the king— or as the result of alchemical action. The transformation from “nigredo” or “nigridity”

into “albification” was the the first step in the alchemic process which ended in the Philosophers’ stone. The calcination of the initial elements left a black substance which could be figured as “death, mortification, or scenes of death and killing” (Roberts, 105). In this substance nevertheless lay the seed of the whole process towards albification, or whitening. The need of “perfect blackness” at this stage was represented by means of a black crow with a white head, and it could also be hinted in sayings such as: “Black best sets forth white “ or “Every white has its black”. The figure of a black man could also be used to present this alchemical stage, as it appears, for instance, in the illustrations of Nicola D’Antonio degli Agli’s manuscript, *Nozze* (1480), an esoteric description of the alchemical elements and operations under the form of a wedding. In the procession “two black pages represent nigredo which will become white. The white seeds which are being thrown by the page on the camel precede the red seed which are still invisible at this stage of the alchemical process” (Klossowsky, 59). The description of the chariot of the Horned Moon with Diana’s attributes in the *Masque of Beauty* is very similar to the iconography of the chariot of “Luna”, one of the seven planetarian gods symbolizing the essential metals in *Nozze* and the image itself of the cleansing waters which wash the nigredo in the alchemic process (Klossowsky, 63). This cleansing function might be another representation of the absolute king persona, another shape for the royal actor.

A look to Alciatus’ emblem and its different versions shows how the potential racial issues at stake in the use of blackness were less clearly defined than others related to the ideology of absolute power and the possibility of individual human will to act on the social system which, in many ways was still regarded, as a stable—natural— creation.

Under the motto “Impossibile”, Alciatus’ original (1531) shows two white men who try to wash white a naked black man who sits on a square block. They stand in front of an ornamental fountain. The commentary states the impossibility to turn Nature’s action and attributes: “No one can light up the darkness of black night” (Daly et al, 1985, 59). In the pictorial development, the presence of the fountain and the block where the black man sits makes clear the sort of interpretation demanded. The fountain was a symbol of the control of human art on one of the most popular cleansing elements—water— and the square block an iconographic attribute of Nature as opposed to the sphere where changing Fortune normally stood.

The moral interpretation of the emblem was expanded in the German and French versions (1536, 1542). Human action is useless against certain natural manifestations and so wise men must be patient and avoid acts of useless pride: “There are a thousand things for which there is no remedy. No matter how hard you try, you will not be master of them. Therefore if you seek to be above reproach, do not try to make a Moor white ...” (Daly & Cuttler, 1985, 59). Apart from the transformation of the “Aethiop” in Alciatus’ emblem into a “Moor” —an oscillation which is also reflected in the different ways Othello is mentioned throughout the play— the final remark makes a direct reference to the original source of the emblem and, consequently, to its moral reading: “An inveterate vice remains”. The topic is drawn from Jeremiah 13, 23 —“Can the Aethiopian change his skin/ or the leopard his spots?”— and it uses the image of Ethiops and the spotted skin of leopards as two epitomes of the workings of Nature or “God’s will and ordinance”.

Another related topic appears in the commentary of the German version: “Similarly, take note that natural vice and what time has aged can never be eradicated no matter what art one uses”. In this case “age” is another example of the workings of nature and the impossibility to change its course. It is surprising that very little reference has been made to Othello’s age,¹ and how this element could link him to a whole tradition of old husbands, a type traditionally associated to jealousy: “(Jealousy) is most evident in old men, that are cold and dry by nature, and married *succi plenis*, to young wanton wives; with old doting Janivere in Chaucer, they began to mistrust

¹ Virginia M. Vaughan has considered the similarity between Othello’s military attitudes and the models presented in treatises and regulations published during the 16th and 17th centuries in England. One of those features is to be “a patriarchal figure” (40).

all is not well: 'She was young and he was old / And therefore he feared to cuckold'. And how should it be otherwise? Old age is a disease of itself, loathsome, full of suspicion and fear; when it is at best, unable, unfit for such matters ... Many men are suspicious of their wives ... but old folks above the rest" (Jackson, 3, 266-7).

The English version of the emblem —*Aethiopem Lavare* in Whitney's *Emblemes* (1586) — provides the clearest connection with the dramatic use of the motif both in *Blackness* and *Othello*. The pictorial treatment duplicates Alciatus' but the commentary emphasizes how vain human powers prove against Nature:

(...) nature is of power,
 Doe what thou canste, to keepe his former hue
 Though with a forke, wee Nature Thruste awaie
 Shee turnes againe, if wee withdrawe our hande;
 And though wee ofte to conquer her assaie,
 Yet all in vaine, shee turnes if still wee stande:
 Then evermore, in what thou doest assaie,
 Let reason rule, and doe the thinges thou maie. (Daly, 1985)

The moral message was not only restricted to the emblem. Something similar appears in the proverb "Above God there is no Lord, above Black there is no colour; and above salt there is found no savour" (Smith & Wilson, 65). Blackness —more often than not— implies the expression of the absolute; consequently, its negation presented a paradoxical situation which might be dramatically exploited with very different purposes.

Since the presence of black people was not the only experiential frame for the interpretation of a character painted black when the plays were first produced, we may question Othello's blackness as a racial reference that both Shakespeare and his audience could be troubled with. A reading of blackness in the period leads us rather to think in a set of significative frames where a dark character as the center of a tragedy could be seen as an attempt to challenge other aspects of knowledge and cultural preconceptions instead of simply racial issues.

Is Othello "the white in the Black?" Or, at least, is Shakespeare trying to puzzle his audience's view about the actions of human will on Nature's creative work? Is he dramatically exploiting the relations between black and white offered in alchemic interpretations, in the *doxa* of the proverbial expressions, and in the more intellectual coding of the emblems? Queen Anne's interest in blackness can hardly be read in terms of a royal concern for racial attitudes; it looks more like the choice of a fashionable topic which could convey a deep moral —or political— message under the exciting shape of an entertainment including dances, transformation scenes and songs. Jonson's concern in *Blackness* is to show the uniqueness of the new monarch, while *Othello* presents a problematized perspective on several cultural assumptions. Shakespeare's final turn of wit is to place a black mask —a common practice in actual masques— on the face of his hero and then to make him perform in front of his audience an apparent reversal of natural truth, the mask becoming true visage.

In this sense we may recall the intellectual place where Desdemona sees Othello's visage: in his mind, not in his nature; in that part of him that could be made up by the effects of language, that is, a form of human art: rhetoric. It is the same position adopted by the poetic "I" in *S.131* where he confesses "thy black is fairest in my judgement's place". There is an obvious contradiction between Othello's self evaluation of his linguistic abilities — "Rude am I in my speech/ and little blest with the set phrase of peace" (1, 3, 81-2)— and his forthcoming words; or the sort of narrative he engages Desdemona with —a travel story told according to the pathetic conventions of romance. Also, Othello's rigorous control of the time given to "love and wordly matters", presents a strong contrast to the timeless images prevalent in lovers' discourse, particularly young lovers.

Othello's nature, characterized by age and geographical origin as much as by race, seems to be "assaied" by Othello's will to leave his "exotic-foreign" nature, to become, by artificial —

rhetorical— means, a natural subject of the Venetian state. If Othello plays during the opening acts “the white in the black” for the puzzlement of his audience, he ends acting according to the *doxa* on darkness. His audience could certainly recall the Turk with whom he identifies at the end of the play as a natural prototype of jealousy: “Many terrible examples we have in this kind, amongst the Turks specially, many jealous outrages” (Jackson, 3, 260). His sexual contention, his rhetorical ability —recorded as a need for the foreigner in Hernando de Soto’s emblem *Utilis Eloquentia Profugis* (1599)— seem to point out the possibility of reversing the impossible, in this case his nature as a foreigner. Shakespeare’s dramatic strategies seem to appeal in the first two acts to another proverbial saying: “The devil is not so black as he is painted;” a question set on appearances and an invitation to check what these appearances might hide.

But Iago triggers the mechanism for Nature to come through, and he makes a point precisely to challenge the explicit comments of the Duke or Ludovico about “Othello’s fairness” in order to stress the Moor’s inevitable dependance on his “true” nature. The relevance of this mechanism in Iago’s plot becomes obvious in the exchange in act 4, 1, when Ludovico, after seeing Othello hit Desdemona, wonders (and I find no reason to doubt about Ludovico’s sympathetic attitude towards Othello):

Is this the noble Moor, whom our full Senate
Thought all in all sufficient? This the noble nature,
Whom passion could not shake? whose solid virtue
The shot of accident, nor dart of chance,
Could neither graze, nor pierce. (270-4).

Ludovico’s questions are answered by Iago in his habitual cryptic form. He rejects Ludovico’s suggestion of madness to explain Othello’s behaviour —“Are his wits safe? is he not light of brain?” — asserting: “He’s that he is; I may not breathe my censure, / what he might be; if, as he might, he is not, / I would to heaven he were!” (275-8). His initial statement identifies his behaviour not with madness but with his nature, and the same is emphasized in the second sentence with a hypothetical construction which provides a metalinguistic comment. If we expand the truism “what he might be, he is not” in relation to Othello’s nature, we realize that Iago is presenting Ludovico’s image of the Moor as “deceived” because it contradicts the laws of Nature. His final assertion diverts the clear accusation previously uttered by means of a lie: his wish that everything he is saying might prove false.

The succession of events seems to prove Iago’s position and also the truth of the emblem but Shakespeare’s use of suicide allows a reconsideration about the final message of the play. Through the image of his divided self Othello is able to die a Venetian by killing his dark nature —age, jealousy, alienation and colour. In this way the final act of human will can contradict the emblem and present the potential of the individual to rise upon his own destiny by means of self-punishment. This in Othello, as in Oedipus, means to acknowledge the act of transgression and thus the validity of the law. Consequently, the hero is able in his final action to identify with an idealized —socially sanctioned— self model.

WORKS CITED

- Berry, Edward 1990: Othello’s Alienation. *Studies in English Literature* 30: 315-333.
- Bravo-Villasante, Carmen, ed. 1983: *Hernando de Soto. Emblemas moralizadas*. Madrid, Fundación Universitaria Española.
- Daly, Peter M. et al. eds. 1985: *Andreas Alciatus. I The Latin Emblems*. Toronto, Toronto University Press.
- Daly, Peter M. et al. eds. 1988: *The English Emblem Tradition*. Toronto, Toronto University Press.

- Daly, Peter M. & Simon Cuttler eds. 1985: *Andreas Alciatus. 2 Emblems in Translation*. Toronto, Toronto University Press.
- David, R. W. ed. 1951: *William Shakespeare. Love's Labour's Lost*. London, Methuen.
- Gerald, Albert 1957: "Egregiously an Ass": The Dark Side of the Moor. A View of Othello's Mind. *Shakespeare Survey* 10: 98-106.
- Jackson, Holbrook ed. 1975: *Robert Burton. The Anatomy of Melancholy*. London, Dent.
- Klossowski, Stanislas 1993: *Alquimia*. Madrid, Ediciones del Prado.
- Latham, Agnes ed. 197: . *William Shakespeare. As You Like It*. London, Methuen.
- Loomba, Ania 1989: *Gender, Race and Renaissance Drama*. New Delhi, OUP.
- Morley, Henry ed. 1890: *Ben Jonson. The Masque of Blackness in Masques and Entertainments*. London, Routledge, 35-57.
- Newman, Karen. 1991: *Fashioning Femininity and English Renaissance Drama*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Ridley, M. R. ed. 1958: *W. Shakespeare. Othello* . London, Methuen.
- Roberts, Gareth 1994: *The Mirror of Alchemy*. London, The British Library.
- Rodríguez Mateos, Joaquín 1995: De los esclavos y marginados: Dios de blancos y piedad de negros. La cofradía de los morenos de Sevilla, in *Actas del II Congreso de Historia de Andalucía*. Córdoba, Publicaciones de la Consejería de Cultura de la Junta de Andalucía y Obra Social y Cultural CajaSur, 569-82.
- Smith, W. G. & F. P. Wilson eds. 1980: *The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Vaughan, Virginia M. 1994: *Othello: A Contextual History*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Wells, S. & Taylor, G. eds. 1994: *William Shakespeare. Titus Andronicus in The Complete Works*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 125-152.

* * *

Shakespearean Strategies of (Dis)Orientation in *Othello*, act I

Juan Antonio Prieto Pablos

UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA

Let me start with an assertion with which we shall all probably agree: Othello is a Moor. Then let me follow with a comment that may perhaps seem surprising to some of you: his racial qualification was not a central issue in most of the critical appraisals of the character written until the nineteen eighties. From Coleridge to Hazlitt, from Bradley to Helen Gardner, Othello was “the Noble Hero” or “the Noble Moor”.

It is only recently that we find a significant shift in critical approaches to Othello. For Ania Loomba, the attitude of earlier critics should be understood as the result of “the simultaneous exclusion of both gender and race” from all critical evaluations of the play, in order to sustain a specific cultural (male-centred, euro-centred) construct (1992: 40); and for K. Newman, Othello becomes “both hero and outsider because he embodies not only the norms of male power and privilege represented by the white male hegemony which rules Venice ... but also the threatening power of the alien” (1991: 213). In the process, Othello’s racial blackness has been equated with evil, and this evil has been doubled by the equation of maleness with patriarchy, which is intrinsically evil as well; and, as a consequence, Othello’s behaviour has been “explained” as intrinsic to his nature as a blackamoor and a man.

Yet, as it is commonly acknowledged that he is not wholly to blame for his actions, some explanations have gone further and presented Othello as the colonised black man who has (mistakenly) tried to assimilate the values of euro-centric culture, only to be (unwittingly) used and eventually destroyed by the agents of that culture, namely by Iago (e.g. Newman 1991). It is therefore not surprising to find assertions like Jack D’Amico’s, where Othello becomes “the foolish husband in a city comedy that destroys him and Desdemona” (1991: 177; my italics).

I hope I am not misunderstood when I say that these recent approaches to *Othello* can distort our view of the text and the character, that they can eventually alienate them from us and our experiences, and can make the play lose its effectiveness in the expression of a specific message which, we should not forget, was intended by Shakespeare to be received under specific conditions of reception.

I have said “alienate the play ... from us and our experiences.” The next inevitable question should be, who is us? Or rather, since we should also assume that Shakespeare had a specific set of recipients in mind, who were “us” in Shakespeare’s time? And how did he want “us” to react to the story of Othello and to his racial features in 1603-4? These questions might seem irrelevant in a critical context in which we have learned to accept the idea that, once written, the text is open for us to read as we think more appropriate. But my point is that, as critical readers, we should, at least, try to find out whatever indications possible of an author’s *original* intention before we engage in any kind of reinterpretation or reevaluation of his message. Otherwise, we might find ourselves discussing (and creating) the text and its author according to values that were simply not functional at the time of the composition of that text.

Now, going back to my questions, it should be obvious that it is virtually impossible to know what Shakespeare’s intentions were when he submitted his play for performance; and that it is also quite difficult to draw an undisputable image of Shakespeare’s audiences in seventeenth-century

London. However, we might gather some valuable information from his deployment of specific narrative and dramatic strategies, especially from the ones that he had to use in the development of the principles of orientation (according to Labov's narrative pattern) and identification (according to the models described by Jauss, among others) in the process of reading or watching the play, i.e. while that process is in progress. These strategies can also help us disclose the receptive effects achieved in that process of reading. With this kind of analysis, we should be able to determine, first, the way in which Othello's image is presented to the audience; secondly, how Othello's race was used as the means to build up that image and then to undermine its foundations; and finally, how this seemingly contradictory process could be indicative of a rather flexible attitude regarding race for both Shakespeare and his audiences.

To do so, however, it should be necessary to strain our imagination and try to reconstruct the conditions in which the play was received by an audience of men and women who went to The Globe to attend the performance of a new play. This is certainly strenuous for the average reader of the late twentieth century, since it requires that we temporarily forget everything we know or have been told about the play and its characters and that we candidly place ourselves in the skin of a spectator who had never seen or read it before.

If we approach the play from this perspective, we would find that it opens with two characters, Iago and Roderigo, in conversation about another person who seems to have chosen one Cassio, a man without experience, as his officer instead of Iago (1.1. 1-7):

Rod. Tush, never tell me, I take it much unkindly
That thou, Iago, who hast had my purse,
As if the strings were thine, shouldst know of this.

Iago. 'Sblood, but you will not hear me.
If ever I did dream of such a matter,
Abhor me.

Rod. Thou told'st me, thou didst hold him in thy hate.

It should be noticed how Shakespeare seems to be deliberately vague as to the circumstances that have resulted in Iago's declaration of hate. Due to the indefiniteness of their "this" (1.1.3), "such a matter" (1.1.5), and "him" (1.1.7), we are forced to fill the information gaps and reconstruct the situation by picking up as many clues as possible from their conversation and adding up our guesses and inferences. As we engage in this activity, however, we must follow the lead provided by the speakers, especially by Iago; so that, as he explains why he should "hold *him* in his hate", we would probably assume that his explanation is adjusted to the truth, regardless of (or perhaps because of) his emotional state.¹ Iago's request for a conclusion in lines 38-40 ("be judge yourself, / Whether I in any just term am affin'd/ To love the Moor") could only lead to our declaration of acceptance of his reasons —not only because he says so, but because we have recreated the conditions that confirm those reasons. As a consequence, the Moor's identity would be reconstructed in terms of the injustice he has committed. And the omission of his name would stress our perception of him, not as an individual, but as a Moor, therefore according to whatever basic or schematic preconceptions would confirm the image of this Moor as unfair or unjust.

The second stage in the development of the Moor's image occurs when Iago and Roderigo wake Brabantio up to tell about a "her" ("Here is her father's house," 1.1.74) who has not been mentioned before onstage, and warn him about something —again— unspecified:

Iago. Awake! what ho, Brabantio! thieves, thieves, thieves!
Look to your house, your daughter, and your bags.

¹ There are critics that reach the opposite conclusions as they argue that Iago's reasons are not justified in the context of military customs. See Vaughan 1994: 44. However, they seem to focus on a rather specialised perspective, rather than on the responses of the common, non-military, people.

Thieves, thieves!

Brabantio at a window.

Bra. What is the reason of this terrible summons?

What is the matter there?

Rod. Signior, is all your family within?

Iago. Are all doors locked?

Bra. Why, wherefore ask you this?

Iago. Zounds, sir, you are robb'd, for shame put on your gown,

Your heart is burst, you have lost half your soul;

Even now, very now, an old black ram

Is tupping your white ewe; arise, arise,

Awake the snorting citizens with the bell,

Or else the devil will make a grandsire of you,

Arise, I say.

Bra. What, have you lost your wits? (1.1.68-92)

The process followed in rousing Brabantio up would have its parallel in the audience's recreation of the events they wish Brabantio to know. What they say is that Brabantio has been robbed, though they do not specify the object of the theft—or, rather, they do, but only by inserting the reference to her between other references, in a way that is clearly misleading (see 1.1.79-81). Then, in very crude terms, they tell him about some sort of weird sheep mating which bears no clear connection with thefts (1.1.88-89). And finally, they hint out that the devil will make him a grandfather (1.1.91). As readers, we have plenty of time to elaborate on the inferences required to put the puzzle pieces together and understand what they are saying—and yet, without the knowledge acquired in previous and various kinds of acquaintance with the text, we would probably only gather that he has been robbed of her daughter (and that only because of Roderigo's initial reference to a "her" in 1.1.74) and that she is being sexually abused by "the devil". But as part of a less well-informed audience, our reaction would be closer to Brabantio's as he wonders if the two men have lost their wits (1.1.92). Brabantio may give us the impression that he is too literal-minded and a bit slow in getting the picture; but it should be remarked that the point of Iago and Roderigo's warning is not confirmed until the end of Iago's speech of 110-117 ("your daughter, and the Moor, are now making the beast with two backs," 1.1.115-7). With this, our reconstruction of the Moor (who is not yet mentioned by his name) is complemented with the addition of his animal, or rather beastly, lasciviousness, and his identification as a devilish creature, capable of reaching the extremities of abduction and rape.

So far, therefore, our construction of this character's image would seem to coincide with (and therefore confirm) conventional representations of the Moors (and by extension, of all African peoples) in Elizabethan and post-Elizabethan times. A London playgoer would indeed believe that this Moor is very much like his dramatic precedents (among others, Muly Hamet in *The Battle of Alcazar*, Aaron in *Titus Andronicus*, even the conceited prince of Morocco in *The Merchant of Venice*; see D'Amico 1991, Cowhig 1985), perhaps even like some real black people or blackamoors he or she might have encountered or heard about (e.g., the Moorish ambassador whose customs and behaviour aroused much criticism during his visit in 1600; see Harris 1958), or like the peoples described in contemporary travel books (see Vaughan 1994: 55-6). So far, therefore, what we see and read would place us on the side of Iago, as we have no discernible reasons to suspect that he is distorting the real facts in a significant way.

However, this construction will be challenged at the beginning of scene 2, when we find Iago with a Moor and we notice (perhaps with surprise) that *this Moor* displays no evident signs of wickedness:

Iago. Though in the trade of war have slain men,

Yet do I hold it very stuff of conscience

To do no contriv'd murder; I lack iniquity

Sometimes to do me service: nine or ten times
I had thought to have yerked him here, under the ribs.

Oth. 'Tis better as it is.

Iago. Nay, but he prated,
And spoke such scurvy and provoking terms
Against your honour,
That with the little goodness I have,
I did full hard forbear him; but I pray, sir,
Are you fast married? For be sure of this,
That the magnifico is much beloved,
And hath in his effect a voice potential
As double as the duke's; he will divorce you,
Or put upon you what restraint, and grievance,
That law (with all his might to enforce it on)
Will give him cable.

Oth. Let him do his spite;
My services, which I have done the signiory,
Shall out-tongue his complaints ... (1.2. 1-20)

While Iago seems to be angry and prone to violence against the man who dared speak against the Moor's honour (the "magnifico", we would infer, after we read line 12; who must be Brabantio, we infer again as we read on), he appears to be quite a peaceful and patient man, confident in the worth of his services to the town—and truly and respectfully in love with his wife (see 1.2.25). Once more, the lack of explicitness as to his identity is so remarkable, the contrast between what we see about this Moor and what we have hitherto assumed about him so clear, even Iago's attitude towards him is so diffident and respectful, that the audience might have been momentarily puzzled.

Moreover, we should bear in mind that the man impersonating the Moor was no less than Richard Burbage. It is known that he had an impressive physique and that, as the leading actor in Shakespeare's company the King's Men, his presence onstage could create quite an impact. Moreover, the effect of his appearance as the Moor could be intensified by his costume (if, as might be expected, he wore a military uniform: see Vaughan 1994: 97) and by the colour of his skin. He was indeed black; but it should be safe to assume that his blackness would emphasize the impressiveness of his physical appearance, perhaps even his projection as a desirable individual, due to the collusion of the soldier and the black as sexually attractive characters: as Tokson argues, "there is hardly a black character created for the stage whose sexuality is not made an important aspect of his relationships with others" (1982: 20); and we should add that this would especially be the case if he was presented as a warrior (see Vaughan 1994: 36).

The puzzle regarding the Moor's personality would be resolved eventually, as we gather up the clues that indicate that this man is indeed *the Moor*, and that it is only Iago's attitude that has shifted from one extreme to another, for reasons still undisclosed. I would argue that his presence would lead to a suspension of judgement concerning both the Moor's personality and the reliability of Iago's assertions. The audience's concern with the Moor's flawed nature could still be sustained, mostly on the basis of his latent sexuality. But, if so, it should be remarked that this quality has been subtly moved on to the audience's perception of the man: in other words, that it is the audience who would see him as a sexually attractive individual—and our eventual awareness of this fact would be a significant step in the recognition of the role we have been playing in building up a false image of the Moor.

The entrance of Brabantio on stage constitutes the third stage in the development of the Moor's image. It is significant that Shakespeare's strategy should now introduce a further argument against the Moor, once the previous ones have been undermined. So, Brabantio's accusations incorporate the notion of the theft, but also of the Moor's practice of black arts or

witchcraft, a perspective which could easily be accommodated in the conventional image of the Moor as a heathen or pagan, and could also serve to explain his adoption of a deceptive appearance, if, as he has “enchanted” Desdemona, he could also “enchant” us by looking like what he is not:

O thou foul thief, where hast thou stow'd my daughter?
 Damn'd as thou art, thou hast enchanted her,
 For I'll refer me to all things of sense
 (If she in chains of magic were not bound)
 Whether a maid, so tender, fair, and happy,
 So opposite to marriage, that she shunn'd
 The wealthy curled darlings of our nation,
 Would ever have (to incur a general mock)
 Run from her guardage to the sooty bosom
 of such a thing as thou? to fear, not to delight. (1.2. 62-71)

Only when they all appear before the Duke and the Senators in scene 3 is the puzzle resolved—though not straight away. On the one hand, the Duke's welcome to Othello and the preference he gives him over Brabantio display his appreciation of the Moor as a much-needed general, but also as a worthy person. Here, at last, we find that his name is Othello, and we also find that he is qualified with the adjective “valiant” by seemingly respectable characters:

First Sen. Here comes Brabantio and the valiant Moor.

Enter BRABANTIO, OTHELLO, CASSIO, IAGO,
 RODERIGO,
and Officers.

Duke. Valiant Othello, we must straight employ you,
 Against the general enemy Ottoman;
 [To Brabantio] I did not see you; welcome, gentle signior,
 We lack'd your counsel and your help to-night. (1.3. 47-51)

On the other hand, when Othello is asked to respond to Brabantio's accusations, he produces a speech whose point is to explain precisely with “what drugs, what charms, / What conjuration, and what mighty magic” (91-92) he won Brabantio's daughter. And although it might be possible to understand that Othello is responding figuratively, it should nevertheless be noticed that Shakespeare still suspends Othello's explanation for some time (until his speech of line 128), and still the definitive evidence of his truth will not be given until Desdemona appears onstage to confirm that she is in full possession of her wits and that she is under the effects of no magic charm—in lines 180-189.

The Duke's attitude has too often been disregarded or misinterpreted (arguing, for example, that he is being carried away by his need of a military leader), but we should not ignore the implications of his comments of lines 171 (“I think this tale would win my daughter too”) and 289-90 (“If virtue no delighted beauty lack, / Your son-in-law is far more fair than black”) in terms of the revaluation of Othello's image. It should be obvious that, by the end of act 1, Shakespeare wanted him to have our sympathies and our admiration; and it should be assumed too that this effect could be intensified by the sense of injustice committed in our earlier evaluations of his character.

The result of this process of orientation and dis-orientation should also include the audiences' awareness of the way in which they have been so easily induced to apply specific severely biased racial and moral preconceptions in their evaluation of Othello. But if this awareness has been reached, it is only because, on the other hand, the audiences would not be unwilling to leave aside these preconceptions and admit that a blackamoor could feature positive, even admirable qualities.

If we accept that Shakespeare did develop a careful strategy to make his audiences change their views of Othello throughout act 1, and if we accept that these audiences did comply with

Shakespeare's strategy, then we also ought to assume that their latent racist preconceptions were not strong enough, and that they were in some way predisposed to discard them, provided that there was enough evidence to support that change of mind. The question of whether, in the process, Shakespeare wanted also "to disturb their settled notions of black people" (Cowhig 1985: 12), and reconsider the strength (or the weaknesses) of their racial prejudices and eventually leave them aside, loses its relevance, once we assume that they were potentially predisposed to accept a Moor as the hero of a play.

Furthermore, we should also bear in mind that this change entails a revaluation of the original instigator of our racial prejudices (Iago) and a readjustment of our ties with the characters and our expectations concerning the sources of the crisis that must come. Iago's soliloquy at the end of act 1 will confirm that he is the real villain in this story, that he has been misleading us as he has misled other characters, and that he is the one we should have been warned about from the very beginning of the play: in other words, if blackness stands for evil at all, Iago is really the one black character in the play—and the real expression of otherness. If, in the process development of emotional and ideological ties with the characters, we ought to dissociate ourselves from any one, it would undoubtedly be from Iago, the one with whom we would have nothing in common.

It may be argued that, as Shakespeare disoriented and then reoriented us in a different way, he might as well give a further turn of the screw and force us to reconsider our attitude once again, since, after all, Othello *is* a murderer. But my point of view is that Shakespeare's purpose was to present Othello first as the hero, then as the tragic victim of Iago's practices (as Desdemona is the tragic victim of Othello's behaviour); and that, by intensifying the pathetic ties between him and us, he wanted us to find ourselves reflected in him. This, however, would not be possible if we, white men and hopefully not cruel, saw him as a cruel blackamoor or as the projection of socially or morally inadmissible values. Rather, I believe, Shakespeare's audiences must have perceived him as an intensely vulnerable person (as Leavis says, a man "cruelly and tragically wronged") who happened to display this vulnerability in his blackness—but also in his age, his illiteracy, and his social marginality, and in a number of additional features which they might have shared with him. If we read or watch the play and do not conclude that Othello is like us (or the other way round: that we are in some way represented by Othello) we may miss the point Shakespeare wanted to make.

WORKS CITED

- Cowhig, Ruth 1985: Blacks in English Renaissance Drama and the Role of Shakespeare's Othello. > Dabydeen, ed. 1985: 1-25.
- D'Amico, Jack 1991: *The Moor in English Renaissance Drama*. Tampa, University of South Florida Press.
- Dabydeen, David ed. 1985: *The Black Presence in English Literature*. Manchester, MUP.
- Gardner, Helen 1955: The Noble Moor. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 15.
- Harris, Bernard 1958: A Portrait of a Moor. *Shakespeare Survey* 11: 89-97.
- Hazlitt, William 1916: *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*. London, OUP.
- Jauss, Hans Robert 1977: *Aesthetische Erfahrung und literarische Hermeneutik*. München, Wilhelm Fink.
- Labov, William & J. Waletzky 1967: Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience. In *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts*. Seattle, University of Washington Press 12-45.
- Loomba, Ania 1992: *Gender, Race, Renaissance Drama*. Oxford, OUP.
- Newman, Karen 1991: *Fashioning Femininity in English Renaissance Drama*. Chicago, UCP.

Shakespeare, William 1965: *Othello*. Ed. M. R. Ridley. London, Routledge.

Tokson, Elliot H. 1982: *The Popular Image of the Black Man in English Drama, 1550-1688*. Boston, Hall.

Vaughan, Virginia Mason 1994: *Othello: A Contextual History*. Cambridge, CUP.

* * *

Conversion narratives: Othello and other black characters in Shakespeare's and Lope de Vega's plays

Ana Manzanas Calvo

UNIVERSIDAD DE CASTILLA - LA MANCHA

One of the common features in Shakespeare's plays is the fact that there is no dramatic space for characters which do not diminish their difference through conversion (racial, political or religious), be it compulsory, as in Shylock's case, or voluntary in Othello's case. Othello's autobiography or tale of himself in I, ii is paradigmatic in this respect in as much as it establishes his journey from Africa to Europe as a "pilgrimage" towards Christianity, Europe and civilized values. This sense of pilgrimage as a journey towards perfection is present, as we intend to illustrate, in Lope de Vega's plays such as *El negro de mejor amo*, where the African character converts to Christianity and western values. The result of these conversions will be in all cases a precarious assimilation to a white, christian society. Europe, in turn, will reveal the deeper contradictions which are present in its alleged open nature.

As Werner Sollors explains in *Beyond Ethnicity* (1988: 25), both "ethnic" and "ethnicity" derive from the Greek word *ethnikos* which meant "gentile," "heathen." The noun *ethnos* was used to refer not just to people in general but also to "others." In English usage the meaning became "non-Christian". Thus the word retained its quality of defining another people contrastively, and often negatively. In the Christianized context the word "ethnic" ... recurred, from the fourteenth to the nineteenth century, in the sense of "heathen." According to this definition of "ethnicity" we can say that Africans fell into the category of the "ethnic." The Africans' difference, furthermore, was not only spiritual or religious but also physical. Blackness has traditionally had negative connotations, as we can see if we take a look at the Oxford English Dictionary. When the English first started their voyages to Africa and encountered real Africans they finally found a referent and a recipient of blackness with all its negative connotations. Their theories clearly presented God's curse upon a race which by 1578 was becoming at least physically notorious in England. Queen Elizabeth began to be discontented at the "great number of Negars and Blackamoors which ... are crept into this realm," and in consequence issued two edicts in 1599 and 1601 in which she commanded the infidels should be discharged out of Her Majesty's dominions (Qted. in Jones 1971: 20). The Queen complained about the great number of Africans, and about the fact that they were infidels, and this alone would make them ethnic, but her words reveal certain fear of the "infection of blackness." "There are of late," wrote Elizabeth, "divers blackmoores brought into this realme, of which kinde of people there allready to manie, considering howe God had blessed this land with great increase of people of our own nation" (Qted. in Newman 1987: 148). These words reveal what we can call "the sexual bias" of the expulsion, and the fear of miscegenation —traditionally reputed as one of the causes of the lowering of the physical and mental level of humans (Fannon 1967: 120). Linked with the fear of miscegenation is the belief that, as George Abbot wrote in 1599, "the monsters of Africa ... were bred when contrary kindes have coniunction the one with the other" (Qted. in Jones 1971b: 20); a belief

which, at least unconsciously, ties together miscegenation and monstrosity, two of the issues which are woven into both plays.¹

The Queen's concern was hardly surprising. From Antiquity, historians and travellers had associated all Africans with blackness and monstrosity. This monstrosity was physical but also cultural: Pliny described men that had "neither nose nor nostrils, but the face all full. Others that have no upper lip, they are without tongues, and they speak by signs, and they have but a little hole to take their breath at .." (in Jones 1971: 5). For Herodotus, Africans were "all inveterate conjurers, and given to the black art" (in Jones 1971: 4). Some traveler reported how "it is the manner among them, for every man to have many wives: and the fellowship of their wives, that other use in secret: they use in open sight" (Qtd. in Mason Vaughan 1994: 55). Leo Africanus wrote in his *Geographical History of Africa* about the jealousy of the Numidians: "For by reason of jealousy you may see them daily one to be the death and destruction of another, and that in such savage and brutish manner that in this case they will show no compassion at all" (Qtd. in Jones 1971: 25). For John Lok, Negroes were "a people of beastly living, without a God, law, religion, or commonwealth" (in Jones 1971: 12).

What happened in Spain?

As Castile conquered back parts of the Peninsula which had been occupied by the Muslims, Spaniards came into contact with Africans. This earlier and more frequent contact with Africans explains the fact that unlike the British, the Spaniards did not tend to supplement the image of the African with the literary images of the black men which had crystallized in travel writing since antiquity. In the 14 and 15th centuries the Spaniards started to use Africans as slaves on plantations recaptured from the Moors, and in the process, the belief that to be a Negro was to be a slave started to take shape. This tendency became dominant and was gradually institutionalized when Africans were transported to Spain's American colonies as slaves (St. Clair Drake 1990: 262). However, as Drake explains, blacks were not singled out as targets of persecution in 15th century Spain. Religion, not skin color, was the mark of ethnicity, as Werner Sollors remarked. The "enemy" in 15th century Spain was composed of Moors who became Christians, Moors who adopted Spanish language and customs without converting, and *conversos*, converted Jews. The image of the black man was not, according to Clair Drake, completely unfavorable. Christian Spain developed, for example, the image of the black Madonna of Monserrat and the black Wise man, Balthasar. Another positive image is the black man as saint, like Antiobo in *El negro de mejor amo*, by Lope de Vega. Although of African origin, Antiobo assists the Christians against the Turks and achieves a resounding victory over the infidels. This "positive" image of the African constitutes one of the basic differences between the British and the Spanish in their perception of the Africans. According to Fra Molinero in *La imagen de los negros en el teatro del siglo de oro*, for the Elizabethans the Africans are such monstrous and diabolic beings that their conversion to Christianity was not worth it; for the Catholic Spaniards, however, the Africans, since they possessed souls, should be included within the Christian plan of salvation (199: 7).

Even if blacks and whites mixed freely in 16th century Seville and miscegenation was frequent, Spaniards were obsessed with "purity of blood" (*la limpieza de sangre*). Although mixed blood was not associated with monstrosity, it was regarded as an evidence of moral deficiency and intellectual inferiority (St. Clair Drake 1990: 257). Lope in *El negro de mejor amo* will demonstrate that the only union between a black man and a white woman is a spiritual marriage between two white souls.

In both plays, Othello and Antiobo are viewed as instrumental Calibans; they are extremely useful in order to secure Cyprus/Sardinia against the ever present menace of the Turks (even after death, in Antiobo's case), but still aliens when in Othello's case he intends to marry white Desdemona, or when Antiobo is wooed by white women. Venice and Sardinia appear as open

¹ The discussion about the situation of Negroes in England is further explored in "The Making and Unmaking of a Colonial Subject: Othello", *Miscelánea* (forthcoming).

communities for the purposes of war, but remain closed on the level of politics and the more conservative sense of “the family.” It seems that when Othello narrates “the story of his life” his blackness dissolves. Othello’s difference appears extremely menacing, however, when Brabantio views him as a potential husband for Desdemona. In that case Othello remains a pagan and slave—a mere impersonation of the stereotype (Singh 1994: 289). In the same way, Antiobo’s difference does not prevent him from being a brave soldier (A black Alejandro, as one of the characters calls him), but we can clearly see how nature itself seems to strike down those white women who try to woo him.

Transforming “the other” into instrumental Othellos or Calibans is one of the features of colonialism in both plays. In return, Europe “enlightens” and lifts the aliens through a liberal education and in most cases, through conversion to Christianity. But what kind of education is this Western, supposedly liberal education? It is a kind of education which passes off as universal what is only particular, which presents as historical what is only a subjective account, and which presents as natural what is fully designed and prepared, that is, what is essentially unnatural, as we will see in both plays. What is the aim of this “liberating” education and the conversion to christianity? The aim is to create a class of persons non-European “in blood and color, but European in tastes, in opinion, in morals and intellect,” as Sing remarks. Venice and Sardinia (and Europe in general) are dependent upon the creation of a very particular kind of progeny, not a monstrous progeny through miscegenation, but the “mimic man” as Homi Bhabha would call him. A man who has been “whitewashed” by Western culture, and yet excluded from its full rights (Singh 1994: 292).

Both Othello and Antiobo are in this light “mimic men” who have converted not only to Christianity, but also to the world vision implied in that religion. Peculiar to both plays is the fact that the conversion only functions in one direction: it is the infidels, that is, “the ethnics,” that convert to Christianity and not viceversa. As Selín the Turkish sultan explains, “nunca un cristiano es buen moro” (*El esclavo de Venecia y amante de su hermana* 1918: 340). Although in real life there were defectors on both sides, the christians are described as having noble, stable essences which are in no way corruptible. It is in fact the corrupt nature of Africa that facilitates the conversion or pilgrimage towards christian universal values. Africa is described as the anti-world, as a world upside down, as the site of an essential world disorder. This is clear in Othello’s case. The disorder or anti-world is plain in the wonders of Africa: first its monstrous inhabitants, then their cultural practices. Physical monstrosity is parallel to cultural monstrosity: “the cannibals that each other eat ...”

As a whitewashed character, Othello appears in the play as a colonial subject who has absorbed European culture and morality, and has therefore domesticated the wildness implicit in his origins. He has also exiled from his personality the menacing aspects of the stereotype of the African such as lasciviousness, lust—as he makes clear before the Duke and the Senators (I, iii, 261-264)—, and jealousy—as Desdemona confirms in III, iv, 30-31. Fully immersed in European culture, for Othello the Turk is “the other”. While he feels at ease within his adoptive culture, his own African culture remains absent, or rather represents one of the “stressed absences” in the play. The handkerchief he confides to Desdemona as a family present is the only repository of his own history in the play, a part of the past which represents itself without resorting to language. Apart from the handkerchief, Othello appears as the perfect “mimic man” or converted subject who has assimilated the quintessential western culture. Othello’s cultural references at this early—and optimistic—stage of the play would confirm the open nature of the metropolis and western culture in general. However, as *Othello* will demonstrate, the self-fashioning peculiar to the Renaissance is limited for the black man.

But the infinite possibilities of self-fashioning are manifest in the telling of his autobiography before the Duke, Brabantio, and the rest of the Senators. As an exercise of self-representation, the autobiography is another instance of tamed difference, of a kind of ethnicity which is appealing to his Venetian listeners. In order to become an acceptable and civil character, he only has to reproduce the most familiar images of European travel narratives and colonial discourse when

dealing with the African. In this way he can establish an insurmountable barrier between the monsters in Africa and his civilized self. His autobiography thus turns into a travel narrative which echoes other narratives such as Pliny's, Herodotus', Mandeville's, and other "racial encounters" such as Antony and Cleopatra's. As in the texts of his predecessors, the gap between the European—or Europeanized—and the African is widened; like in their texts, in Othello's narrative "stressed absences" also appear. We do not hear about the nobility, the civility and hospitality of certain African kings. Instead we get the most common features of the Elizabethans' image of Africa and its monstrous wonders. Africa, in Othello's words—like in the words of any other western traveller—is reduced to a land populated by "the Cannibals that each other eat, / The Anthropophagi, and men whose heads/Do grow beneath their shoulders" (I, iii, 142-43).

More than revealing Othello's origins, as critics such as Newman (1987: 150) and Singh (1994: 288) explain, his tale demonstrates that Othello has no access to his past except through a borrowed language and its colonial discourse. Othello's tale reveals as well his narrative position as a subject immersed in Western-European culture looking like a curious traveller at his object of observation, the African, from his western ideological position. The tale does not add anything new to the traditional image of Africa, and in this way reassures the familiar. At the same time, Othello's narrative eases European conscience as if Africa were already known and essentialized once and for all. Equally reassuring in the ears of the Venetians is the sense of progression toward purification implicit in the word "pilgrimage" with all its connotations as a journey towards a mystic center. In this light, Othello's autobiography stands as the conversion narrative of a man who starting in darkness has come to the light. Othello's is therefore a conversion narrative on the level of culture and religion and on the level of language. Unlike Caliban, he does not use language to curse. He has learnt the white man's language and explicitly possesses the world vision expressed and implied in that language. To speak the Venetians' language is to take on a world vision and a culture, as Fannon would say (1967: 38).

In *El negro de mejor amo* Lope de Vega presents another conversion narrative. Like in *Othello*, the darkness of Africa prompts Antiobo to seek Christianity. We see, however, that Lope de Vega presents no monsters in the play. In this we can see how the Spaniards had a more realistic view of Africa. Still, Africa, as Fra Molinero explains, is the site of moral disorder: the killing of the brothers of the new king to protect the kingdom from a hypothetical usurpation (Cf. Fra 1995: 106). Africa is "unnatural" too because it resists and fights the "just" and "universal" cause of the Spaniards. These grounds explain why Antiobo starts a pilgrimage towards western values. Still, Lope de Vega opts for a dignified image of Africa and for a distinguished black queen, Sofonisba. Sofonisba, as a case in point, seems to be another black lady of striking beauty. Even if black beauty is praised, the play embraces the most common views of black and white and their connotations. When the King, Sofonisba's father, gives her over to Dulimán, he apologizes for his daughter's blackness: "aunque negra," he says, "es de blancos pensamientos." These words are evidence of a subconscious racism, and show to what extent the characters Lope situates in black Africa have interiorized the Europeans' view of the Africans. These words, moreover, are very similar to the latent racism implicit in the words the Duke addresses to Brabantio when Othello departs for Cyprus: "Your son in law is far more fairer than black" (I, iii, 290). On her part, Sofonisba seems to have embarked herself on another pilgrimage to lighten her color through her marriage to Dulimán: "vos sois", she says to Dulimán, "el blanco en el que acerté mi vida." This reveals, we can say, Sofonisba's progression towards whiteness and perfection, since lightening the color of her skin was traditionally seen as an improvement to the race. We can see how in this sense the play reproduces the most common beliefs about miscegenation.

Although Sofonisba will be Antiobo's biological mother, she cannot compete with Antiobo's spiritual mother, the Christian woman who nurtured him and managed to baptize him. Consequently, as Fra Molinero explains, Sofonisba does not appear in the second part of the play, when Antiobo is already a young man in search of his real self (1995: 111). Antiobo's baptism proves more determining than his African heritage, which, surprisingly, and as in Othello's case, does not appear in the play and thus constitutes one of those "stressed absences." There is, therefore, nothing African about Antiobo. Baptism has washed off Antiobo's blackness and his "ethnicity." Figuratively, Antiobo turns into a washed ethiope. He becomes aware of the anti-

world of Africa and departs for Europe to aid the Christians in their confrontation with the Turks in Sardinia.

Antiobo's new allegiance to the Christians is expressed as both a liberation from sin and as a new desired servitude. Antiobo is acclaimed as "el negro de mejor amo." Through this naming the Sardinians fix Antiobo, as Kimberly Benston would say, in his irreversible otherness (1984: 152). He does not have a name—maybe he does not need one, according to the Christians—, he is pure paraphrase. This bondage in paraphrase indicates that Antiobo is Christ's vassal; he is the black who belongs to the greatest of Masters. Liberation is achieved, paradoxically, through metaphors of belonging and subordination. From Antiobo the prince he'll become Antiobo the slave—even if he is slave to the best master. Being God's slave, as Fra Molinero explains, is a Christian aspiration. As St. Paul's explains in Romans 6, 20-23, "being made free from sin "one becomes" servant to God." Through conversion to Christianity God grants freedom to his converts. Liberated from the slavery of sin, the convert is now God's slave (Fra Molinero 1995: 102). The implications of this new mode of bondage are multifold, and I have the feeling they don't work in the same way for whites and blacks. Since the natural state of an African in 16th century Spain is slavery, being God's slave can be seen as liberating, since the master is not of this world. But even his state of bondage sets no limits to slavery since God is atemporal and is above time. Being God's slave projects slavery onto the future—*ad infinitum*, we could say—, and confirms the common belief that the most fitting state for the black man is slavery, be it physical or spiritual. The title of the play, *El negro de mejor amo* thus naturalizes a state of bondage for Antiobo in the Christian world.

To accommodate to their new status as Christians, both Antiobo and Othello have to renounce themselves and set up new boundaries which separate and differentiate them from "the other." In the narrative of his life, as we saw, Othello separates himself from his fellow countrymen—Cannibals, anthropofagi, men whose heads grow beneath their shoulders. To mark his belonging to the non-ethnic Christians, Antiobo voices the unequivocal discourse of an intransigent crusader: "¡No quede moro con vida! / que yo con este rosario / lo pienso alcanzar con ruegos, / y con esta [la espada] peleando" 1929: 973).

Through their conversion to Christianity both Othello and Antiobo learn their place as aliens in the new society. Both characters are incorporated into a universal just order. The peculiarities of this new order are well known: in both plays African characters of noble origins become marginal characters: a cursed, cursed slave, as Othello calls himself towards the end of the play; or a slave to the best master in Antiobo's case. In both plays, Europe restores categories and imposes what is assumed as a "natural order." Europe, in other words, situates the African character where he belongs, on the margins: Othello becomes the incarnation of the stereotype: a "Moor", an outcast and a cursed slave who has finally occupied his true position. In this light Shakespeare presents the predictable trajectory of a "stage Moor" who lapses into stereotype unable to resist the "call of evil" supposedly implicit in the deeper impulses of his nature. Antiobo (who is a whitened image of the African as inveterate conjurer) turns into another instrumental Othello who performs miracles and acts when needed by the Christians. By becoming a hermit, he imposes marginality upon himself and remains sufficiently removed from the Sardinians' life so that racial integration in the play is not put to the test. One of the ways in which marginalization is imposed on both characters is through the rejection of miscegenation, a topic which deserves another study beyond these pages.

Othello's and Antiobo's conversions to Western cultural and religious values must have sounded enormously gratifying for Elizabethan and Spanish audiences. Both *Othello* and *El negro de mejor amo* simultaneously integrate and segregate the African characters, thus exposing the double and contradictory nature of Venice and Sardinia. Both plays reveal how when it comes to a black character conversion to Christian values is not enough. Both characters erase their "ethnicity" as they embrace western values but their difference pervades and prevents assimilation. Although there is no space for black characters, Lope de Vega offers a more optimistic case of the cleansing of Antiobo's darkness. Through baptism, God, according to Antiobo, has washed him and made him white. Shakespeare, quite differently, presents towards the end of the play a different case of the washing of the black man when Othello exclaims: "Whip me, ye devils, / From the possession of this heavenly sight! / Blow me about in winds! roast me in sulphur! / Wash

me in steep-down gulfs of liquid fire! (V, ii, 278-81). A reference which comes to confirm that the washing of the Ethiop implies destruction.

WORKS CITED

- Benston, Kimberly W. 1984: I Yam What I Am: The Topos of Un(Naming) in Afro-American Literature. > *Black Literature and Literary Theory*. Henry Louis Gates, Jr., ed. New York & London: Methuen, 1984.
- Clair, Drake, St. 1990: *Black Folk Here and There*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Fannon, Frantz 1967: *Black Skins, White Masks*. New York: Grove Weidenfeld.
- Fra Molinero, Baltasar 1995: *La imagen de los negros en el teatro del siglo de oro*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Jones, Eldred, D. 1971: *The Elizabethan Image of Africa*. Oxford: Folger Books.
- Vaughan, Virginia Mason 1994: *Othello: A Contextual History*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Newman, Karen 1987: 'And Wash the Ehtiop White': Femininity and the Monstrous in *Othello*. In *Shakespeare Reproduced: The Text in History and Ideology*. > Jean E. Howard and Marion F. O' Connor eds. London & New York: Methuen.
- Shakespeare, William 1604: *Othello*. G. A. Bently ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1958.
- Singh, Jyotsna 1994: Othello's Identity, Postcolonial Theory, and Contemporary African Rewritings of *Othello*. > *Women, "Race", and Writing in the Early Modern Period*. Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker. London & New York: Routledge.
- Sollors, W. 1988: *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture*. Oxford: OUP.
- Vaughan, Virginia Mason 1994: *Othello: A Contextual History*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Vega, Lope de 1918: *El esclavo de Venecia*. > *Obras de Lope de Vega*. Madrid: Real Academia.
- Vega, Lope de 1929: *El negro del mejor amo*. > *Obras de Lope de Vega*. Madrid: Real Academia.

* * *

The elusive ensign: towards a “grammar” of Iago’s motives

Keith Gregor

UNIVERSIDAD DE MURCIA

Of all Iago’s gestures few are more unsettling than his defiant final words to his captors: “Demand me nothing; what you know, you know: /From this time forth I never will speak word” (5. 2. 300-1)¹. And so his part in *Othello* concludes, the real reasons for his “fault” being left for his torturers’ ears —and to the audience’s imagination. No one would “demand” him anything, were it not for that endless dialogue between work and interpreter which has been the hallmark of post-early modern critical practice. Just as art is seen to begin at the edges of the author’s “existential reality”, so the disappearance of the player is regarded as the *condition* of his re-birth as a character. In the case of Iago, this re-birth tends to hinge on the recovery of that most elusive element: the ensign’s motives.

The concept of character would then seem inseparable from an account of motivation. After all, both concepts emerge at the same historical moment. *Elizabethans*, it seems, explained action in terms of a taxonomy of humours or the equally venerable dichotomy of virtue and vice (Scragg 1968). The “motiveless malignity” which Coleridge found lurking in Iago would mean little to an audience which, as Bradbrook noted, “did not expect every character to produce one rational explanation for every given action” (1983, 59-60). Iago’s silence would thus be an adequate response for an audience which failed, or simply refused, to see beyond the deed.

Iago the *character* appears once science learnt to fix concrete motives to such actions, motives which in many cases (and Iago’s is one) are undisclosed or even unknown to the agent. As Bradley put it: “[The] question Why? is *the* question about Iago, just as the question Why did Hamlet delay? is *the* question about Hamlet” (1981, 181). The modern “will to know” (Foucault 1981) is no longer content with the visible *effects* of an agent’s behaviour. Unlike Lodovico, who pulls the curtain on the sight-poisoning object of the dead Desdemona and Othello, the latter-day hermeneut, like the post-Renaissance physician, defines his science by that which remains invisible or unspoken (Wilson 1993, 162). To keep the theatrical metaphor going, the final curtain spells the start, not the end, of his enquiry.

An important premise of the hermeneutic project is always to ignore the obvious or explicit. Iago’s silence is in this respect deemed far more eloquent than the earlier “motive-hunting” denounced by Coleridge. Peevishness at Cassio’s promotion, an obscure desire for Desdemona (Cinthio’s prime motive), the suspicion that ‘twixt his sheets Othello’s done his “office” (1. 3. 381-82), tend to be discarded for the psycho- and socio-pathological impulses of insecurity, racism or a kind of sensual delight in the *acte gratuit*. In performance actors and directors have found further “motives” to give flesh to Iago’s manipulations. The most suggestive of these is a repressed desire for Othello himself.

The list could no doubt be extended — the Iago file is far from closed and it would be presumptuous to attempt that here. My main concern is the notion of “motive” itself, as well as

¹ This and all subsequent references to *Othello* are to the New Penguin Shakespeare edition by Kenneth Muir (1968).

the relevance of such a discussion to such a complex and pivotal work as *Othello*. I don't want to gloss different interpretations of the play; simply to establish the rules by which we make sense of what, from the mid-seventeenth century, came to be called "character". *Othello*, written between 1602 and 1604, pre-dates that process but, in the figure of Iago, anticipates some of its problems.

In "The Dynamics of Interactions" McCall and Simmons highlight the relativity of the concept of action:

If we are to understand a person's behavior, to discern a role through it, we must try to discover for which audience he [*sic*] is avowing and imputing motives, and whether or not the vocabulary in terms of which he does so is an acceptable one to that particular audience. Once we decide whom he is playing to, so to speak, we can usually discern the motives or purposes that are organizing his line of action. If we do not share the vocabulary of motives held by that particular audience, however, we may be totally unable to make sense of [his] actions. (1983, 165)

This quote from recent sociology is relevant, not just because of the analogy it establishes with the theatre, but because of the light it sheds on the hermeneutic project as a whole. The attribution of motives is in actual fact a negotiation (an "interaction") between interpreter and agent. The analysis of action relies on a shared "vocabulary" between the social or theatrical actor and the patient or spectator. Iago's "what you know, you know" would thus seem like a "Keep Out" sign to those who speak in other tongues, i.e., who reject the concept of pure action or the (related) casuistry of fiends and devils. Granville-Barker expresses some of the baffled rage of the modern motive-hunter when he re-poses Othello's question to his ancient:

Why, indeed! The true answer, spuriously qualified, he has long ago given us [...]. 'I hate the Moor' — there has been no more to the whole elaborately wicked business than that. (1982, 116)

Yet, and here I would like to take McCall and Simmons' idea one step further, the absence of a shared vocabulary with the "original" audience doesn't preclude the possibility of further interactions. In *Meaning by Shakespeare* T. Hawkes alludes to the "literary pragmatism", by which plays such as *Othello* are assumed to "always 'take part' in historical milieux, whenever and however they are realized" (1992, 6). For Hawkes this means the abandonment of the essentialist humanist notion of a context-free meaning or "truth" behind or beneath the play, and the invitation to endless re-productions (appropriations) of the work in the idiolects of successive audiences. As far as the concept of character is concerned, it spells the dismantling of the (anachronistic) notion of a transcendent ego, of a more or less coherent "subjectivity" informing and guiding each of the agent's actions (Barker 1984, 31, 58; Belsey 1985, 48), and the translation of agency in terms "acceptable" to various publics.

This sounds liberating but actually, as Hawkes himself implies, it isn't. The expropriation of the agent from the grip of essentialist notions of subjectivity ushers in new models of coherence, models that may sound depressingly familiar. The re-presentation of Iago as devil-worshipper, skeptic or homosexual may actually play into the hands of a reactionary politics of character, tends, in Sinfield's words, to "activate regressive aspects" of the cultural formation in which the play is produced (1992, 51). Students of *Othello* are no doubt familiar with the attempts to make Iago our "contemporary". To adopt Sinfield's dichotomy, these range from Hazlitt's "conservative" identification of the ensign as "a sort of prototype of modern Jacobinism" (1969, 14) to more "liberal" categorizations such as Empson's (Iago the *déclassé* and so socially maladjusted individual [1979, 218-49]) and Muir's (Iago the pathologically jealous sadist [1968, 20]). Such translations or (more accurately) *socializations* of Iago's motives successfully avoid the essentialist confusion of character with individuality, but only in the name of the dusty old ideals of political, social and sexual "normality".

This doesn't have to be the case of course, and more "oppositional" responses to the characters' behaviour can show how *Othello* may "expose", rather than merely "promote", regressive ideologies (Sinfield 1995, 106). In his book *Shakespeare* (1989) Kiernan Ryan voices what, amongst more radical theatre critics and producers, seems to be the prevailing interpretation

of the play: the insanity of racism. Central to Ryan's account is the re-interpretability of the text from the standpoint of the present, the idea that "a text from the past is not a final product of its age, but a productive practice of both its moment and our own" (13; for fuller statements of this view see Williams 1977, 115-16; Bennett 1990, 75-7). This insight encourages what Ryan calls a "dialectical or two-way procedure", whereby the present re-interprets itself in the light of the past and the past is re-examined in the light of the present (1989, 13).

Yet rather than challenge humanist ideals, all this could be said to do is to reinforce them. Significantly citing G. M. Matthews' essay "*Othello* and the Dignity of Man" (1964), Ryan presents as the result of his "dialectical" engagement with the text, the revelation of the barbarity of a culture "whose ruling preconceptions about race and sexuality deny the human right of such a love to exist and flourish" (51). Focusing on Iago's motives, he simply reiterates the Coleridgean thesis that the reasons Iago adduces for his action are a smokescreen, that their "transparent inadequacy ... provokes us to search beyond them", to discover the "racist source of his malignity" (53; for similar responses see Salway 1991, Andreas 1995). The hermeneutic circle seems unavoidable, as does the connected idea that theatrical characters require some motivation for their action. This may, and frequently does, mean going against the grain of what is actually said or done. But no one, it seems, can resist the urge to treat the actor as a person, "a real human being who has become a sign for a human being" (Esslin 1994, 56). And like all human beings, they must have reasons for acting as they do.

The problem with Iago, as so many critics have complained, is not exactly a dearth of possible motives, but simply that the "evidence" we have to go on is mainly circumstantial. The inevitable impression we get from the play is, in Katherine Eisaman Maus's words, that what we see on stage "is only part of the truth, an evidence of things not seen, or not entirely seen" (1995, 177; see also Pujante 1991). Iago's soliloquies may, like Hamlet's, strike us as indices of a nascent subjectivity, but the real "clues" to his behaviour remain primarily on the "surface" level of the action itself. Does this then invalidate the Bradleian quest for motivation? If the question Why? points to some underlying psychological cause(s) of Iago's acts, criticism is indeed hard-pressed to provide explanations. The so-called "inner life" was in early modern times a relatively undeveloped concept and, as Margreta de Grazia and other theorists have maintained, the mere fact that a character reveals his or her secret thoughts to an audience on stage or in poetry, isn't necessarily proof of a kind of interiority *avant la lettre* (de Grazia 1995, 86-7; see also Ferry 1983, Greenblatt 1986). The concept of motive has a range of applications, only one of which pertains to the agent's psyche.

A less "psychologistic" grid for explaining human conduct was outlined by Kenneth Burke in *A Grammar of Motives* (1969). Burke proposed a "pentad" of motives, involving an account of not just why something was done (purpose), but what was done (act), when and/or where it was done (scene), who did it (agent) and how (agency) (xv). Thus, to take a couple of examples Burke himself cites, the *machine* can be constitute both an agency (i.e., an instrument to be used) and, in the vast accumulation of machinery, the industrial "scene". Similarly, *war* may be interpreted both as agency (a means to an end), an act and, in schemes proclaiming a cult of war, a purpose, etc.

This goes beyond Bradley in allowing us to show how, in a play laden with secrets and false reports, characters respond to more "manifest" stimuli, such as the events of the plot themselves, the classic theatrical elements of time and place, the question of an agent's function and an overt concern with method or technique. This is not to ignore wider concerns, such as the issues of race or class rightly stressed in various appropriations of the play. Rather, it is to deal with them *through*, instead of *despite*, the scant evidence of the text.

In the case of Iago, the motives offered at the end of Act 1 are not so much clues (whether false or otherwise) to an underlying malignity, as an instance of the process by which the interpreter-agent seeks to "catch up" with events that have in certain respects already got under way without him. Iago is in this respect the "patient" of a system in which "Preferment goes by letter and affection, /And not by old gradation" (1. 1. 36-7) and, in terms of the "plot", his demotion to the post of ancient. The secondariness involved here is evident in the appraisal of his

strategic relation both to Othello and to himself: “In following him, I follow but myself” (1. 1. 59). Iago’s determination to “act” is then dependent on the acts of others. This doesn’t make him a victim or parasite, but does mean his “revenge” on Othello will mainly be effected through others (Roderigo directly; indirectly Cassio, Bianca and Desdemona).

Iago’s “patience” is also clear in his relation to “scene”, the where and when of the action. Like Othello, Iago is out of place in Venetian society. But while the Moor Othello retains some use-value to the state, Iago has suffered a further displacement — his being barred from the rank of *lieutenant* (literally, “place-holder”). When the action shifts to Cyprus, to a “town of war/Yet wild” (2. 3. 207-8), Iago finds “the time, the place and the condition” conducive to his aims (2. 3. 290-1). His first act is, significantly, to re-place Cassio. As for the temporal factor, for Iago time or, more accurately, *timing*, is a growing concern. On the one hand, wit must, as he assures Roderigo (2. 3. 362), depend on “dilatatory time”; on the other, the concatenation of events in Cyprus forces him to act more quickly than he might have wished. Though he consoles Othello in Act 3 with the commonplace “Leave it to time” (3. 3. 243), time is something he struggles to keep in step with. The struggle comes to a head in Act 5 scene 1, as Iago informs the audience: “This is the night/That either makes me, or fordoes me quite” (5. 1. 130).

The final motive I want to consider is agency, the how of Iago’s acts. Hazlitt described Iago as an “amateur of tragedy in real life”, who rehearses his part “in downright earnest, with steady nerves and unabated resolution” (1969, 207). The theatrical analogy is reiterated by Granville-Barker, who attributes to Iago the “artist’s faculty for doing well whatever he takes pleasure in doing” and describes him as “something of a melodramatic actor in real life” (1982, 112, 115). The appeal to “real life”, a clear attempt to socialize this aspect of Iago’s “character”, is curiously enough made through the analogy of the theatre. For Hazlitt Iago’s acts have “tragic” proportions, whereas for Granville-Barker they tend towards the “comic”: his “confession” to Roderigo (“I hate the Moor”) would, repeated amid the “holocaust” of later events, “sound even to him so incongruous as to be all but comic” (1982, 116; see also Greenblatt 1980, 234).

The obsession with agency links Iago to other Jacobean schemers, such as Jonson’s Volpone or Middleton and Rowley’s De Flores. As well as serving as indices of the moral and social decadence of turn-of-the-century English society, such characters invite audiences to reflect on the mechanics of characterization itself. Iago’s “motives” are at best obscure, but only if the term is used in the psychologistic sense of purpose, of a reason or set of reasons which somehow precedes or transcends the work itself. This is not to discredit socializations of Iago’s behaviour which link his actions to forces at work in the cultural formation in which the play is produced and received. Instead, it is to make explicit the grounds on which those socializations are made, grounds which, as Robert Weimann has suggested in relation to Hamlet, are inseparable from the “existential realities of theatrical representation” (1985, 276) itself. The hermeneutic principle tends to ignore those “realities” in the (largely) decent appeal to “real life”, but then defeats its own purpose by re-classifying “life” in terms directly relating to the theatre (comic, tragic, melodramatic, etc.).

This inability to break out of the paradigms which condition any such socialization is a mirror-image of Iago’s own subjection to the strictly dramatic criteria of time, place and action. The concern with the *how* of his revenge, which quickly replaces the motive-hunting of earlier soliloquies, is symptomatic of the absence of such motives, or at least of the non-identity of motive with *purpose*. Instead, as we have seen, the “reasons” for his acts are to be traced to the “external” factors of scene and action. Iago “acts” (and speaks) as he does because the “conditions” in which he operates — the loss of military and so social status, a hostile, war-like environment, etc. — are the inevitable “motives” for such behaviour. That, adapting Keats, is all we know and all we *need* to know.

The kind of approach I’m proposing would then indeed begin with the dismantling of the notion of an inner conscience or subjectivity determining or controlling the characters’ acts. Such psychological imponderables as wounded pride, pathological jealousy or racism, etc., are attributable less as causes or (worse) justifications of particular behaviours, than as the effects or products of particular circumstances, circumstances which the play reflects in precise ways. The “grammar” of motives I’ve outlined takes account of those circumstances, as well as the ways in

which the play inverts “ordinary” causality to expose the spuriousness of our own rationalizations of a given character’s conduct.

When Francis Throckmorton was tried for treason in 1584, the official report claimed he told his torturers: “He that hath falsed his faith, hath lost his reputation”. This daring refusal to renounce his religion was interpreted as “proof” of his decision to give “his faith to bee a Traitor, and not to reveile the treasons” (Kinney 1990, 156). Throckmorton was duly “encouraged” to sign a confession in which he not only recognized his fault but actually demanded a “trebling of the torment” (158). I’m not suggesting the figure of Iago owes anything to Throckmorton, or that *Othello* the play was inspired by this report. The point of the comparison is simply to show how easily interpretation can usurp the “truth” of what’s actually said or done; how such usurpations are inspired by particular interests and how a vow of silence is almost always the invitation to speak under duress.

WORKS CITED

- Andreas, James R. 1995: *Othello’s African American Progeny*. Kamps, Ivo. ed. *Materialist Shakespeare: A History*. London, Verso: 181-97.
- Barker, Francis 1984: *The Tremulous Private Body*. New York, Methuen.
- Belsey, Catherine 1985: *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama*. London, Routledge.
- Bennett, Tony 1990: *Outside Literature*. London, Routledge.
- Bradbrook, M. C. 1983: *Themes and Conventions in Elizabethan Tragedy*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Bradley, A. C. 1981: *Shakespearean Tragedy*. London, MacMillan.
- Burke, Kenneth 1969: *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley, U. of California P.
- de Grazia, Margreta 1995: Soliloquies and Wages in the Age of Emergent Consciousness. *Textual Practice* 9: 67-92.
- Eisaman Maus, Katharine 1995: Proof and Consequences: Inwardness and Its Exposure in the English Renaissance. > Kamps, I. ed. 1995: 157-80.
- Empson, William 1979: *The Structure of Complex Words*. Totowa, N.J., Rowman and Littlefield.
- Esslin, Martin 1994: *The Field of Drama: How the Signs of Drama Create Meaning on Stage and Screen*. London, Methuen.
- Ferry, Anne 1989: *The “Inward” Language: Sonnets of Wyatt, Sidney, Shakespeare, Donne*. Chicago, U. of Chicago P.
- Foucault, Michel 1981: The Order of Discourse. Young, Robert. ed. *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Boston, Routledge and Kegan Paul: 48-78.
- Granville-Barker, Harvey 1982: *Prefaces to Shakespeare: Othello*. London, Batsford.
- Greenblatt, Stephen 1986: Psychoanalysis and Renaissance Culture. Parker, Patricia and David Quint. eds. *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins U. P.
- Greenblatt, Stephen 1980: *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago, U. of Chicago P.
- Hawkes, Terence. 1992: *Meaning by Shakespeare*. London, Routledge.
- Hazlitt, William. 1969: *Characters of Shakespear’s Plays. The Round Table*. London, Dent.

- Kinney, Arthur F. ed. 1990: *Elizabethan Backgrounds: Historical Documents of Age of Elizabeth I*. Hamden, Archon.
- McCall, George J. and J. L. Simmons 1983: *The Dynamics of Interactions*. Thompson, Kenneth and Jeremy Tunstall. eds. *Sociological Perspectives: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth, Penguin: 159-79.
- Muir, Kenneth 1968: Introduction. *Othello*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Pujante, Angel-Luis 1991: Iago: Percepción, Opinión y Reconocimiento. *Studia Patricia Shaw Oblata*. Oviedo, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo. Vol. 2: 267-74.
- Ryan, Kiernan 1989: *Shakespeare*. Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Salway, John 1991: Veritable Negroes and Circumcized Dogs: Racial Disturbances in Shakespeare. Aers, Lesley and Nigel Wheale. eds. *Shakespeare in the Changing Curriculum*. London, Routledge: 108-124.
- Scragg, Leah. 1968: Iago — Vice or Devil? *Shakespeare Survey* 21: 53-65.
- Sinfield, Alan 1992: *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. Oxford, Clarendon.
- Sinfield, Alan 1995: *Macbeth: History, Ideology and Intellectuals*. > Kamps, I. ed. 1995: 93-107.
- Weimann, Robert 1985: Mimesis in *Hamlet*. Parker, Patricia and Geoffrey Hartman. eds. *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. New York, Methuen.
- Williams, Raymond 1977: *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford, OUP.
- Wilson, Richard 1993: *Will Power: Essays on Shakespearean Authority*. Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf.

* * *

‘Deformed, unfinished, sent before my time’:
Monstrosity in *Richard III* and Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*

Antonio Ballesteros González

UNIVERSIDAD DE CASTILLA - LA MANCHA

Shakespeare is undoubtedly one of the main sources of inspiration to be found in Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley’s works, the great Bard’s influence being constant and decisive in any English-speaking literary context. However, a global and accurate evaluation of Shakespeare’s presence in the writings of the Romantic authoress has never been successfully traced, despite the proliferation of criticism -conceived from many different approaches- centred upon the female writer. It is not our concern here to undertake such a task for obvious reasons and limitations. Our purpose is more modest in its scope: to carry out a brief study of monstrosity in *Richard III* and suggest some intertextual and comparative guidelines of the topic as it appears in Shakespeare’s “history play” and Shelley’s most well-known narrative, *Frankenstein*. This research will hopefully show how the latter borrowed -whether consciously or unconsciously- significant features in the referential framework of monstrosity from Shakespeare’s play, manipulating them through the patterns of thought concerning the topic in the 18th and early 19th centuries, finally providing the subject with new mythical connotations.

Emily Sunstein (1989), the best biographer of Mary Shelley to date, has conveniently emphasized the fact that, while composing *Frankenstein* in the interval between 1816 and 1818 (the year of publication of the first edition of the novel), Mary Shelley was currently reading and studying Shakespeare’s plays. Even in her early childhood, Mary was familiar with them: “*Godwin, however, continually impressed her with the need for long apprenticeship, and her standards were very high. Spenser, Sidney, Shakespeare and Milton were her favorite older English poets*” (Sunstein, 59). Her father’s rigorous education was later on completed by Percy Shelley’s influence upon her writings and readings. The young couple carried with them in their elopement to France, in 1815, the works of Mary’s mother -the great pioneer of the British feminist movement, Mary Wollstonecraft-, together with those of Shakespeare and Byron (Sunstein, 84). Percy and her used to study the major English poets: Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton... in the months preceding the composition of *Frankenstein*. Moreover, Shakespeare was included in the “reading list” that Percy Shelley used to perform aloud while Mary was finishing the first volume of her *magnum opus*.

Mary’s favourite play was *Othello*, where monstrosity constitutes one of the most successful rhetorical fields. As Sunstein says,

She [Mary] placed herself in the grand tradition of lawbreaking passion with Francesca and Paolo, Juliet and Romeo, and identified in particular with Desdemona, who fell in love with her father’s friend, eloped and was discovered; she was always to see *Othello* played whenever she could. (104)

However, as we pointed out above, neither Sunstein nor any other biographer or critic has fully determined the importance of Shakespearean imagery in the configuration of monstrosity, so essential a matter in *Frankenstein*, although there are some partial contributions in this respect. In an original and intriguing book, Chris Baldick (1987) studies the significance of monstrosity in the context of nineteenth-century writing, focusing on the categorization of *Frankenstein* as a myth. Baldick makes us aware that “*In modern usage ‘monster’ means something frighteningly*

unnatural or of huge dimensions" (10). However, in earlier usages still persisting in the nineteenth century, the term carried connotations which were not only physical, but also explicitly moral. As the French philosopher Michel Foucault underlines, a 'monster' is something or someone to be *shown* (1967: 68-70). The etymology of the word comes from Latin *monstrare*, from which Spanish *mostrar*, French *montrer* and English *demonstrate*, derive. In a world created by a beneficent God, what can be the explanation for the existence of the freak, the deformed and the lunatic? As Baldick puts it, the answer is: "*to reveal visibly the results of vice, folly, and unreason, as a warning... to erring humanity*" (10). Great thinkers of Ancient times ranging from St Augustine to Martin Luther attempted interpretations of monstrosity from this perspective. And this is mainly the meaning of physical and moral deformity in Shakespeare's plays: in *Othello* Emilia speaks about jealousy as a monster (III. iv. 161), and ingratitude is prototypically seen as such in *Timon of Athens* (V. i. 65) and *King Lear* (I. i. 219-20), together with the more explicit usage of the category in *The Tempest*, where a 'real' and literal monster, Caliban, can be found. In general terms, "*The monster is one who has so far transgressed the bounds of nature as to become a moral advertisement*" (Baldick, 12)¹.

However witty and relevant Baldick's analysis actually is, it is certainly striking that he never refers to *Richard III* when dealing with monstrosity in Shakespeare. It is our contention that the play sustains significant relationships with the critic's ideas, *Richard III* providing a link in the main chain of the treatment of monstrosity leading to the conceptual framework of reference which appears in *Frankenstein*, an intertextual chain whose most remarkable peaks in this respect are those of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, some of Shakespeare's plays, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Hobbes's *Leviathan*, Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* and Godwin's *Caleb Williams*. Of course, this taxonomy would be completed by several classical and medieval illustrations which maintain intertextual bonds with Mary Shelley's novel. A clear example is that of the Vice of medieval drama, a Machiavellian role assumed by Richard himself throughout the play: "*Thus, like the formal Vice, Iniquity, / I moralize two meanings in one word*" (III. i. 82-3).

The figure of King Richard coincides with the most important features that Baldick describes for the monster in the past. First, as was pointed out above, monstrosity was habitually used as an illustration of a particular vice or transgression. When the monster is a king, the embodiment of royal power whose prerogatives came directly from a divine source, the moral lesson presents more interesting implications, for a monster-king can only be seen as a sign of God's trial for the sins and mistakes of a nation or country. As Baldick establishes:

The representation of fearful transgressions in the figure of physical deformity arises as a variant of that venerable cliché of political discourse, the 'body politic'. When political discord and rebellion appear, this 'body' is said to be not just diseased, but misshapen, abortive, monstrous. Once the state is threatened to the point where it can no longer be safely identified (according to the medieval theory) with 'the King's body' -that is, with an integral and sacred whole- then the humanly recognizable form of the body politic is lost, dispersed into a chaos of dismembered and contending organs. (14)

This view is related with the conception of Richard as a representative of the *flagellum dei* or "scourge of God", a wicked and blasphemous being in this case who serves God's exemplary purpose of punishment and final redemption: the tragical fall of Richard conveys the accession to the throne of Richmond, Henry VII, an able ruler who, according to Shakespeare, would restore order and control in a country devastated by the blood-thirsty War of the Roses. The mistakes of the past have to be purified through the very epitome of horror: a tyrant king whose murderous contrivances are suffered both by the Court and the people of England, her territory becoming -like her ruler- monstrous. The "mob" -sometimes monstrous too in Shakespearian plays- can do

¹ Baldick collects some more significant examples of monstrosity taken out from Shakespeare's plays (pp. 11-15).

nothing to stop the hypocritical tyrant, as is seen in the citizens's scene in III. 7, despite their rejection of Richard.

However, by means of God's final restorative mechanisms of control and order, it could be stated that England's sin turns itself into a *felix culpa* which will develop the inexorable and ultimately fair designs of God.

Richard becomes thus a moral advertisement of malignant behaviour, one -we repeat with Baldick- "*who has so far transgressed the bounds of nature*" (12). Although monsters are "natural", they are often perceived as "unnatural" and even "uncanny". It is curious that, in Shelley's narrative, this definition would be more appropriately applied to Victor Frankenstein, the scientific overreacher, than to his creature. This is undoubtedly a reminder of each other's indissoluble entity, a link reflected in popular culture by calling the monster after its creator's name.

Secondly, ingratitude as a monster in Shakespearean terms has to do with another feature of monstrosity, as, again, Chris Baldick emphasizes: "*It is the vices of ingratitude, rebellion, and disobedience, particularly towards parents, that most commonly attract the appellation 'monstrous': to be a monster is to break the natural bonds of obligation towards friends and especially towards blood-relations*" (13). One of the most noticeable characteristics of the relationship between creator and creature in *Frankenstein* is rebellion -however much justified it can be- or a turning against one's parent or "benefactor". Richard III, the same as the monster, will show his unnaturalness by means of practically extinguishing his whole family and -due to his sexually devious and puritan behaviour- aborting any possibility of multiplying his own offspring. The climax of the play is reached in the pivotal action of killing the young princes, his own nephews (IV. ii), infanticide being a most atrocious and "monstrous" deed. Frankenstein's monster also wipes out his own family (except one member, Ernest), in murdering his progenitor's relatives, for Victor is his "father". The paroxysm of violence contributes to the reader's perception of the monster's actions as unbearably unfair, his arguments of *bon sauvage* in Rousseauian terms being utterly deconstructed throughout the systematic butcheries against the innocent members of his "kith and kin".

Both Richard's and the monster's justifications for their bloody behaviour coincide in their deterministic despair brought about by their deformity and monstrosity. Of course, if peculiar in the end, the creature's arguments are the product of his being rejected because of his uncanny ugliness by the rest of mankind, his creator and would-be friends included. Richard's alibi is even more elusive, as can be deduced from his self-portrait in I. i. His deformity can justify neither his hatred for his own family, priorly focused on his being a cold-fish in sexual matters, nor his hypocritical aversion towards his own brothers. He obviously fits better in a war-like context, for that calamity is also portrayed as a monster ("*Grim-visaged war hath smoothed his wrinkled front,*" I. 9). Unlike his brother Edward, he is "*not shaped for sportive tricks/ Nor made to court an amorous looking-glass*" (14-5). Richard's rejection of sexuality -or his sado-masochistic approach to it, as illustrated by his devious feelings towards Lady Anne (I. ii.)- is curiously akin to that of Victor Frankenstein himself, a feature which is subconsciously manifested in the episodes of the creation and posterior destruction of the female monster (Chapter XX), and his obscure fears as his wedding-night approaches (Chapter XXII). Together with this moral resemblance with Victor, Richard parallels the creature's monstrosity:

I, that am curtailed of this fair proportion,
 Cheated of feature by dissembling Nature,
 Deformed, unfinished, sent before my time
 Into this breathing world, scarce half made up,
 And that so lamely and unfashionable
 That dogs bark at me as I halt by them -
 Why I, in this weak piping time of peace,
 Have no delight to pass away the time,
 Unless to spy my shadow in the sun

And descant on mine own deformity (16-27).

“Dissembling Nature”, the same as Frankenstein, seems to have selected the parts of Richard in a distorted way, modelling him out of *disjecta membra*, monsters prototypically being “composed of ill-assorted parts, sometimes combined from different creatures..., sometimes merely multiplied to excess” (Baldick 13). Both Victor’s creature and Richard conceive of their bodies as “other”: their physical appearance becomes an archetype of “otherness”. Animal imagery in their self-portraits and in other characters’ perception has something to do with this feeling of unnaturalness and alienation. Only in *Richard III* the King is called or compared to a “hedgehog”, a “[bloody] dog”, a “[foul bunch-backed] toad”, a “bottled spider”, a “creeping venomous thing”, a “tiger”, an “ape”, a “[deadly] boar”, a “cockatrice”, a “hellhound”, a “foul swine”, and a “wolf”, one of the symbolic investitures of the devil.

However, the most recursive images in both works are those connected with the moral ugliness of the monsters and their connexion with hell and the devil. Indeed, they are considered as “devils” in many occasions. The most common denigrating epithets applied to Frankenstein’s creature are those of “monster” (27 appearances), “fiend” (25), “daemon” (18), “creature” (16), “wretch” (15), “devil” (8), “being” (4) and “ogre” (1). Many of them are related to the moral wickedness of the character, coherent with the physical repulsion which he provokes in those who -unlike the benevolent reader, who never “sees” the monster, or bears in mind the lovable image of Boris Karloff- contemplate his horrid appearance.

Richard is also identified by the other characters in the play as a product of hell, and he is called “black magician” and “hell’s black intelligencer”, the contriver of “devilish plots, damnèd witchcraft and hellish charms”, “devil” (at least 12 appearances), “devilish slave”, “devil’s friend” (“*Not to relent is beastly, savage, devilish*, Clarence will say shortly before he dies at the hands of Richard’s mercenaries in I. iv), “cacodemon”, “dreadful minister of hell”, “slave of nature and the son of hell”, “Hell-governed arm”, “death and hell have set their marks on him” (there are some other references to hell in connexion with Richard; he is also the embodiment of “sin”), “foul defacer of God’s handiwork”, “God’s enemy” (precisely the etymology of the word “Satan”), and “cursed self”.

On the other hand, “monster”, “deformed”, “misshapen thus”, “elvish-marked”, “wretch” (his own mother, the Duchess of York, remembers him as “The wretched’st thing when he was young” in II. iv. 18, and considers her womb as “accursèd” in IV. i.), “bloody”, “murderous villain”, “villain-slave”, “guilty homicide” also occur in the play. As can be inferred, there is a striking coincidence between some of the adjectives and syntagms applied to both monsters. This resemblance is sharpened in their most remarkable characteristic: they possess a fearful command of rhetoric and eloquence. Victor Frankenstein is haunted by the monster’s narrative, despite his intolerable ugliness and his priorly having murdered William, the scientist’s younger brother:

Thus I relieve thee, my creator’, he said, and placed his hated hands before my eyes, which I flung from me with violence; ‘thus I take from thee a sight which you abhor. Still thou canst listen to me, and grant me thy compassion. By the virtues that I once possessed, I demand this from you. Hear my tale ... (101).

For the creature has had a good teacher of eloquence: no more no less than Satan in Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, one of the books contributing to his “education”. Although he cannot persuade Victor to create finally a female monster for him, his command of rhetoric is impressively moving. It is not strange that, at the end of the novel, Frankenstein advises Walton not to pay attention to the wretch’s mellifluous words, and kill him as soon as he turns up:

Yet, when I am dead, if he should appear; if the ministers of vengeance should conduct him to you, swear that he shall not live -swear that he shall not triumph over my accumulated woes, and survive to add to the list of his dark crimes. He is eloquent and persuasive; and once his words had even power over my heart: but trust him not. His soul is as hellish as his form, full of treachery and fiendlike malice. Hear him not, call on the manes of William, Justine, Clerval, Elizabeth, my

father, and of the wretched Victor, and thrust your sword into his heart. I will hover near, and direct the steel aright. (209)

Like father, like son: another hint of the creator-creature's unavoidable duality is Victor's oratorical powers as described by Walton (210): "*His eloquence is forcible and touching; nor can I hear him, when he relates a pathetic incident, or endeavours to move the passions of pity or love, without tears*".

With respect to Richard, his eloquence is proverbial, and the main reason for his surprising and rapid success. Apart from the general use of precise language throughout the first part of the play, the best examples of his never being at a loss with words are the parallel scenes of courtship in I. ii and IV. iv, where the perfect hypocrite (*hypokrités* was the usual term for "actor" in Ancient Greek) respectively woos Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth, whom he wants to turn into a go-between that would convince her daughter Elizabeth into marrying him. Shakespeare's exploitation of irony here is bold if we take into account that Anne, to her fatal grief, will marry him in the end, in spite of the murder priorly committed by the grotesque character against her own husband. The case of Queen Elizabeth is even more painful, for Richard has killed her husband -the legitimate king- and her sons. His eloquence is so brilliant and his arguments so tempting that she will consent to arrange her daughter's marriage with the bloody monarch. Despite his ugliness and monstrosity, Richard's linguistic and rhetorical appeal is unquestionable.

In short, it seems to be clear that Shakespeare's purpose in depicting the *dramatis persona* of Richard III is that pinpointed above and dealt with in Samuel Johnson's sentence, "*Vice, for vice is necessary to be shown, should always disgust*" (quoted in Botting 1995, 6). The reader had to "*know how to discriminate between virtue and vice*" (Botting 1995, 7), and this contrast is more emphatic if the reader or the spectator pays attention to the opposed figures of Richard and Richmond, the false king's antithesis and the archetype of the able Christian ruler. Monstrosity fulfils a moral intention that is semiotically extended and widened at the time when Mary Shelley begins to write *Frankenstein*, a lapse when new aesthetic, political and social connotations, which had already appeared throughout the eighteenth century, occur. As a consequence, *Frankenstein* as a book, as a "romance", will become "monstrous", made of *disjecta membra* or "ill-assorted parts" (Botting 1991, 1995).

As a corollary, it can be established that the fate of monsters is ultimately the fate of otherness, an alienation ultimately perceived in the monster's assumed or forced and resigned isolation. Foucault reminds us of the fact that "*monsters signal the variety and diversity of nature's continuity*", and, at the same time, "*the monster ensures the emergence of difference*" (quoted in Botting 1995, 7). These assertions are well exemplified by both epitomes of otherness, Richard III and *Frankenstein's* creature, intertextual points of departure of literary myths.

WORKS CITED

- Baldick, Chris 1987: *In Frankenstein's Shadow: Myth, Monstrosity and Nineteenth-Century Writing*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Botting, Fred ed. 1995: *Frankenstein*. London: Macmillan, New Casebooks.
- Botting, Fred ed. 1991: *Making Monstrous: Frankenstein, Criticism, Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Foucault, Michel 1967: *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Trans. Richard Howard. London: Tavistock.
- Shakespeare, William 1968: *Richard III*. Ed. E. A. J. Honigmann. Harmondsworth: The New Penguin Shakespeare.
- Shelley, Mary W. 1969: *Frankenstein* (1831 edition). Ed. M. K. Joseph. Oxford: OUP, World Classics.

Sunstein, Emily W. 1989: *Mary Shelley: Romance and Reality*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

* * *

The epic tone in Shakespeare's *Henry V*

María José Álvarez Faedo

UNIVERSITY OF OVIEDO

The richness of Shakespeare's language is present in every single line of *Henry V*, where, in a series of extraordinary hyperboles, there emerge like frightful caricatures, the beast-violences of action and the histrionic strains of ferocity.

The verse is usually strong and interesting, forthright and uncomplicated, at its best animated, eloquent and rich. Most of its serious speeches are addresses with an aim in mind. This is appropriate to the demonstrative nature of plot and character, and it is extremely well done.

The Chorus emphasizes the epic tone: it speaks five prologues and an epilogue. Undoubtedly the speeches of the Chorus are epic in tone, but they have another epic function, for in the careful way they recount the omitted details of the well-known story, they secure unity of action. Shakespeare follows the ancient writers of tragedy.

The Chorus, in addition to the bridging gaps in time and place and enlarging the scene to epic proportion, also translates action into description: movement related becomes arrested. The effect, however, is not of lifelessness but of motion arrested. We envision the English sailing to France, or the camp on the eve of battle as we see a huge canvas all at once and with the figures caught, frozen, in the middle of action, but, at the same time, with the impression of energy and movement, colour and sound given to us by the voice of the Chorus:

From camp to camp through the foul womb of night
The hum of either army stilly sounds,
That the fixed sentinels almost receive
The secret whispers of each other's watch.
Fire answers fire, and through their paly flames
Each battle sees the other's boastful neighs
Piercing the night's dull ear, and from the tents
The armourers, accomplishing the knights,
With busy hammers closing rivets up,
Give dreadful note of preparation. (IV.0. 4-14)

The fourth Chorus is, in a different manner from its precursors, superb in significance of atmosphere and mood. Henry is now to be not only leader but friend, and the language becomes tender in evoking the endangered English and the "little touch of Harry in the night", which is to hearten and encourage them; and Shakespeare plays with the idea of darkness ("night") and "cold", in contrast with "colour", light and warmth ("sun"):

Upon his royal face there is no note
How dread an army hath enrouned him
Nor doth he dedicate one jot of colour
Onto the weary and all-watched night,
But freshly looks and overbears attaint
With cheerful semblance and sweet majesty,
That every wretch, pining and pale before,

Beholding him, plucks comfort from his looks.
 A largest universal, like the sun,
 His liberal eye doth give to everyone,
 Thawing cold fear, that mean and gentle all
 Behold, as may unworthiness define,
 A little touch of Harry in the night. (IV.0. 35-47)

The crucial eve before Agincourt gives all that could be asked for.

Heroic poetry is supreme for a moral reason: it is above everything concerned to promote the image of the greatest of men, whom it exhibits in action and in glory for our admiration and imitation. Henry was a king whose life was immaculate. Such was the idea of heroic poetry at that time.

A close study of Henry's language will show different levels of his oratory:

The eloquence and irony in his answer to the gift of tennis balls (which constitute a mock to Henry's revealing youth) show the wisdom in a young king that cannot be easily deceived, but who can turn the mock to his own advantage:

When we have match'd our rackets to these balls,
 We will in France (by God's grace) play a set
 Shall strike this father's crown into hazard.

... ..

... tell the pleasant Prince this mock of his
 Hath turn'd his balls to gunstones ... (I.ii. 261-282)

Henry's speech to the conspirators, and particularly to Scroop, is a richly felt and moving address, it sounds the tenor of tragic emotion as Henry discovers that one so trusted has proved so false. It creates a particular tone which the scene needs, that of reconciliation in tragic parting, through grief shared between the king and conspirators, so that even their intended treachery ends in prayers for the safety of the land. Henry's speech is heartfelt, tender and dignified.

There is not the slightest suggestion of personal anger. Henry's emotions are not his own but one in the control of an order larger than his limited human self. That his emotion is enlarged and controlled is manifested in the formality of his rhetoric:

... Show men dutiful?
 Why so didst thou. Seem they grave and learned?
 Why so didst thou. Come they of noble family?
 Why so didst thou. Seem they religious:
 Why so didst thou. (II.ii. 124-128)

The stylistic devices - rhetorical questions, repetition (both present in the latter quotation), metonymy (substitution of subject for adjuncts or adjuncts for subject): "Their cheeks are paper" (II.ii.71), metastasis (the turning back of an objection against he who made it):

The mercy that was quick in us but late
 By your own counsel is suppressed and killed.
 You must not dare, for shame, to talk of mercy,
 For your own reasons turn into your bosoms,
 As dogs upon their masters, worrying you. (II.ii. 76-80)

And periphrasis (the use of a descriptive phrase for a common name, often to give an air of solemnity or elevation or to avoid a harsh word); the lines:

You have ...
 Join'd with an enemy proclaimed and fixed,
 And from his coffers
 Receiv'd the golden earnest of our death (II.ii. 163-166)

- might have come straight from a Renaissance book of rhetoric. They are purposely exaggerated to emphasize the control of passion by an ordered, ordering judgement in the character of the king. The speech of the ideal king, like every other of his attributes, is measured and controlled. The acuteness with which he follows the argument through and the sharpness and concentration of the argument itself are signs of an earnest engagement with the subject at a level of hypothesis. The whole argument is well followed and properly concluded.

King Henry delivers two formal orations in the play, the first before the final attack on Harfleur, the second before the battle of Agincourt.

The first encourages, inspires and exhorts the soldiers. At every juncture in the play where action or passion might threaten to disturb measured order, the agitating force is brought under control by a highly formal rhetorical style. Henry's exhortation to the troops, for example, arrests, and formalizes movement:

Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more,

 I see you stand like grey hounds in the slips,
 Straining upon the start. The game's afoot.
 Follow your spirit, and upon this charge
 Cry, "God for Harry! England and Saint George! (III.i. 1-34)

It is, of course, as general of his armies and not as knight that Henry addresses his troops, though it is as king that he declares war. In addressing to the Governor of Harfleur, Henry speaks of himself as a "soldier": "A name that in my thoughts becomes me best".

But, though he claims to be a "plain soldier", his challenge to the Governor of Harfleur is framed in such exaggerated rhetoric that it becomes Senecan - i.e. horrible subject matter is rendered as still as statuary by stylistic formality:

Therefore in fierce tempest is he coming,
 In thunder and in earthquake, like a Jove,

 Opens his vasty jaws; and on your head
 Turns he the widow's tears, the orphan's cries,
 The dead men's blood, the pining maidens' groans,
 For husbands, fathers, and betrothèd lovers
 That shall be swallowed in this controversy. (II.iv. 99-109)

Here the formal measure achieved in such devices as balance, the use of triplets ("husbands", "fathers", "lovers" - "claim", "threatening", "message"), and paramoron is enhanced by elevation and conventionality of diction ("vasty jaws", "widow's tears", "dead men's blood", "pinning maidens"). Elemental violence and horror is here described in highly wrought literary terms.

The second speech, though a soliloquy, is really a public address, eloquent and memorable. Yet, eloquent though he is, this is the speech of status; even in its very privacy it discourses to the audience about kingly cares and humble content. Tell-tale phrases betray an unexpected petulance or self-pitying extravagance - phrases like "every fool, whose sense no more can feel" or "horrid night, the child of hell". These touches of irrationality may be signs that Henry is under strains, the speech is not without Shakespeare's humanizing psychology:

What infinite heartsease
 Must kings neglect that private men enjoy?
 And what have kings that privates have not too,
 save ceremony, save general ceremony? (IV.i. 233-236)

As regards the speech of Agincourt, technically, there is also the excitement of the supreme expected occasion: this is the crowning exercise of all those in which Henry must direct his words

to a prescribed end. The thoughts come with ease and power, born along infallibly by the rhythmical flow and resonant melody of the lines, and heightened by the heady refrain about St. Crispin's day. The daring paradox by which the very fewness of his soldiers is made to sound a source of strength is carried off with irresistible conviction; the mounting vision of victory and fame is offered in the words both heroic and human; and from the initial stress on the king's own honour there spread out widening circles of contagious emulation, until all his men feel the spell of brotherhood, their thoughts lifted beyond present peril to the prospect of honour, old age and brave memories. This comment merely rewrites flatly what Henry says exactly; the great thing about the exaltation is that it blends itself with intimate human feeling, with neighbourliness, and humour, and hopes and proper pride.

Although king Henry has abjured the frivolity of his youth, he is not all seriousness. Young prince Hal's love of a jest and of fellowship with ordinary men reappears in king Henry when he provokes Michael Williams (whose powerful prose deserves to be mentioned) to challenge the glove which the king has induced Fluellen to wear in his cap.

What is specially remarkable is the way his tone becomes plain when he addresses the French, specially to Catherine. King Henry does not speak French when he addresses the French nobility: In Agincourt, not only did the English army defeat the French, but also did English language defeat French. He only speaks French when he addresses to Catherine. Why to her and not to the rest? Perhaps because the same way England defeated France, Henry's love is subjected to Catherine and viceversa. Consequently, Henry attempts to speak French and Catherine tries to learn English. Or it might be that his use of French were a very deliberate contrivance, since the affectation of bumbling ignorance is surely a strategy of power.

The richness of the speeches in *Henry V* contribute to emphasize the epic tone of the play, not only implied by the presence of the Chorus, but also reinforced by the serious speeches uttered by Henry. This confirms Ben Johnson's lines in a poem prefacing the 1623 Folio edition of Shakespeare's plays:

For a good Poet's made, as well as borne.
And such wert thou.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bauman's, S. 1976: *Henry V for Centenary Season at the Royal Shakespeare Theatre*. Oxford, Pergamon Press.
- Berry, R. 1978: *The Shakespearean Metaphor*. London, The Macmillan Press.
- Berry, R. 1981: *Changing Styles in Shakespeare*. London, George Allen and Unwin.
- Blake, N. F. 1983: *Shakespeare's Language (an introduction)*. London, Macmillan.
- Brook, G. L. 1976: *The Language of Shakespeare*. London, Andre Deutsh Limited.
- Calder Wood, J. L. 1979: *Metadrama in Shakespeare's Henriad (Richard II to Henry V)*. California, University of California Press.
- Campbell, L. B. 1980: *Shakespeare's Histories*. Bristol, Methuen.
- Gale, S. H. 1981: John Osborne: Look Forward in Fear, in Wertheim, A. ed. 1981: *Essays on Contemporary British Drama*. Munich, Hueber.
- Joseph, S. M. 1947: *Shakespeare's Use of the Acts of Language*. New York, Columbia University Press.
- Quinn, M. 1969: *Henry V (A Selection of Critical Essays)*. Bristol, Macmillan.

Tillyard, E. M. W. 1969 (1944): *Shakespeare's History Plays*. Middlessex, Penguin Shakespeare's Library.

Waith, E. M. 1965: *Shakespeare. The Histories*. New York, Prentice Hall Inc.

Wells, S. & Taylor, G. 1988: *William Shakespeare. The Complete Works*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

* * *

Shylock's five-faceted character

Jesús Cora Alonso

UNIVERSIDAD DE ALCALÁ DE HENARES

The figure of Shylock has engaged the imagination and attention of critics when dealing with Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*. Many have dwelled on Shylock's Jewishness and have pondered whether the play is imbued with anti-semitism or not.¹ Shylock's being a Jew is certainly important, but focusing exclusively on this aspect of the character is sheer reductionism, especially blatant when assuming an extreme new-historicist or post-structuralist approach which may render Shakespeare as a despicable Dead White Male full of prejudice against other races.²

Indeed, Shylock can be considered in some respects the archetypal Jew, but it is also true that he also shows characteristics appertaining to other dramatic archetypes such as the malcontent and the New Comedy father in both its usurious and miserly subtypes. If we want to make a full appraisal of Shylock and see whether the play is racist or not, we will have to take into account that he is a Jew, a malcontent, a usurer, a miser and a father, the five facets I refer to in the title of my paper, and, this is most important, that his Jewishness is, paradoxically, both qualified and enhanced by the other four aspects.

Shylock as a Jew illustrates the commonplaces and prejudices of Christian societies against his "nation". He is the cruel usurer who knows no mercy, a misbeliever, a dog, a devil, as he is many times called in the play, and, possibly, a cannibal as show his desire for a pound of Antonio's flesh "to feed fat the grudge" (I. iii. 42)³ he bears him and his decision to accept Bassanio's invitation to supper "to feed upon/ The prodigal Christian" (II. v. 14, 15), remarks that hark back to the

¹ For a brief summary of opposed views see John F. Andrews's afterword essay entitled Perspectives on *The Merchant of Venice*, in the Everyman Edition (London, Dent, 1993) 202-19, esp. 205-6.

² Even moderate new-historicist approaches like that of Ania Loomba's in *The Color of Patriarchy: Critical Difference, Cultural Difference, and Renaissance Drama in Women, "Race", and Writing in the Early Modern Period*, ed. by Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker (London, Routledge, 1994) 17-34, include sorry instances of "positive bigotry" like race-oriented readings of "black" and "darkness" and other images in John Webster's *The White Devil*. Loomba paranoiacally sees racist connotations in the use of these words as qualifiers because of their moral implications: «In *The White Devil*, "blackness" is a signifier for various forms of socially unacceptable behaviour. Flamineo says: "As in this world there are degrees of evils, / So in this world there are degrees of devils." (IV. ii, 57-8). The term "black" is obsessively used to describe all of them. Monticelso calls Lodovico a "foul black cloud" (IV. ii, 99); Flamineo, at the end of the play, sums up his own life as a "black charnel" (V. vi, 267); there is "black slander" (II. i, 60), "black lust" (II. i, 7), "a black concatenation of mischief" (III. ii, 29-30), "black deed" (V. iii, 247), and Monticelso's "black book" in which "lurk the names of many devils" (IV. i, 33, 36). (27). Overlaps between the construction of women and cultural outsiders [...] are similarly evident in the process of "naming" Vittoria. "Black dust" and "black concatenation of mischief" are attributes of this "debauch'd and diversivolent woman" (III. ii, 29-30). The "jade" Vittoria is obliquely referred to as a "resty Barbary" horse" (IV. ii, 93), and when Brachiano suspects Vittoria's fidelity, he describes her not only through the patriarchal stereotypes of "changeable stuff" and "whore", but as a "devil in crystal", whose beauty is fatal as a "heathen sacrifice" (IV. ii. 43, 46, 85, 86)». (28). It is true that the words "black" and "darkness" show negative connotations as to morals in this play and many others in the Renaissance, but it is also true that they have nothing to do with race but with the atavic fear of darkness and night common to all humans whence the negative connotations spring.

³ I have used the text of the Arden edition, second series, edited by John Russell Brown (1955, London, Routledge, 1989) for all the references to and quotations from the play.

long-standing myth about Jews that crucified and later devoured tender, innocent Christian children. Yet at the same time, Shylock is also the much-maligned Jew, a victim of society, of people such as Antonio, Gratiano, Solanio and Salerio who despise, hate and insult him on account of his race, religion and customs. He is a wronged character who deserves our sympathy, a figure that harbours an understandable but also alarming wish for revenge.¹

Thus, Shylock is also a malcontent, that is, an archetypical character who has been mistreated by society, or, in some cases, at least thinks he has been wronged or deserves better and therefore bears a grudge against the existing order which he is intent on subverting by achieving his personal revenge on the very person who slighted or hurt him in some way.

In this respect, Shylock is akin to not only Marlowe's Barabas, but also other Shakespearean characters like Don John, Iago and Edmund as well as John Webster's Bosola and Middleton and Rowley's De Flores, Marston's Malevole, even Milton's Satan. As Shylock is a Jew, an alien, who must bear prejudice and upon whom heaps of abuse are piled, he is the perfect embodiment of the malcontent. The bond with Antonio allows him the great opportunity to satisfy his desires for revenge and social subversion.

We first know his intentions in his aside in I. iii 36-47 in which he reveals the reasons why he hates Antonio, but we can also think that Shylock is already considering the possibility of revenge earlier in the same scene when Bassanio entreats him to lend Antonio the money he needs. To me, Shylock's "Antonio is a good man" implies that Antonio is a good man indeed, but not in the usual moral sense, but in a private sense that only Shylock can understand: Antonio is a suitable man for his vengeful purposes. On the one hand, Shylock wants to take revenge on Antonio because he bears a personal grudge against him as he is his rival in the money-lending business and he has often spat and spurned him in public; on the other, Shylock also chooses Antonio as a scapegoat to assuage both his personal resentment and the collective rancour of other Jews for the prejudice and discrimination they are subject to. That is why in the justification of revenge he delivers to Salerio and Solanio in III. i, the "Hath not a Jew eyes?" speech, a remarkable rhetoric piece, he starts personalising, referring to his own predicament by identifying the reason why Antonio insults him: "I am a Jew", then speaks about the more and abstract "a Jew" and continues with the plural "we" and "us" in contraposition with the general "you", just to revert to "a Jew" in contraposition with "a Christian" and finally the first person singular pronoun "I" in a two-way progression from the particular to the general and back again (the italics are mine):

... he hath disgrac'd *me*, and hind' red *me* half a million, laugh'd at *my* losses, mock'd at *my* gains, scorned *my* nation, thwarted *my* bargains, cooled *my* friends, heated *mine* enemies, -and what's his reason? *I* am a Jew. Hath not *a Jew* eyes? hath not *a Jew* hands, organs, dimen- sions, senses, affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as *a Christian* is? - if *you* prick *us* do *we* not bleed? if *you* tickle *us* do *we* not laugh? if *you* poison *us* do *we* not die? and if *you* wrong *us* shall *we* not revenge? - if *we* are like *you* in the rest, *we* will resemble *you* in that. If *a Jew* wrong *a Christian*, what is his humility? revenge! If *a Christian* wrong *a Jew*, what should his sufferance be by

¹ The earliest story that tells about the ritual murder of Christian children perpetrated by Jews is the martyrdom of St. William of Norwich (1144). A short account of this tale is included in *The Peterborough Chronicle*, see *A Book of Middle English*, ed. by J. A. Burrow and T. Turville-Petre (Oxford, Blackwell, 1992) 73-78, ll. 74-82. Another well-known martyrdom of a Christian children at the hands of Jews is that of St. Hugh of Lincoln, to which, as Burrow and Turville-Petre point out, Chaucer refers in his *The Prioress's Tale*, see *The Canterbury Tales*, vii, 684-86. (I must acknowledge here the help of my dear colleague Dr. Isabel de la Cruz, who helped me locate the *The Peterborough Chronicle* text illustrating this legend). E. E. Stoll also points to the presence of this legend in John Day's play *The Three English Brothers* (1607). Stoll, in "Shylock" reprinted in abridged form in *Shakespeare: The Merchant of Venice*. Ed. by John Wilders, Casebooks Series (London, Macmillan, 1969) 47-58, quotes in a footnote on page 53 the following words uttered by the Jew Zarith: "Now by my soule 'twould my sprits much refresh / To tast a banquet all of Christian's flesh" (page 54); "Sweet gold, sweete Jewell! but the sweetest part / Of a Jewes feast is a Christian's heart" (page 60).

Christian example? - why revenge! The villainy *you* teach *me* I will execute, and it shall go hard but *I* will better the instruction. (III. i, 47-66)

In this speech, his figure rises to an almost heroic stature as he becomes the representative and revenger of his people. He is almost comparable to Satan in the first book of Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Thus, the constant references to Shylock as a devil may have been prompted not only by racist prejudice or as a part of the characterization of Shylock as an evil, twisted figure with great rhetorical powers who can even "cite Scripture for his purpose" (I. i, 93), but also as an indication of his being a malcontent.¹

Just once, there is a reversal in the rôles of Christians and Jews. The Jew was, as a rule, subject to prejudice, discrimination, persecution and mass-murder in pogroms as the scapegoat of Christian societies whenever they faced problems such as the failure of crops or the affliction of plague. In Shakespeare's play, Shylock becomes the would-be victimizer, not the victim. This inversion of rôles, which is again reversed at the end of the play, is a result of the combination of the theme of revenge, actually an illustration of the biblical Talion Law, of course, justified to some extent, and a peculiar rendering of the world-upside-down *topos* which was no doubt, quite shocking if not "subversive" for Elizabethan times.

Besides, with his insistence on his bond, Shylock not only cherishes his personal revenge on Antonio, but also the disruption of Venetian law and order. If he has not one thing he will try to achieve the other:

And by our holy Sabbath have I sworn
To have the due and forfeit of my bond, -
If you deny it, let the danger light
Upon your charter and your city's freedom. (IV. i, 36-39)

The pound of flesh which I demand of him
Is dearly bought, 'tis mine and I will have it:
If you deny me, fie upon your law!
There is no force in the decrees of Venice.
I stand for judgment, - answer, shall I have it? (IV. i, 99-103)

Of course Shylock is bound to fail, but the main reason why he fails is not that he is a Jew, but because he is a malcontent, because he supposes a threat to society and he is a double-dealer, a revenger. Malcontents and revengers, whatever their race, are always punished in Elizabethan and Jacobean plays. In *The Merchant of Venice*, a comedy after all, Shylock suffers his downfall, but this does not cost him his life.²

Shylock is also the archetypal father of Greek New Comedy and Roman *fabula palliata*. That is another reason why he suffers deceit and derision in this play, why his plans are utterly thwarted.

He is just another ring in the long chain of fooled fathers in comedies inspired by the New Comedy example. As Robert S. Miola points out:

¹ John Marston links Malevole with Lucifer in *The Malcontent*: "This Malevole is one of the most prodigious affections that ever conversed with nature; a man, or rather a monster; more discontent than Lucifer when he was thrust out of the presence." (I. ii, 17-20). The connection between malcontentedness and the Devil is manifest in Iago. On the other hand, as it has often been pointed out, both Shylock and Iago may be a derivation of the Vice of the old Morality plays.

² However, Jonathan Miller's 1970 production for The National Theatre Company, with Laurence Olivier as Shylock, showed an added epilogue at the end of the play in which Jessica received a letter presumably telling her about the death of her father while the Kaddish, the Jewish funeral song, was sung off-stage. (This production is available on video in its TV version: *The Merchant of Venice*, ATV, 1974, Renaissance Classics, Polygram Video, 1992, VHS PAL 083 394 3).

the New Comedic agelast enriches Shakespeare's portrayal of Shylock; there is even a suggested *locus classicus*, Euclio in *Aulularia*, who futilely attempts to lock up Phaedria and who suffers comic distress over the loss of ducats and daughter. (10)

It is possible to add to Miola's remark that Shylock corresponds to the *senex* archetype in as much as he is also undone by an *adulescens*, or two, rather. In classical New Comedy, the usual plot presents a young man or *adulescens* who intends to marry the old man's daughter. The old man or *senex* opposes the match but at the end of the play he must yield to the desires of the couple. Later, in the Renaissance plays written in the New Comedy tradition, the *adulescens* becomes the Prodigal as a result of the influence of the Parable of the Prodigal Son in Luke: 15 which also deals with the relationship between a father and his off-spring.

In *The Merchant of Venice*, Shakespeare complicates things a bit and doubles the amount of prodigals that fool Shylock by following and combining both classical example and Renaissance tradition in an ingenious way.

The relationship between Lorenzo and Jessica derives from classical New Comedy. The change that Shakespeare introduces is that Shylock ignores what is going on between his daughter and the Christian, he only finds out when it is too late, once they have eloped and stolen a large amount of his money and jewels. Shylock, of course, opposes and hates the very idea of the match, but circumstances force him to accept their love and even provide for them after he loses the trial.

Lorenzo and Jessica's affair is "an unthrift love" as Lorenzo defines it in V. i, 16. Lorenzo is a prodigal although he is not called that in the play and he makes Jessica a new convert to Christianity and also prodigality. Soon they waste what they steal from Shylock and become improvident, that is why Lorenzo, on hearing Nerissa's news about Shylock's deed of gift, compares the document to "manna in the way / of starved people" (V. i, 294-5).

Bassanio is, nonetheless, the clearest example of the prodigal figure in *The Merchant of Venice*. Bassanio defines himself as such in I. i, 129 and Shylock tells Jessica the young man is "The prodigal Christian" in II. v, 5 when he is about to go to have supper with him. It is Bassanio's prodigality what gets Antonio into trouble, for it is for Bassanio's sake that Antonio accepts the bond with Shylock. Therefore, it is Bassanio the prodigal that sets in motion a chain of events that end up in Shylock's ruin. Therefore, Shylock is undone, however indirectly and unintentionally, by another prodigal.

Actually, we can think that there is a third prodigal involved in Shylock's downfall since the Jew also refers to Antonio as: "a bankrupt, a prodigal, who dare scarce show his head on the Rialto" (III. i, 39-40). However, I doubt that Antonio can be considered an *adulescens* for he seems to be older than Bassanio and a paternal figure for him.

Last and by no means least in the analysis of Shylock as a New Comedy *senex* comes the importance of his very name. Shylock is a denotative name and the use of denotative names for characters was another characteristic of New Comedy and *fabulla palliata*. I believe that Shylock is a compound that joins the words "shy" and "lock" in a name that is in consonance with the fact that he is a usurer and a miser and he insists so much that Jessica locks the house and closes the casements for fear of masquers in II. v. In this respect, it is possible that the name implies a pun with "shycock", an obscure slang word that the *Oxford English Dictionary* defines as "a wary or cowardly person; also 'One who keeps within doors for fear of bailiffs' (Grose *Dict. Vulgar T.*, 1785)".

The last two facets of Shylock, his being a usurer and a miser are closely related to those of his Jewishness and being a New Comedy father, that is why we might be tempted to think that they are secondary. It is true that usury was an inherent part of the Jew archetype and prejudice against Jews and miserliness is already present in Plautus's *Aulularia* as Euclio becomes obsessed with keeping the money he has found all to himself, nevertheless, I think we must consider these as separate facets in their own right because they are important traits that complement, link, and also clash with the other three facets of Shylock. Shylock's usury and miserliness link the archetype of the Jew with that of the New Comedy *senex* and they are the very aspects that make Shylock a

despicable character. The question is whether these facets are closer to the former archetype or the latter.

This brings my discussion of Shylock's character to the point in which I have to deal with how these facets are combined in the play. This is precisely what we have to observe and analyse once we know the different aspects that conform Shylock: we must study how Shakespeare uses the five facets to guide and prompt the responses of his audience.

If we consider the scenes in which Shylock appears, we will see they follow a four-part pattern which is indeed the development of Shylock's "tragedy". In I. iii, we first meet Shylock and find out that he is a Jew, a usurer and he plans revenge in the fashion of a malcontent. This is the protasis, so to speak, of his downfall. In III. i, we find the core or epitasis where all the five facets are concentrated and counterbalanced in a very short time. III. iii is the catastasis, the climactic point at which Shylock reveals the other characters his true nature as a cruel, relentless, unmerciful usurer and malcontent. Finally, in IV. i, we witness the resolution or catastrophe in which Shylock gets his punishment as a usurer, miser, malcontent, and unmerciful man at the hands of not so merciful Christians who fail to carry out what they preach.

To me, as regards to the combination of Shylock's facets, the most important part of this four-step pattern, of all the play, I dare say, is III. i, for here we find a masterpiece in the manipulation of characters to elicit different emotions and ideas in an audience, the best example of what Shakespeare does with Shylock, the key to grasp what his intentions were on creating this character.

The scene opens with Solanio and Salerio talking about the loss of one of Antonio's ships. Shylock joins them and Salerio starts mocking and teasing him about the loss of his daughter and the irrational conditions of the bond. From line forty-six, Shylock undergoes a rapid succession of emotions and moods in response to what the other characters say. Shakespeare focuses on a single facet of Shylock at a time and he does so to prompt our reactions to each particular aspect of the character.

Thus, Shylock, in the "Hath not a Jew eyes?" speech justifies the conditions of the bond, his desire for revenge with one of the best rhetoric pieces written in drama. Shylock portrays himself as a victim, as the discriminated and wronged Jew. He speaks about himself first, but then he makes the point extensive to all Jews and he sounds, as I said before, as a hero that will set things to rights between Christians and Jews. Shylock underlines the common humanity of Christians and Jews in a series of questions which Salerio and the audience cannot answer otherwise than by saying yes to all of them but for the last one. We agree with what Shylock says up to line fifty-nine. From line fifty-one to line fifty-nine, Shakespeare makes us feel sympathy for Shylock. This is the facet of Shylock as the ill-treated Jew. However, from line sixty we find a twist in his argumentation, he brings revenge to the foreground. Now we have mixed feelings as our sympathy for Shylock clashes with our rejection of his desire for revenge which is morally unjustifiable, a "villainy" as Shylock himself says in line sixty-five. Here the facet of Shylock-the-victimized-Jew is next to and overlaps with Shylock-the-malcontent creating a paradox similar to that which considers what was first, the egg or the hen?

In the conversation held by Tubal and Shylock, Shakespeare uses the latter's facets of miser and malcontent. We see that Shylock cares more for the money and jewels that Jessica has stolen and the money that the search for her costs him than for what may have happened to her. Actually, Shylock would rather see her dead at his feet than lose that fortune. When we hear Shylock's words, we, of course, censure him, we reject and despise him because he is such an uncaring, unnatural father, such a vile miser. His Jewishness is now farther in the background.

When Tubal alternates information on Antonio's bad luck and Jessica's wild expenses, we see that Shylock reacts in two different ways alternating his miser and malcontent facets depending on what he hears. Of course, Shakespeare uses Shylock's moods and the energy he shows in them to produce a comic effect, so that we find Shylock not only despicable but also laughable.

However, at the end of the scene, Shakespeare changes his portrayal of Shylock quite radically. He briefly introduces a new perspective in the character of Shylock which is not fully

developed in the play in order to counter-balance the negative aspects he has insisted upon. This new perspective is that of Shylock as a loving husband. Shylock is really hurt when he hears that Jessica stole and sold for a trifle the ring that his late wife Leah gave him as a present when he was a bachelor. We realize that the ring had a tremendous sentimental value for him, an indication that he also has feelings after all, that he is also a fellow human-being. The extent to which Shylock is hurt is evident in the last lines he utters in this scene. He still thinks of carrying out his revenge, but we can perceive that his mind is troubled by something else, certainly the memories of his long-lost wife which have been stirred in his memory by the news of the loss of his turquoise. We can appreciate this in the deflation of the linguistic energy he displayed in previous lines. In these last lines, Shylock repeats words and makes long pauses. The rhythm of his speech is slower. These are signs that his thinking is not as clear as in the rest of the scene. He sounds absent-minded, pensive, hurt, if not defeated.

Then, bearing in mind this scene, it is quite clear and evident what Shakespeare does with Shylock. He focuses on each of his facets in succession to make him show different aspects of himself which, at the same time, provoke diverse, even contradictory reactions in his audience. Shakespeare's manipulation of Shylock is so fast and superb that we hardly realize that Shakespeare also manipulates us as an audience. The rapid juxtaposition of Shylock's facets confuses us completely. Shakespeare knew very well what he was doing when he decided to join in one character the archetypes of the Jew, the malcontent, the New Comedy father, the usurer and the miser. He knew that their coalescence would certainly create tensions not also within Shylock himself, but also in the way the spectators would react to what they heard and saw. Just as Shylock is a rounder character because of this combination of facets, our response to the play is also more complex.¹

Then, how does this affect the issue of anti-semitism in the play? Well, in fact, the answer is quite simple, all we have to do is to be aware of Shakespeare's manipulation of both Shylock and us, the audience, and see that in fact we have to consider each facet individually, only thus we will realize that Shylock is not despicable or laughable because he is a Jew, but because he is a malcontent, a miser and a usurer. As a Jew he is a fellow human being and deserves our sympathy, as an old man whose feelings are hurt he is also worth our commiseration and pity. Therefore, we must be discerning spectators and readers and avoid being misled by appearances, a theme which is precisely underlined in *The Merchant of Venice*, we must not think that Shylock is just the embodiment of the archetypical Jew as the expression of anti-semitism, for he is not.

I would like to finish my intervention with a few words by way of a (tongue-in-cheek) disclaimer. In this paper I have referred to Shylock as a five-faceted character, I hope this metaphor of mine will not be misconstrued as a racist observation, let me assure you that it is not a cryptic criticism or jibe against Amsterdam or New York Jewish diamond dealers. In fact, I think it has more to do with my own appreciation and valuation of the play and Shylock in particular as jewels in the Shakespearean canon and gallery of characters respectively.

WORKS CITED

¹ It is also possible to consider Shylock as the embodiment of the Old Law, the Old Testament, as opposed to the New Law of the Gospels of the Venetian Christians. This would be a sixth facet. His insistence on carrying out what he thinks, his sticking to the letter of the bond contrasts, quite paradoxically, with the Christians who fail to practise what they say, they fail to follow their principles and prove to be more machiavellian than Shylock, who is wronged again, thus gaining in part our sympathy. For a good discussion of the trial scene and the darker side of the Christians' behaviour see A. D. Moody, *Shakespeare: Merchant of Venice*, Studies in English Literature, 21 (London, Edward Arnold, 1964) 38-44.

- Andrews, John F. 1993: Afterword. *The Merchant of Venice* by William Shakespeare. Ed. by John F. Andrews. London, Dent. 202-19.
- Burrow, J. A. and T. Turville-Petre, eds. 1992: *The Peterborough Chronicle*. > *A Book of Middle English*. Oxford, Blackwell. 73-8, ll. 74-82.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey (1958) 1984: *The Prioress's Tale*. > *The Canterbury Tales*. Ed. by A. C. Cawley. Everyman's Library. London, Dent. 182-191.
- Loomba, Ania 1994: The Color of Patriarchy: Critical Difference, Cultural Difference, and Renaissance Drama. > *Women, "Race", and Writing in the Early Modern Period*. Ed. by Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker. London: Routledge, 17-34.
- Marston, John (1604) 1967: *The Malcontent*. Ed. by Bernard Harris. New Mermaids Series. London, Ernest Benn / New York, W. W. Norton.
- Miola, Robert S. 1994: *Shakespeare and Classical Comedy. The Influence of Plautus and Terence*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Moody, A. D. 1964: *Shakespeare: Merchant of Venice*. Studies in English Literature 21. London, Edward Arnold.
- Plautus, Titus Maccius 1916: *Aulularia, or The Pot of Gold*. > *Plautus*. 3 vols. Trans. by P. Nixon. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press / London, William Heinemann, rptd. 1979, vol. I, 231-323.
- Shakespeare, William (1974) 1992: *The Merchant of Venice*. ATV, Renaissance Classics, Polygram Video. VHS PAL 083 394 3.
- Shakespeare, William 1955: *The Merchant of Venice*. Ed. by John Russell Brown. The Arden Shakespeare, 2nd Series. London, Routledge, rptd. 1989.
- Stoll, E. E. (1927) 1969: Shylock. > *Shakespeare: The Merchant of Venice*. Ed. by John Wilders. Casebook Series. London, Macmillan.

* * *

Gender Ambiguity and Desire in *Twelfth Night*

María del Rosario Arias Doblas

UNIVERSITY OF MÁLAGA

Recent criticism of Shakespearean comedies has significantly focused on topics such as cross-dressing and the role of the boy actor. Feminist scholars have undertaken especially the study of comedies like *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1590-94), *The Merchant of Venice* (1596-98), *As You Like It* (1599) and *Twelfth Night* (1601), in which the female protagonist disguises herself as a man. In addition, there has been extensive comment on the theatrical fact of an all-male acting company on the Renaissance stage in England. Therefore, it seems that any approach to the above-mentioned comedies cannot be made without some controversy.

In 1975 the feminist critic, Juliet Dusinberre, offered an optimistic view of the Shakespearean female characters; according to her thesis, Shakespeare, in portraying witty and high-spirited heroines, transcends patriarchal social prejudices about women and sees “men and women as equal in a world which declared them unequal” (quoted in Hidalgo 1987: 167). Later Dusinberre relates the freedom and independence enjoyed by Shakespeare’s heroines with the actual situation of women in the Renaissance. Thus Dusinberre belongs to that first group of critics that Lisa Jardine distinguishes within a feminist perspective (1983: 1-8).

Other feminists such as Clara Claiborne Park take a very different approach to Shakespeare’s drama since, for them, Shakespeare had a limited view of women as did the society he lived in. In this sense, Park argues that once Portia, Rosalind or Viola disguise themselves as men they can be as saucy as they like, however if they do not wear male garments, “feminine assertiveness is viewed with hostility” (108). Moreover, these crossdressed women take their male disguise off willingly, suiting thus male expectations.

Yet it is Linda Woodbridge who concentrates on Dusinberre’s thesis and wonders if Shakespearean comic heroines succeed in disrupting the gender system once crossdressed. Woodbridge comes to the conclusion that “a woman’s essential nature (...) shines through any kind of clothes” (155). Therefore there is no such a gap opened in the gender system, although some plays participate more actively in the recuperative process than others, as it will be developed below.

The fact that female parts were played by boy actors cannot be ignored and a great number of scholars have devoted their studies to the transvestite actor. Lisa Jardine stands out among those critics and - together with Kathleen McLuskie and Jean E. Howard - belongs to the “materialist feminism” against the idealism defended by Dusinberre, for example. However different their positions are, all of them agree in considering gender as socially formed. Therefore gender changes across time and also depends on the culture in which it is embedded - here, early modern England -. Jardine privileges the boy actor and focuses on contemporary comment this convention caused among antitheatricalists and polemicists such as Stubbes and Rainoldes. Lisa Jardine points out that playing a woman’s role “is an act for a male audience’s appreciation” (31), consequently the boy actor is considered a sign of homosexual energies in the theatre, an object of male desire. Not only does Jardine argue for the erotic component on the Elizabethan stage, but also Stephen Orgel thinks “the basic form of response to theater is erotic” (1989: 17), hence the assumption that there is an element of homosexual eroticism in the performance of a play.

Behind all these assertions lies the importance of clothes in the Renaissance. Through sumptuary legislation there was an attempt to regulate social station, social role and gender,

especially in urban settings where some women did crossdress at the turn of the sixteenth century. Although actors were allowed to violate the sumptuary laws, this did not stop the antitheatricalists from railing against the transvestite theatre, which was seen as unnatural. These laws came to an end when James I succeeded to the throne (Garber 1992: 23).

Twelfth Night is an excellent play in which to explore issues such as transvestism, gender and the importance of clothing. The female protagonist of this comedy, Viola - who “can sing both high and low” (II, iii, 35) -, is one of the most fascinating Shakespearean characters. Unlike *As You Like It*, nothing much happens in the comedy itself since the focus is on the crossdressed Viola and the emotions s/he arouses. Besides, Viola/Cesario is a figure who can be thought to question not only sexual difference but also gender identity. Therefore, in this paper I propose to examine these ideas in detail and, if possible, to connect them with the critical trends already mentioned.

Viola appears disguised as Cesario in the very first moments of the play and remains so. Even though s/he is significantly ambiguous - at least, for the other characters -, Viola does not hesitate to show her feminine subjectivity as soon as possible: “Whoe’er I woo, myself would be his wife” (I, v, 41). Ironically, she must woo Olivia on Orsino’s behalf as a page, which puts her in a subservient position. Dependency is, in Lisa Jardine’s terms, a shared characteristic between the heroine - Viola - and the male personification - Cesario - so “the woman preserves her ‘chaste’ self by transposing female dependency into male dependency: page instead of wife or daughter” (25). In contrast with this assertion, Valerie Traub affirms that critics usually fail to recognize the fervour, self-assertion and interest that Viola shows as Cesario when wooing Olivia (130):

VIOLA: Make me a willow cabin at your gate,
And call upon my soul within the house;
Write loyal cantons of contemnèd love,
And sing them loud even in the dead of night; (I, v, 223-26)

Often praised for its lyricism, this speech delivered by Viola mocks romantic love as Rosalind does in *As You Like It* but the protagonist of *Twelfth Night* makes a different approach since she gets herself involved as an unrequited lover and takes a new, unexpected point of view (Leggatt 1973: 234).

Feelings indeed play an important role in the comedy --especially sadness and melancholy. Viola feels unhappy with the male garments she is wearing and conveys her emotions in a soliloquy where she also rejects the misunderstandings the male disguise creates:

VIOLA: Disguise, I see thou art a wickedness,
Wherein the pregnant enemy does much. (II, ii, 24-25)

In my opinion, this speech captures the main difference between Viola and other crossdressed heroines such as Julia, Portia and Rosalind: for the first time, the crossdressed female figure takes into account the psychological implications brought about by the male disguise. As she calls herself “poor monster” (II, ii, 30) - a term usually applied to hermaphrodites and crossdressed women in the Renaissance -, Viola acknowledges “the complexities of homoeroticism by surrounding it with anxiety” (Hayles 1980: 234-35). Viola has no female companion to share her worries with, so she makes use of asides and soliloquies to turn inward psychologically. Conversely, in *As You Like It* Rosalind can open her heart to Celia, her cousin, illustrating a good example of female bonds.

Scenes like the one just commented on have led many scholars to consider the “homoeroticism residing in theatrical transvestism” (Traub 1992: 120) because not only does Orsino establish a close friendship with Cesario, but also Olivia gets infatuated with the saucy boy --who is really a woman in the theatrical fiction and a boy in reality. Although it is true that Viola/Cesario remains sexually ambiguous until the end and that much emphasis is actually given to her equivocal relationships with other characters, there are feminist critics like Jean E. Howard who do not think that transvestite theatre “promoted solely homoerotic desire” (Howard 1994: 109).

As far as gender is concerned, Viola's behaviour is seen as unnatural (Woodbridge 1984: 153-54): the audience always knows that s/he is really a woman who is longing for the happy solution. When Viola / Cesario tells Orsino a story about a woman in order to make him aware of his own selfishness, she is, in a way, telling him her own story:

ORSINO: And what's her history?

VIOLA: A blank, my lord. She never told her love,
But let concealment like a worm i'th'bud
Feed on her damask cheek. She pined in thought,
And with a green and yellow melancholy
She sat like Patience on a monument,
Smiling at grief. (II, iv, 105-11)

Viola skilfully portrays an image "drawn from her own experience" (Leggatt 1973: 237) and tries to awake Orsino's feelings for someone else. Catherine Belsey does not agree with this interpretation and argues that in fact there is "a speaker who at this moment occupies a place which is not precisely masculine or feminine" (187) since in this scene the notion of identity has been altered. Moreover, the whole play seems to be subversive because there is a possibility of blurring sexual difference, according to Belsey. It is not Viola, then, who is sitting patiently, smiling at grief --Viola complains about her own personal situation now and again. Another interesting analysis has been offered by Lisa Jardine. For her, the boy actor "armed with his arsenal of female characteristics and mannerisms" (33) displays a stereotype of women: patience. Many literary works in the Renaissance make reference to the virtue of patience by using two archetypal images: Lucrece and Grissill. The imprint of Grissill is easily found in Shakespearean female characters such as Julia, Viola and Imogen, who, finding themselves in a difficult situation, show a preference for passivity and silent enduring of whatever patriarchy proscribes.

Interestingly, in the introduction to the New Cambridge Shakespeare edition of *Twelfth Night*, Elizabeth Story Donno points out that in some circumstances Viola "remains quite surprisingly taciturn" (10). Two episodes could actually illustrate this idea: on the one hand, the meeting of Antonio - sea captain and Sebastian's friend - and Viola/Cesario, mistaken for her twin brother, Sebastian; and on the other, the attitude of Viola when Orsino threatens her at the very end of the play:

ORSINO: I'll sacrifice the lamb that I do love

To spite a raven's heart within a dove. (V, i, 119-20)

In the confrontation between Viola / Cesario and Sir Andrew Aguecheek, the female protagonist reveals her real nature in an aside: "Pray God defend me! A little thing would make me tell / them how much I lack of a man" (II, iv, 255-56). As stated previously, the audience is aware that underneath Cesario's clothes is a woman who feels uncomfortable with her male disguise. However, in this scene a metatheatrical reference, a reference to the boy actor who plays the role of Viola can be understood, so that the lines just quoted above can show a *double entendre*. In fact, ironies, puns, homosexual allusions and so on pervade the play to create the "most highly intricate misunderstandings" (Fortunati 1992: 108). If it is true that wearing male clothes can cause sexual confusion, as Belsey proposes - in opposition to Howard's thesis -, that threat is balanced with the protagonist's feminine subjectivity (Howard 1994: 113). Following Howard's line of argument, the heroine's transvestism is not such a problem for social order "if not accompanied by the political desire for a redefinition of female rights" (113).

In fact, both Lisa Jardine and Jean E. Howard argue that the real threat to the system is not Viola but Olivia. Olivia's passion for the page, Cesario, is comically presented when she decides to do without men at the beginning of the play. Ironically, it is Olivia - economically independent and self-sufficient - "whose eroticized relationship of 'service' with Cesario is most socially and sexually transgressive" (Jardine 1992: 33). Consequently, the unruly Olivia will be submitted to the control of a man, Sebastian. As Howard points out, the crossdressed Viola, the apparent threat to the patriarchal system, is rewarded whereas Olivia, the real threat to the social order, gets punished (112).

The homoerotic attachments come to an end with the heterosexual closure of the play when the androgynous Cesario splits up into two: Viola and Sebastian, where reality and imagination blur:

ANTONIO: An apple cleft in two is not more twin
Than these two creatures. (V, i, 207-08)

Despite the fact that Orsino still calls Viola *Cesario* and *boy* and that, visually, Viola does not wear women's attire at the end, in my opinion, there is no doubt that it is a heterosexual union on Viola's part --although it is not so clear on Orsino's, who has to transfer his passion for what he thought to be a page to a crossdressed woman. However, Viola's sexually ambiguous figure has led to recent scholars to privilege some issues such as eroticism and homoerotic feelings in their studying the play itself.

Even though no definite conclusion can be reached in a subject like this, I hope to have shown that both cross-dressing and sexual indeterminacy are crucial in Shakespearean comedies where a change of costume is involved. Controversial as they are, these topics provide extremely interesting ways of approaching these plays.

WORKS CITED

- Belsey, Catherine 1985: *Disrupting Sexual Difference: Meaning and Gender in the Comedies. Alternative Shakespeares*. > Drakakis, John ed. London, Methuen. 1992: 166-90.
- Donno, E. Story ed. 1985: *The New Cambridge Shakespeare. Twelfth Night*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Fortunati, Vita 1992: The 'Female' Page : Transvestism and 'Ambiguity' in Elizabethan Theatre Roles. *Proceedings of the II Conference of the Spanish Society for English Renaissance Studies*. > Fernández-Corugedo, S. G. ed. Oviedo, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo. 1992: 95-11.
- Garber, Marjorie 1992: *Vested Interests: Cross-dressing and Cultural Anxiety*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Hayles, Nancy K. 1980: Sexual Disguise. *Cymbeline. Modern Language Quarterly* 41. 3: 231-48.
- Hidalgo, Pilar 1987: Shakespeare y la crítica feminista. *Estudios literarios ingleses vol. 2: Shakespeare y el teatro de su época*. > Portillo, R. ed. Madrid, Cátedra. 1987: 161-80.
- Howard, Jean E. 1994: *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England*. London, Routledge.
- Jardine, Lisa 1983: *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*. Brighton, Harvester Press.
- Jardine, Lisa 1992: Twins and travesties: Gender, dependency and sexual availability in *Twelfth Night. Erotic Politics: Desire on the Renaissance Stage*. > Zimmerman, S. ed. New York and London, Routledge. 1992: 27-39.
- Leggatt, Alexander 1973: *Shakespeare's Comedy of Love*. London, Methuen.
- Orgel, Stephen 1989: Nobody's Perfect: Or Why Did the English Stage Take Boys for Women. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 88. 1: 7-29.
- Park, Clara Claiborne 1980: As We Like It: How a Girl Can Be Smart and Still Popular. *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*. > Swift Lenz, C. R., Greene, G., & Neely, C. T. eds. Urbana, University of Illinois Press. 1980: 100-31.
- Traub, Valerie 1992: *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Drama*. London and New York, Routledge.

Woodbridge, Linda 1984: *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540-1620*. Brighton, Harvester Press.

* * *

An isle full of noises, sounds and sweer airs:
Shakespeare's *The Tempest*
and Krzysztof Kieslowski's *Red*

Miguel Ángel González Campos

UNIVERSITY OF MÁLAGA

In his 1977 pioneering study of Shakespeare and film, entitled precisely *Shakespeare on Film*, Jack J. Jorgens established a useful distinction between *presentation*, *interpretation* and *adaptation* as three possibilities for cinematic versions of plays and novels, in decreasing degree of faithfulness to the original work (12-14). In this sense, Alden Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan point out that “*Adaptation* seems to have been the key to successful cinematic representation of *The Tempest*” (200). In fact, the filmmakers that have approached this play have always *adapted* it very freely to the silver screen. Even the films that are most easily recognizable as presenting Shakespeare's work, Peter Greenaway's *Prospero's Books* (1991) and Derek Jarman's *Tempest* (1980), have taken great liberties. In Jarman's film, for instance, the wedding masque takes the form of a show in which Elizabeth Welch sings a version of “Stormy Weather” while the rest of the characters dance happily. Significantly enough, a film clearly acknowledged as a cinematic presentation of *The Tempest*, *Forbidden Planet* (Fred McLeod Wilcox, 1956), takes place in outer space.

In the field of film studies more and more attention is being paid to Shakespearean adaptations, appropriations and spin-offs. Thus, we find frequent references to the indebtedness to *The Tempest* of extremely varied films, such as Paul Mazurski's *Tempest* (1982), the Western *Yellow Sky* (William A. Wellman, 1948), or even *The Jackals* (R. D. Webb, 1967), and hosts of Shakespearean scholars have analysed them thoroughly with the original play in mind. Given the growing interest in the subject in recent years, I find it surprising that almost nobody (a short review by Vicente Molina Foix would be the exception) seems to have noticed the parallelisms and connections between Krzysztof Kieslowski's *Three Colours: Red* (1993) and Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. In my opinion, they are not merely coincidences, but the result of Kieslowski's conscious attempt to impregnate his film with echoes of this play that constitute the “noises, sounds and sweet airs” which I refer to in the title of this paper.

Three Colours: Red is the last film in the trilogy *Three Colours* which, taking as a leit motif the three colours of the French flag, presents a reflection upon the three emblematic concepts of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity (*Red* deals with the last one). To begin with, I cannot help mentioning a first (non-textual but con-textual) parallelism between *The Tempest* and *Red*. Both works were the farewell of their authors to their Art since, after finishing them, both retired to the countryside to live their last peaceful days. Kieslowski, who often declared himself to be a reader and a true admirer of Shakespeare, repeatedly said that *Red* would be his last film; his death in 1996 has definitely made it so, and it is tempting to remember Prospero's words at the end of *The Tempest*, when thinking about his future life he envisions a time when “every third thought shall be my grave”). In each one of these last works we find a central character (Prospero in *The Tempest* and the judge in *Red*) who is in control and in the end gives up his power. Many film critics have seen in the judge the alter-ego of the director, in the same way that Shakespearean critics such as Thomas Campbell or Frances Yates have in the past seen in Prospero an imaginative

paradigm of Shakespeare himself as a poet. In both cases critics have insisted on the identification (in Shakespeare's case somewhat problematic) between creator and character in the work.

In *Red* Kieslowski presents the story of Valentine, a young model who meets a retired judge after running over his dog. He lives surrounded by books in complete isolation, devoting his time to spying on his neighbours' phone conversations. After that meeting a chain of strange coincidences develops, ending with a shipwreck which brings together Valentine and Auguste, a young law student. The most obvious parallelism of the story with *The Tempest* lies in the character of the judge, who resembles Prospero in several aspects. Both were former authority figures that now live on a distant island, a real physical one in the case of Prospero and a spiritual one in the case of the judge, who lives in his house isolated from the rest of society. In both cases this "exile" has been motivated by usurpation: Prospero was deprived of Milan and the judge lost the woman he loved when a more powerful man crossed her path.

The character of Valentine parallels Miranda in *The Tempest*. Although she is not the daughter of the judge, who explicitly says at the beginning of the film that he has no daughters, her close relation with him in the course of the story develops a father-daughter bond that makes him into a symbolical father figure for Valentine, whose real father is deliberately shown as being absent. While Kieslowski gives us some pieces of information about her mother and brother nothing is said about Valentine's father, only that he might not have been her real father.

Valentine is a modern independent woman. As a Miranda figure she is certainly a 20th century politically correct Miranda. However, she still has to learn from her father-figure, like Shakespeare's Miranda, discovering in this way a new reality she did not know, and reacting in a similar way. Thus when they first see their fathers' activities their initial reaction is horror. Miranda is horrified when she sees the tempest provoked by Prospero's magic, just as Valentine is horrified when she discovers the judge spying on his neighbours. After this horror both Miranda and Valentine have the same sympathetic reaction, and they ask Prospero and the judge to stop, since "the direful spectacle (...) touch'd/ the very virtue of compassion in [them]" (I, ii, 26-7). Similarly, both Valentine and Miranda serve as the dramatic excuse for the playwright and the filmmaker to tell us about the past. Right after rising the storm at the beginning of *The Tempest* Prospero tells Miranda about Milan and their past. In the same way, in *Red* the judge is giving an account of his own story to Valentine, precisely in a theater, when a violent storm which foreshadows the end of the film breaks out.

The basic situation of the central male characters in *The Tempest* and *Red* is therefore similar. Both are entirely devoted to their art, traditional magic for Prospero and the magic of information for the judge who spies on his neighbours through their phone conversations. Both will renounce their activities voluntarily in the end, and the resolution of the story will be closely dependent on this renunciation. The parallelism between both activities (Magic and spying) is, in my opinion, very wisely established by Kieslowski, and it presents interesting implications. Just as Shakespeare provided Prospero with Magic, the most powerful weapon he could conceive to restore the previous order, Kieslowski gives the judge the most precious source of magic power possibly available nowadays: information. Information becomes, in this way, 20th century magic. The information that the judge gets by eavesdropping on his neighbours is the source of his power, and gives him a magic aura similar to that of Prospero. The judge, for instance, seems to be able to foresee the reactions and behaviour of those he spies.

The parallelism between the magic of these two characters is also emphasized by Kieslowski. *The Tempest* opens with an example of Prospero's magic power, the storm that sinks the ship. Similarly, *Red* also begins by showing the essence of the judge's power, when we are taken in the astonishingly visual sea-voyage of a phone call through the phone lines, listening to a mixture of voices, conversations and echoes. But, besides, Kieslowski suggests in the film that the judge has some special powers not connected with the phone conversations, and that these powers guide the actions of the characters to the final resolution, when the encounter between Valentine and Auguste ("our brave new" Miranda and Ferdinand) takes place after the shipwreck. Just as we see the storm in *The Tempest* as the result of Prospero's magic, Kieslowski makes it clear, too, that the judge has a mysterious influence on the shipwreck of the ferry in *Red*. There is no other

justification for his apparently absurd insistence on knowing the exact date and time of the ferry she is going to take to go to England. The final storm in *Red* is also the result of some supernatural force. Kieslowski shows the phone call made by the judge to a weather service center, which informs him that the weather forecast announces a wonderful day on the date of Valentine's trip, and there are hints that he engineers the change in the weather that causes the shipwreck to bring Valentine and Auguste together.

Another moment when we are suggested that the judge has supernatural powers is in the initial encounter with Valentine. He seems to use his dog, Rita, to attract Valentine toward his house. She apparently runs over the dog, and takes her to her master's home where the doors are wide open and the judge is obviously waiting for Valentine. Kieslowski gives hints that the accident is not the product of chance, but the effects of a plan carefully designed by the judge. In fact, when Valentine gets in her car that day she feels a strange inexplicable disturbance, and a few seconds before she runs over the dog, her car radio begins to emit strange noises which distract her and make her run over the dog. These sounds are exactly the same ones we will hear in the judge's home. Valentine will keep Rita since the judge does not want her anymore, and a second time the dog will attract Valentine to the judge's house. In a way, the dog functions with Valentine as an Ariel that conducts her to the judge, just as Ariel leads several characters toward Prospero. Ferdinand's words about Ariel in *The Tempest* could be uttered by Valentine about "thence I have follow'd it, /or it hath drawn me rather" (I, ii, 396-7), and on the other hand, Prospero also uses spirits in the form of dogs at the end of *The Tempest* (IV, i) and Ariel himself even barks in one of his songs (I, ii).

In *The Tempest* Ariel is a presence that takes different shapes. In *Red* an Ariel-like presence is suggested by Kieslowski's use of the camera, as, for instance, when at one point it shows Auguste and then moves away in a remarkable travelling up without any cut and, with the smoothness of a bird's flight takes us through the window into Valentine's room to witness a phone conversation with her boyfriend. On several occasions the subjective camera suggests the point of view of an unseen character, as if the judge were a presence following her around. Another example is the moment when we see Valentine from behind a swing door through a subjective camera that does not correspond to the point of view of any character, suggesting in this way that someone is constantly watching and, at certain points, controlling her actions just as Prospero does with the rest of the characters in *The Tempest*.

The presence of the judge marks the action of *Red* in the same way that Prospero controls the events in *The Tempest*, including the "restaging" of his usurpation through the conspiracy of Antonio and Sebastian and that of Caliban, since this is an opportunity (as Orgel points out) "to rectify and to revise the past" (15). And this is exactly what the judge does in *Red* through the figure of Auguste, a law student that can be considered as an alter ego of the judge. What we see of the student's life re-enacts that of the judge, even in the smallest details. (Thus, for instance, before a crucial examination both dropped a book which opened exactly where the exam questions were shown, both like the fictional musician Van den Budenmayer, and both fall in love with a blonde woman two years older than them who eventually leaves them for a wealthier man.) Just as in *The Tempest* the restaging of the usurpation leads to a different ending thanks to Prospero's intervention, in *Red* the Judge also pulls the strings of his characters in order not to repeat his own story in Auguste. This time, as the judge envisions in a dream, the young lawyer will not be exiled from the kingdom of love and will find the happiness the Judge could not enjoy. What has been said about Miranda and Ferdinand is equally valid for Valentine and Auguste: they "[embody] the hope without which we could not live" (James, 152).

However, as recent criticism on *The Tempest* has pointed out, the hope and the restorative vision which appears at the end of *The Tempest* is limited. As Orgel says, at the end of the play "repentance remains (...) a largely unachieved goal, forgiveness is ambiguous at best (and) the clear ideal of reconciliation grows cloudy as the play concludes" (Orgel, 13). We only have to think in this sense of the suspicious silence of Antonio or the uncertain destiny of Caliban. This may be the reason why we readers can sense the "overwhelming impression of sadness that the play transmits through its happy ending" (Marienstras, 183). And this is exactly the feeling we get at the end of *Red*, where we find the same restorative vision that is clearly present in *The Tempest*

and, at the same time, on a deeper level, a much bleaker and gloomier vision of this restoration. *Red* has an apparently happy ending in which the heroes of the trilogy *Three Colours* reappear, miraculously saved from the shipwreck, and the audience is expected to share the Judge's smile of satisfaction. On second thoughts we remember that, in order to join Valentine and Auguste, more than 1400 innocent people have drowned. Can such a terrible disaster be a happy ending for a film that is, paradoxically, about fraternity?

I have only mentioned some of the more relevant parallelisms between *Red* and *The Tempest*. Other elements that could have been studied include the use of water imagery, the central role played by music in both works, or, crucially, the issue of forgiveness versus revenge that seems to mark both stories. Significantly enough, the judge is happy to remember how once he acquitted a sailor even though he was guilty; his lenient sentence, however, allowed the sailor to start a new life and find a new place as a constructive member of society.

Going back to the first idea that I presented at the beginning of this paper that *The Tempest* has always been adapted very freely, my claim is that, on the whole, there are enough similarities, echoes and intended reverberations of important aspects of *The Tempest* in Kieslowski's *Red* to justify an attentive reading of the film with Shakespeare's play in mind. I believe that a cross-study of these two works would enrich both the field of Shakespearean criticism and film studies, and this paper is a first approximation to the topic.

WORKS CITED

- James, D. G. 1967: *The Dream of Prospero*. Oxford, OUP.
- Jorgens, Jack J. 1977: *Shakespeare on Film*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.
- Marienstrass, Richard 1985: *New Perspectives in the Shakespearean World*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Molina Foix, Vicente 1994: Tres Colores, Rojo in *Fotogramas* 1813: 11.
- Orgel, Stephen ed. 1985: *W. Shakespeare: The Tempest*. Oxford, OUP.
- Vaughan Alden, T. & Vaughan, Virginia Mason 1993: *Shakespeare's Caliban*. Cambridge, CUP.

* * *

“He hourly humanizes”: Transformations and Appropriations of Shakespeare’s Caliban¹

Sofía Muñoz Valdivieso

UNIVERSIDAD DE MÁLAGA

The list of characters in *The Tempest* describes Caliban as “a sa(l)vage and deformed slave” and the text itself is full of conflicting evidence as to the shape of this bewildering creature that is referred to, among other epithets, as “fish”, “monster”, “beast”, “tortoise” and “devil”. The many pejorative names he is given in the course of the play have opened the way for multiple possibilities when envisioning his grotesque appearance. But the text also suggests at other points that he has a recognizable human form. For example, Prospero speaks of Caliban as the only human-shaped creature on the island when they first arrived, and when Miranda meets Ferdinand (I, ii) she refers to Caliban as the third man she has ever seen (although later in Act III, she speaks of Ferdinand as the *second* man she has ever known).

Caliban has indeed learned how to use the gift of human language that Prospero claims to have given him, and although Caliban insists that language only serves him to curse his master, to him belong some of the most beautiful lines in the play. In a sense, however, we could say that this gift of language has not allowed Caliban to speak for himself. We hear about his past in the play mainly through Prospero and Miranda, and throughout the years readers have felt that they had to speak for Caliban in a great variety of ways, telling his story and discussing his condition. Thus, “each age has appropriated and reshaped him to suit its needs and assumptions, for Caliban’s image has been incredibly flexible, ranging from an aquatic beast to a noble savage, with innumerable intermediate manifestations” (Vaughan & Vaughan, ix). It is not surprising that Caliban should have led to such a variety of different readings, for he is one of Shakespeare’s most enigmatic creations, and he belongs to a play that has also been read in a variety of ways. As has been pointed out, more than other plays *The Tempest* has changed shape in time: “What it ‘means’ seems to be continually on the move [and] has always been a challenge” (Daniells, 11). The same is true for Caliban: he has remained through the ages a puzzling figure for readers, who have variously interpreted both his outer and his inner nature.

Clearly “part of our difficulty in absorbing Caliban is his originality, even in Shakespeare’s cosmos of characters” (Bloom, 2). It is difficult to establish a definite source for Caliban, who seems to be an original composite image of many previous literary and cultural traditions. The general assumption is that “Shakespeare drew on a variety of existing historical and literary models and his own perspicacity to form a wholly new character” (Vaughan / Vaughan, 25). There are some elements in Caliban of the wild man figure present in literature and folklore since the early Middle Ages, the famous green man of English popular festivities which was incorporated into Tudor and Elizabethan pageantry as a symbol of the controlled forces of nature.² Shakespeare

¹ Research for this paper has been funded by the Spanish Ministry of Education, *Plan de Investigación y Promoción del Conocimiento*, DIGCYT Research Project PS 94/0106.

² “During the establishment of Tudor rule, the traditional wodehouse had been appropriated for ideological purposes in royal entertainments. Wild men shot fireworks on the Thames during Anne Boleyn’s 1533 coronation and frequently appeared in entertainments for Queen Elizabeth. In spectacles designed to celebrate the monarch’s

was also probably influenced by a long tradition of monsters present in poetry, story-telling, travel accounts and so on. He surely had access to Pliny's *Historie of the world*, a widely read book in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance in which he surely found references to wonders in ancient Greece. Among other possible literary sources for Caliban we find Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, antimasque figures in early 17th-century masques, and maybe some characters from the tradition of the originally Italian *commedia dell'arte*. Caliban partakes of features of all of them and shows exclusive and definite allegiance to none of them.

The same is true for non-literary sources. It is impossible to ascertain for sure the exact contribution of the historical context to the shaping of Caliban. In general, Caliban has been connected with America much more than with Africa, even though his mother Sycorax is described in the play as having Algerian ancestry and the island is close to the Tunisian coast. Shakespeare was in all probability influenced by papers of the Virginia Company describing a shipwreck off the Bermudas in 1609. The importance of the so-called Bermuda pamphlets in *The Tempest* was noticed as early as 1808, and it is generally acknowledged today that travel literature connected with the New World was one of the major influences on the play. The accounts of the shipwreck of the *Sea Venture* and its miraculous salvation, "much in the news in the year just preceding *The Tempest*, have long been seen as a relevant context for the play by all but a few very critics" (Skura, 43).¹ The name "Caliban" has been taken as a sign that Shakespeare wanted to suggest the native of the New World, "Caliban" being an anagram of the word "cannibal" or, alternatively, of the word "Carib". If this is the case then, Shakespeare presented an image of the American native that is a far cry from the ideal noble savage. This is a point that we will return to later, as it is a controversial issue in recent criticism. Caliban as the native aboriginal is a widely accepted interpretation today, although there are some dissenting voices that insist that if Shakespeare intended Caliban as a portrait of the native American, he certainly failed, since "from the Restoration until the late 1890s, Caliban appeared on stage and in criticism as almost everything but an Indian" (Vaughan 1988, 138).

In briefly considering how each age has in turn shaped Caliban to suit its assumptions, we must remember that Restoration and 18th-century readings of *The Tempest* were determined by Dryden and Davenant's version, entitled *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island. A Comedy*, first performed in 1667 and published in 1670. This adaptation remained extremely popular well into the 18th century. The authors keep only about one third of the original Shakespearean text, and they "try to restore what they think of as classical balance by giving Caliban a sister called Sycorax, Miranda a sister called Dorinda, and Ariel a fiancée" (Daniell, 31). We could say that they are taking to its extreme a pattern of pairings and oppositions already present in the play. They also introduce a young man called Hippolito. He is Prospero's foster son and indirectly defines Caliban by offering a foil to him. Hippolito represents humanity in a state of nature, but he is able to learn courtly arts and manners; he is, unlike Caliban, perfectible. In fact, the cast list for *The Enchanted Island* does not use the description for Caliban in the original *Tempest* ("A salvage and deformed slave"); it refers to Caliban and his new sister as "Two monsters of the Isle", and the text of the play describes them as "half-fish". Dryden and Davenant severely reduced in their version Caliban's speeches, including the beautiful lines in which he expresses his love for the island, its magic sounds and airs, and the result is that he is, unlike Shakespeare's, a fully insensitive monster. Given that their changes of the play were influential both on theatrical performances and on critical responses to *The Tempest* for a long time, in general we can say that in the Restoration and 18th century the role of Caliban on the stage was relatively minor and he usually appeared as a monster with grotesque qualities.

The Restoration *Tempest* dominated the stage for the most part until 1838, when the original text by Shakespeare was again revived in a production by William Charles Macready. Now Caliban becomes a more important character and his portrayal reflects the more sympathetic

power, wisdom, and beauty, the wild man represented the natural forces she controlled." (Vaughan & Vaughan, 65-66).

¹ Skura mentions two exceptions: E. E. Stoll and Northrop Frye.

conception of the Romantic critics. We see it in the writings of Samuel Taylor Coleridge and William Hazlitt, although for Coleridge Caliban still is not fully human, since he lacks the moral sense that (even more than intellectual powers) distinguishes man from the animals. In response to Coleridge, Hazlitt takes a more political stance on Caliban's situation and argues that Caliban and not Prospero was legitimately entitled to ruling the island. For the first time it is suggested that Caliban is the victim of oppression, which implies a first implicit criticism of the Prospero figure. In the different performances of *The Tempest* on both sides of the Atlantic in the mid-19th century Caliban retains some elements of the 18th-century monster but he also begins to suggest features of the 19th-century rebel. Although Caliban is still fairly bestial in his attributes, he is more than a monster: he begins to be "the focus of pity and human understanding" (Vaughan & Vaughan, 105).

As the 19th century advanced and Darwinism became an important intellectual force, Caliban was seen in a new light as the amphibian ancestor of our own race. Caliban's supposed fishlike appearance in the play was interpreted within the Darwinian framework, and seen as perfectly consistent with the claim that human beings originally developed from some type of aquatic creature. A good example of this Darwinian Caliban is the protagonist of Robert Browning's 1864 poem "Caliban Upon Setebos", an amphibian Caliban who reflects upon his creator (the subtitle of the poem is "Or Natural Theology in the Island") and who describes himself as a "lumpish" "sea-beast" with split toe-nails. The growing scholarly interest in Darwinian theories of evolution did not reach stage productions until late in the 19th century, when Caliban was cast as a creature half way between an animal and a human being, with definite physical features which suggested at times his amphibian origins, but more likely his connection with apes. This Darwinian Caliban persisted well into the 20th century, and Darwinian conceptions of Caliban were important on the stage until the 1960s, when initially among Third World thinkers and literary critics and later in the Anglo-American academic world, colonial interpretations of *The Tempest* began to appear.¹

In fact, colonial readings of *The Tempest* have become predominant in recent years. Thus, in a 1992 collection of articles on the character of Caliban, its editor Harold Bloom indicates that "the politically correct article on Shakespeare these days is likely to be called 'Caliban and the Discourse of Colonialism'" (Bloom, 1). This is part of a general interest in colonial readings, which are still a "hot" issue in the 1990s. Thus, the January 1995 issue of the PMLA was devoted to the special topic "Colonialism and the Postcolonial Condition", and the editor indicates that the six essays in the issue had to be selected out of 117 submissions, which he describes as "a record number".

The issue of colonialism in *The Tempest* had of course been perceived by earlier critics. The first Shakespearean critic to insist that Caliban was Shakespeare's rendering of the American native, although there had been scattered references in earlier texts, was Sidney Lee at the end of the 19th century. He initially spoke of Bermuda as Prospero's island in 1898, and later, in a 1913 article entitled "Caliban's Visits to England", he argued that Shakespeare attempted "in Caliban a full-length portrait of the aboriginal inhabitant of the New World" (quoted in Bloom, 20). For Lee, Shakespeare's view of American natives is clearly presented through this character in *The Tempest*:

To Shakespeare the western native was a human being endowed with live senses and appetites, with aptitudes for mechanical labour, with some veneration, knowledge and command of the resources of nature, but lacking moral sense, moral control, and ratiocination (quoted in Bloom, 21).

Lee is the early representative of those critics who think that in Caliban Shakespeare was presenting the contemporary negative conception of American Indians as shrew, rebellious and intoxicated. Within colonial readings of *The Tempest*, however, the predominant vision today is that of Caliban as the dispossessed victim, a noble native who is initially generous to the invaders

¹ Caliban was frequently envisioned as the colonial victim in the 1960s and 1970s; in the 1980s Caliban came to represent other marginalized groups, not necessarily in a colonial context.

of his island only to be betrayed and enslaved. Thus Shakespeare is seen as implicitly criticizing colonialism by critics such as Stephen Greenblatt. In Greenblatt's view:

[Shakespeare's] imaginative mobility enables him to display cracks in the glacial front of princely power and to record a voice, the voice of the displaced and oppressed, that is heard scarcely anywhere else in his own time (Greenblatt, 575).

The colonial readings of critics such as Greenblatt clearly go against the positive view of Prospero as the great educator in earlier critics, who interpreted colonial facts in a complacent way, and basically shared G. Wilson Knight's praise of Prospero as representing England's "colonizing, especially her will to raise savage peoples from superstition and blood-sacrifice, taboos and witchcraft and the attendant fears and slaveries, to a more enlightened exercise" (Knight, 255).

As we can see, the fictional facts in *The Tempest* have been variously interpreted and the figure of Caliban has changed accordingly. Readers and criticism have "generally seen much more in Caliban than Prospero does" (Orgel 25), and this is the idea that the title of my paper refers to. The sentence "He hourly humanizes" is said by Miranda in a 1797 very free adaptation of *The Tempest*, when she tries to convince her father to take Caliban with them to Milan, arguing that his nature has quickly improved and that "by commixture with so many men, /He hourly humanizes". Even this extremely brief and necessarily superficial overview of some of Caliban's transformations from the seventeenth-century monster to the politically correct native of the 1990s can show how we have "humanized" him differently in accordance with our own shifting concerns. The different readings of the character of Caliban confirm Alan Sinfield's words in this same forum back in 1993: "There is no disinterested reading; Shakespeare is deployed in diverse ways as part of an ongoing cultural contest" (Sinfield, 238). What Sinfield says about Shakespeare in general can be applied to the character of Caliban. The various interpretations of his ambiguous nature show that we have shaped him in accordance with our intellectual and cultural needs at different points in history. Indeed, in him we readers have tried to find "a cultural space in which [we] may recognize [our]selves" (Sinfield, 237).

WORKS CITED

- Bloom, Harold ed. 1992: *Caliban*. New York, Chelsea House Publishers.
- Daniell, David 1989: *The Tempest*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ, Humanities Press International
- Greenblatt, Stephen 1976: Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century. > Capelli, Fredi, ed. 1976: 568-71. *First Images of America: The Impact of the New World in the Old*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Knight, G. Wilson 1947: *The Crown of Life*. New York, Barnes & Noble.
- Orgel, Stephen 1987: Introduction. *The Tempest*. Oxford, OUP.
- Sinfield, Alan 1993: Dissident Reading. *Sederi IV*: 237-42.
- Skura, Meredith Anne 1989: The Case of Colonialism in *The Tempest*. *Shakespeare Quarterly* (40): 42-69.
- Vaughan, Alden T. 1988: Shakespeare's Indian: The Americanization of Caliban. *Shakespeare Quarterly* (39): 137-53.
- Vaughan, Alden T. & Virginia Mason Vaughan 1991: *Shakespeare's Caliban. A Cultural History*. Cambridge, CUP.

* * *

Ovid and Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*: A Study of sexual-role reversal

Beatriz Soubriet Velasco

EOI TOMELLOSO

The use of mythology was widespread among writers in the Elizabethan period, and Ovid's presence in Renaissance literary texts seemed to be essential as it constituted the most important classical source for the literary tradition at that time. We should mention a single book, *The Metamorphoses*, of which many writers were aware, as it played a very important role in the transmission of a mythological world, often becoming the most suitable frame for poetry.

Elizabethans were fascinated by stories about gods who loved, but could not pursue the loveliest object of their desire, without experiencing terrible transformations in doing so. These stories represented the natural way of expressing the processes of human feelings, especially the anguish of love. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* suggests that change is one of the primary realities of our experience; our lives, our society, the rules and powers which govern us, our feelings all being subjected to different changes somehow. We are used to this sense of mutability in the same way Elizabethans were. In this sense Ovid's writing provides the idea of a changing reality and claims that poetry should find the mechanisms to express it.

Ovid's influence in the sixteenth century was easily perceived after Cardinal Wolsey's decision to introduce the *Metamorphoses* into the curriculum of English grammar-schools. Soon the poem gained popularity among schoolboys who learnt it to adapt and imitate Latin verse. In this way Shakespeare became familiar with the poem. Shakespeare knew the Latin version, but preferred the most famous translation ever written in Renaissance England, Arthur Golding's *Metamorphoses*, which was published in 1567. Golding was a moralist, and his interpretation of Ovid's poem assumed that "metamorphosis was a punishment for sexual unnaturalness". (qtd. in Bate, 1994: 53) However, poets like Shakespeare and Marlowe were more interested in the causes of love than in moralizing it. Mythology was good material for poetry, and it constituted the natural background for the erotic-love narrative poems which flourished at the end of the sixteenth century. Shakespeare was aware of the great excitement these narrative poems stirred at the turn of the century: That may have been the reason why he decided to make his own contribution to this subject, writing the epyllion *Venus and Adonis*- perhaps in a theatrical off-season-, which was entered in April 1593 and published a few years later. The aim of this paper is to explore the use of mythological material and illustrate how it works in the poem in order to show a reversal of the feminine and masculine roles, as traditionally illustrated in love poetry.

The story of Venus and Adonis appears in Book Ten of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Orpheus tells us the story when he laments to the trees and wild animals after the loss of Euridyce. Venus is desperately attracted to the young Adonis, who, being more interested in the art of hunting, does not show any form of affection. She tries in vain to persuade Adonis to love her. However, Adonis prefers to go hunting, and he dies after being badly injured by a boar. But Venus does not resign herself to the loss of her beloved and decides to metamorphose him into a beautiful flower growing from his blood, and which still remains a symbol of her frustrated love.

Shakespeare does not follow Ovid's version of Venus and Adonis, as it is told in Book Ten from the *Metamorphoses*. However, he shapes his poem out of diverse mythological references. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* filters into the poem in many different ways, and this constitutes the main

alteration to the original source. Shakespeare takes the central figures and the general background from Book Ten, but his characters are taken from Salmacis and Hermaphroditus' tale, as it appears in Book Four. Ovid tells us the story of Salmacis who falls in love with the beautiful Hermaphroditus while the latter is bathing in a river nearby. Salmacis is so impressed by his beauty that she feels a terrible desire to embrace his body and in doing so they turn into a single person. Shakespeare's Venus owes much of this terrible passion to Salmacis, as described in Book Four, and this constitutes the prime issue of our discussion.

On the contrary, Adonis is a keen hunter, reluctant to show any expression of love, who has close affinities to another mythological figure: Narcissus. The expression of desire which cannot be fulfilled turns out to be a commonplace in the different mythological allusions Shakespeare uses in the composition of his poem. The poem is Ovidian in technique as we appreciate in the use of antithesis, the echo device, the parallelism of some linguistic structures of many passages from the poem and all the embedded tales that give shape to the poem. Shakespeare's originality lies in the way he retells the story and alters the main source, mainly because he seems to be more interested in exploring the lover's mental state under the stress of emotion and desire.

Shakespeare's Venus cannot be regarded as the ideal woman according to the Renaissance canon of beauty, deeply affected by Petrarch's poetry. On the one hand, although Petrarchism provided Renaissance poetry with some basic assumptions about how desire operates within and between lovers, Shakespeare does not follow Petrarch in his female characterization and moves away from him. Venus' beauty is described with great sensuality and Shakespeare does not pay much attention to the traditional commonplaces of hair, teeth, lips and face to describe his Venus. Instead, he prefers to talk about her in different terms, and she appears, for instance, as a woman with "soft flesh" and a "smooth moist hand". On the other hand, Shakespeare completes Venus' characterization by providing her with unusual qualities for a young lady in love, as it is the active role in the game of love, usually given to men. It is the female character who persuades Adonis and desperately tries to obtain his natural response to love, becoming trapped in her own desire and love sentiments.

However, Shakespeare approaches Adonis in a very different way. Shakespeare's poem opens with Adonis' physical description, which is a praise of his splendid beauty, but the reader of the poem is disturbed by the way Adonis is presented. We do not find a conventional description of a young man, strong and aggressive in love, but a sweet and delicate lover, and it constitutes the characteristics more of a woman suffering from love than those of a man. Adonis' shyness had already been prefigured in Spenser, although it is Shakespeare who provides him with this unexpected effeminacy. Adonis' beauty reaches perfection and goes beyond the natural barriers of gender. Venus says that he is "more lovely than a man / more white and red than doves or roses are" (vv. 9-10). The symbolism of the colours red and white, applied to Adonis in the poem, had traditionally been used in relation always to the female, as in the poetry of Petrarch or Sidney.

There is, consequently, a deliberate intention to stress a sexual ambiguity in the roles that Venus and Adonis take in the game of love. Their personalities, as traditionally conceived, are reversed and the conventional barriers of gender dissolved. We should not forget that the Venus and Adonis story must be seen in the broader context of the Orphic series of narratives concerning destructive passion and female desire, as originally transmitted by Ovid. (Bate: 1994) Book Ten is terribly ambiguous in its content, and the tales that appear claim a homoerotic desire which becomes licensed under the cover of mythology, although this attitude contrasts with social reality since homosexual behaviour was condemned and punished in Elizabethan England. Shakespeare was fascinated by the extreme expression of desire in the story of Orpheus and he took the ambiguity of the general background of Book Ten in the *Metamorphoses* to stress the ideological implications of natural desire. In traditional love poetry it is the woman who is seduced and shows her rejection to physical love, whereas man takes the active role of the young lover who persuades his beloved by means of linguistic arts. In the art of persuasion conventional and linguistic arguments are very important in the quest for love and, following the conventions that govern love poetry, we observe how the discourse of love is mainly masculine. However, Shakespeare complicates Ovid on this matter and incorporates a new reading of the poem, as we observe in this deliberate reversal of roles, although this unusual perspective is not free from ironic connotations.

It is Adonis who blushes when he hears about love, who looks sexually desirable and whose perfect body resembles a work of art.

It is interesting to point out that Shakespeare devotes most of his attention to the arguments characters use to persuade themselves rather than to the story itself. Venus' attempt to seduce Adonis becomes, then, the prime issue dealt with in the poem. Seduction for her is a very difficult task, and in this sense we should draw our attention to the role hunting plays in the structure of the poem. The expression of human desire and love sentiments is deliberately perverse, and the figurative use of hunting in the poem serves this purpose. There are, consequently, many external references to the hunting theme in the poem, especially in the love-making scene, where lexical terms such as 'vulture', 'wild bird' or 'falcon' always tend to occur in relation to Venus. Then, Adonis necessarily becomes the hunted, giving, therefore, direct interpretation to the allusion of the Acteon myth. Diana, the huntress becomes the hunted when Acteon hides behind a bush and secretly gazes at her while she is bathing. In the tradition of love poetry all furtive and lustful gazes always rest on the female. However, Shakespeare seems to be much more interested in playing with such conventionality. He makes Adonis the object of desire and it is Venus who hides and gazes at his splendid beauty. The author seems to give us always a wrong impression of what we think we perceive as readers. Adonis is forced to look like a girl, whereas Venus' aggressiveness in love is described in a grotesque way as we deduce from the stanza concerning her kisses:

Even as an empty eagle, sharp by fast,
Tires with her beak on feathers, flesh and bone,
Shaking her wings, devouring all in haste,
Till either gorge be stuff'd or prey be gone:
Even so she kiss'd his brow, his cheek, his chin,
And where she ends she doeth anew begin. (vv. 55-60)

Ambiguity becomes one of many strategies Shakespeare uses to discover the inability to express desire with conventional language, and the language of desire, therefore, needs to be "multifaceted" (Dollimore, 1994: 133). Desire grows up in Venus and reaches such a dimension that provokes a distortion in the perception of reality, which ceases to be itself when it enters the complex world of emotions. We are forced to move to a world of appearances and visions, becoming trapped in an ambiguous atmosphere of unreality and uncertainty. Shakespeare is interested in exploring Venus' state of mind at this stage of the poem and shows how everything that surrounds Venus is not real. The experience of desire can be terrible and Venus' appreciation of reality becomes a reflection of her tortured mind. All this implies a sense of destruction and violation of the natural norms, returning us to the idea that female desire may be destructive.

There are some episodes in the poem that stress this sense of distorted reality, as we can appreciate in the encounter between Venus and Adonis' horse. The erotic implications suggested by the symbolism of the horse cannot pass unnoticed by us, as they did not by Venus. She becomes fascinated by the vision of this horse, she feels such a passion that can only be compared to her extreme attraction for Adonis. We have the impression that the horse is something more than just a simple horse, as can be deduced from the following lines:

His nostrils drink the air, and forth again,
As from a furnace, vapours doth he send,
His eye, which scornfully glisters like fire,
Shows his hot courage and his high desire (vv. 273-276)

This unnatural vision of the horse could only find its origin in the lover's stressed mind, as a result of the materialization of desire. There is a marked ambiguity that emphasizes the contrast between the extreme sensuality entailed by the vision of the horse and Adonis' rejection of love. The experience of desire, therefore, generates moments of madness and irrational excitement, spoiling the perception of reality and becoming, then, wild and violent. It seems possible to say that Shakespeare, following Ovid, prefers to focus on the kind of representation of the lover's tortured mind, which constitutes the main contribution to the Elizabethan narrative poetry.

However, this loss of reality isolates Venus, who is trapped by her desire and by the distorted image which have their origin in her stressed mind, and produce terrible effects on her. This situation awakens instinctive behaviour, almost wild, in Venus when she sees how Adonis' life is menaced by the boar. The episode of the boar-hunting occurs as in a dream, as a terrible vision about what is to come. Venus experiences how all her senses stop, all except for her hearing. She cannot see, she can only hear the boar and the hounds barking, feeling terrible anguish when she knows that she is going to lose her beloved. Although the goddess of love can use all her power and metamorphose herself into the boar in the manner of Jupiter becoming an animal to rape a young woman, she behaves like a mortal. Her humanity confirms the idea that "the story is about frustration rather than violation, because a woman cannot rape a man". (qtd in Bate, 1994: 65). The expression of desire appears at this stage with extreme violence as is suggested by the image of Venus surrounded by hideous small animals, which becomes a reflection of the destructiveness released by strong emotions. The power of silence, her terrible isolation, the stress upon the heart impeding utterance, and the final look at the body of Adonis dead are all elements used throughout the poem with the sole purpose of expressing the multiple aspects of desire. But all this violence generated by intense emotion ceases at the moment Adonis is metamorphosed. Although the story of Venus is tragic, we cannot consider the poem a tragedy of love. That is partly because Shakespeare mocks at the story he is telling by means of all the comic devices he uses throughout the poem; although it is Adonis' final metamorphosis which stops this tragic sense.

The *Metamorphosis* is a book which implicitly seems to raise questions about the nature of love, and Ovid's mythology apparently licenses unnatural manifestations of love, which could only be celebrated in the visual arts and in literature. Ovid had been moralized since Medieval Times, but Shakespeare prefers to explore the origin of amorous feelings and the experience of love rather than condemn it. The sexual role-reversal, as it appears in the poem, entails a new perception of the conventional norms that govern love poetry and its conceptualization in the Renaissance tradition, and, moreover, the nature of female desire.

REFERENCES

- Bate, Jonathan 1994: *Shakespeare and Ovid*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Brewer, Wilmon 1978: *Ovid's Metamorphoses in European Culture*. Frankestown, New Hampshire: Marshall Jones.
- Bush, Douglas 1963: *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry*. London: OUP.
- Dollimore, Jonathan 1994: Shakespeare Understudies. In Dollimore, J. & Sinfield, A. eds. 1994: 129-149.
- Ellrodt, Robert 1987: Shakespeare the non-dramatic poetry. In Wells, S. ed. 1987: 35-47.
- Felperin, Howard 1993: *The Uses of the Canon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Haber, Judith 1994: *Pastoral and the Poetics of Self-Contradiction*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Harvey, Elizabeth D. 1995: *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Javitch, Daniel 1982. *The Impure Motives of Elizabethan England*. In Greenblatt, S. ed. 1982: 225-238.
- Martindale, Charles ed. 1988: *Ovid Renewed*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Rivers, Isabel 1994: *Classical and Christian Ideas in English Renaissance Poetry*. London: Routledge.
- Shakespeare, William 1994: *The Poems*. London: Routledge.

* * *

The fair and the unfair:
Renaissance images and their change
in William Shakespeare's Sonnets

Jorge Luis Bueno Alonso

UNIVERSITY OF OVIEDO

INTRODUCTION

Critics haven't missed the existing contrast between the first sonnets addressed to the Friend and the last ones addressed to the Dark Lady. It is not our aim to discourse about the hidden identity of both Mr. W. H. and the Dark Lady. We share Stephen Booth's opinion: "If Shakespeare was talking about real people and events, we have no clue whatsoever as to the woman's identity. Speculation on her identity has ranged from wanton to ludicrous and need not be illustrated." (Booth 1977: 549)

What drew our attention to the Sonnets has been a little topic present on them. It is obvious that the language and the images used by Shakespeare change throughout the Sonnets. In some of them the images are typically Renaissance, following the Petrarchan and Elizabethan traditions. In some others the aforesaid images present different nuances. The Image evolves and the Conception changes. Among the different parts in which criticism has divided William Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, there are two great unities especially interesting as regards the aim of this paper. In this paper we would like to show a few textual evidences to set clear that difference. For that purpose we have chosen a few sonnets from among the first seventeen, opposed to some of the last ones (the so called *Dark Lady Sonnets*).

On the one hand we will analyse those examples taken from the *Procreation Sonnets*, and the character of the images found there. On the other hand we will examine the evidence found in the *Dark Lady Sonnets* to see the differences they hold opposed to the sonnets addressed to the Friend. It is not our aim neither to worry about the ordering of the texts, nor to give a description of the main topics of the *Sonnets*. We simply want to present a brief textual analysis of some sonnets, to collate them so as to see their differences as far as the conception of the images is concerned, and to bring forward textual evidences from other writers to corroborate our analysis.

PROCREATION SONNETS: IMAGES AND TRADITIONAL ELEMENTS

It is obvious that these first seventeen sonnets are intended to convince a young man to marry so that he can be able to perpetuate his beauty. In other words, his child will make him immortal:

Shakespeare induces his Friend to marriage, to abandon his selfishness which, in the end, by not increasing himself would deprive the world of his beauty on his death. (Simon 1986: 281)

From the very first line we find those traditional images which will be criticized later on by Shakespeare. In Sonnet I we find the image of the Rose, which has always stood for the

Neoplatonic idea of Eternal Beauty, an image inherited from Medieval Imagery.¹ The *Rose* appears also as *bud*, showing a kind of contrast between creator/creature:

That Thereby beauty's *Rose* might never die (I.1)²
 Within thine own *bud* buriest thy content (I.11)

This classic element of the Rose, together with many others, is present throughout the sonnets. e.g: Sonnet LIV "The Rose looks *fair* ", "Perfumed tincture of the Roses", "Sweet roses do not so". This image of the Rose expressing beauty could be found with the same aim in Quevedo:

La tentación lozana de la Rosa,
 deidad del campo, estrella del cercado³

and in Garcilaso's Sonnet XXIII:

En tanto que de rosa y d'azucena
 Marchitará la rosa el viento helado⁴

which shows a great parallelism with "beauty's rose might never die". In Shakespeare, that eternal beauty of the Rose is also completed with the idea of eternity and procreation to perpetuate that beauty. Thus, we find some words clearly referring to that: "Increase" → procreation, and "might bear his memory" → Eternity and Immortality.⁵

Another traditional element in Sonnet I is "Spring", which presents a curious parallelism with Garcilaso's Sonnet XXIII:

and only herald to the *gaudy spring*
 coged de vuestra *alegre primavera*.

In both, the adjective adjoined to "spring" could have the same meaning. "Gaudy" meaning "bright, resplendent, gay" is also found in Shakespeare's *Love's Labour Lost* "The gaudy blossoms of your love" (V.ii.802)- and in *Venus and Adonis* "Under whose brim the gaudy sun would weep." (1088)⁶

Sonnet II presents another typical image: the passing of time, the devastating effects of time upon beauty.

When forty *winters* shall besiege thy brow
 and dig deep trenches in thy beauty's field,
 thy youth's proud livery, so gazed on now,
 will be a tottered weed of small worth held (1-4)

We have found a great deal of examples as regards the image of *winter* because this conception of time is tremendously common:

Coged de vuestra alegre primavera
 el dulce fruto antes que'l *tiempo airado*

¹ L. Simon 1986: 281. She quotes Seymour-Smith's book *Shakespeare Sonnets* in which this idea is contained.

² All quotations in this paper from Shakespeare's Sonnets have been taken from Booth's edition.

³ Francisco de Quevedo's *Parnaso*, 191 a. Sonnet *Con ejemplos muestra a Flora la brevedad de la hermosura para no malograrla*, number 295, lines 5/6, in Jose Manuel Blecua's edition. In that same sonnet Quevedo uses the semantic field of flowers to support that idea: "en su propia flor nevado", or, "lejos de la flor". All quotations from Quevedo's poems present in this paper have been taken from Blecua ed. 1981, *Francisco de Quevedo: Poesía Original Completa*, Barcelona, Planeta.

⁴ Garcilaso de la Vega, Sonnet XXIII, lines 1/12. Taken from Elias L. Rivers ed. 1990. *Poesía Lírica del Siglo de Oro*, Madrid, Cátedra, p. 63.

⁵ That increase and immortality, of course, is desire from *fairest* creatures. So, the sonnets adressed to the friend will show the "fair", and the *Dark Lady Sonnets* will show what is "not fair", as opposed to that previous conception of fair. e.g. Sonnet LIV "The Rose looks *fair* but *fairer* we it deem" which gives evidence to support our idea.

⁶ Different meanings of "gaudy" taken from Onions 1986.

cubra de *nieve* la hermosa cumbre¹

ntes que lo que hoy es rubio tesoro
venza a la *blanca nieve* su blancura²

Cuando me vuelvo atras a ver los años
que han *nevado* la edad florida mía³

... mas agora,
la *blanca nieve* del *invierno cano*,
de todo le desnuda y le desdora.
Todo lo acaba el tiempo y lo enajena,
que todo tiene fin si no es mi pena⁴

These texts show that some images (such as *winter*, *nevada*, *nieve*, as a symbol of death, decay, passing of time) were widely spread. In these texts and through the *procreation sonnets*, the element of *carpe diem* is present also as a traditional image. Shakespeare will offer that image of Time as both *carpe diem* and *tempus fugit*, and will use some petrarchan formulæ idealizing the love object, that is, his Friend. All this shows the classical character of the images and conceptions these first sonnets hold. Other examples of that *winter* image in the sonnets are also found in:

To hideous *winter* and confounds him there (V, 6)
But flowers distilled, though they with *winter* meet (V, 13)
Then let not *winter's* ragged hand deface (VI, 1).

Against the stormy gusts of *winter's* day
and barren rage of death's eternal *cold*. (XIII, 11-12)

In Sonnet III we find the image of the glass: "Look at thy glass and tell the face thou viewest", which is subject to parallelism with "Persuadiote el espejo conjetura / de eternidades en la edad serena".⁵

We also come across in line 12 -"thy *golden time*"- the image of Time associated with "golden", which is found in Gongora's Sonnet CLXVI, line 10 - "antes que lo que fue en tu *edad dorada*,"⁶- being both lines similar to Quevedo's Salmo IX -"la *edad florida* mia."² These lines also contrast with Garcilaso's "*edad ligera*" in Sonnet XXIII line 12, and with Shakespeare's Sonnet VII, line 10 "*feeble age*", connecting both with the conception of time as "Never resting" in Sonnet V, and "Devouring Time" in Sonnet XIX, which is a clear reference to *Tempus Fugit*.

In fact, the whole Sonnet V conforms Shakespeare's recreation of *Tempus Fugit*, using the imagery of Seasons, Time and Nature in a classical conception:

Those hours that with gentle work did frame
the lovely gaze where every eye doth dwell
will play the tyrants to the very same,
and that unfair which fairly doth excel.

¹ Garcilaso's Sonnet XXIII in Rivers 1990: 63.

² Gongora's Sonnet CLXV in Rivers 1990: 112.

³ From Quevedo's *Las Tres Musas*, 248, a; 21 in Blecua's Edition, p. 24.

⁴ From Quevedo's *Las Tres Musas*, 45; 391 in Blecua's Edition, p. 411.

⁵ From Quevedo's *Parnaso*, 217, a; 338 in Blecua's Edition. p.360.

⁶ Rivers 1990: 212.

For never-resting Time leads summer on
to hideous winter and confounds him there,
sap checked with frost and lusty leaves quite gone,
beauty o'ersnowed and bareness everywhere. (V, 1-8)

This could be compared with the elements previously described and that comparison applied to the following texts will show a paralellism as regards that classical topic:

Coged de vuestra alegre primavera
el dulce fruto antes que'l tiempo airado
cubra de nieve la hermosa cumbre.
Marchitará la rosa el viento helado,
todo lo mudará la edad ligera
por no hacer mudanza en su costumbre.¹

Goza cuello, cabello, labio y frente,
antes que lo que fue en tu edad dorada
oro, lilio, clavel, cristal luciente,
no solo en plata o viola troncada
se vuelva, más tu y ello juntamente
en tierra, en humo, en polvo, en sombra, en nada.

Tu edad se pasará mientras lo dudas;
de que te habrás de arrepentir mañana.²

We think that these examples have revealed the classicism of the *Procreation Sonnets*,³ classicism as far the imagery is concerned. The different sources we have brought forward support our analysis and our conception of these two parts of the sonnets as an opposition between two imageries: the classical *fair* (sonnets to the Friend) and *unfair* (sonnets to the Dark Lady) conceptions. Even though Shakespeare is original in composing his sonnets with that classical material, that classical conception established his background and source:

La inversión (...) de la fórmula petrarquista, aunque esta resulte parcial, dado que retiene componentes de dicha fórmula.

En relación con estas tradiciones (Petrarquista e Isabelina), los sonetos ofrecen a la vez concomitancias y divergencias."⁴

To show these *concomitancias* has been our aim in this first analysis:

La belleza suprema de la mujer, su idealización, su casi divinización se ha desplazado aquí hacia un joven, el amigo.⁵

¹. Rivers 1990: 63 and 212.

². From Quevedo's *Parnaso*, 191, a; 295 in Blecua's Edition, p.337.

³. A brief list of symbols and images of the described kind could be found in L. Simon 1986: 281-282: "Sonnet 7 is a comparison to the sun's diurnal course with the life of the Friend (...), Sonnet 8 uses throughout the imagery of musical sounds (...), To support that idea of decay Shakespeare makes use of the following traditional imagery in Sonnet 12: the clock that tells the time (...), Sonnet 14 recurs to astronomic and weather images. Sonnet 15 consists of a comparison of man's growth to the increase of plants (...)."

⁴. Abad 1986: 250.

⁵. Pérez 1986: .210.

This movement from lady to boy is one of Shakespeare's originalities, but without any doubt the images, conceptions and symbols he uses to praise his friend are the same used by other Renaissance authors with, more or less, the same aim.

Now, we will try to point out the *divergencias*, his breaking with tradition, and his new images and concepts which will criticize the previous ones. This evolution will also be present in other authors and this fact will reveal that this is a logical evolution through the Renaissance: conceptions change, images vary, the world evolves. The *fair* will become the *unfair*, being that *unfair* the new reality.

DARK LADY SONNETS: A DIFFERENT CANON

From now on we are going to find a different concept of beauty and a different kind of images which will contrast with the aforementioned ideas; the traditional idealization of the lady evolves into:

Parodización de la misma: antítesis Dama Morena / Amada Petrarquista o contraste *oscuridad* física y moral de la primera y la belleza clara y pura de la segunda.¹

This change is found from the very first line of Sonnet CXXVII:

In the old age black was not counted fair,
or, if it were, it bore no beauty's name (1-2)

That *old age* refers to the past time (previous Petrarchan tradition, perhaps) in which *black* was an unfair image with a negative symbolic meaning. But Shakespeare impose new *fair* meaning upon that condition: "Every tongue says beauty should look so (CXXVII.14)". Now, his canon of beauty changes and we are going to find less degree of idealization and greater deal of earthly feelings and attitudes.

Sonnet CXXVIII perhaps shows a pleasant tone recalling the old fashion but, of course, we find no idealization; it is only a poetic game with musical imagery. Sonnet CXXIX, apart from being one of the most beautiful Shakespeare's sonnets, offers no traditional images. The poet presents love and the pains of it with no idealization, with a direct approach. His being in love is in a way "savage, extreme, rude, cruel", adjectives holding both negative meaning and true reality. This poem in particular is totally opposed to the petrarchan tradition. This realistic and direct vision of the poet's state could have never been written by Sidney or Spenser nor even Garcilaso.

Sonnet CXXX constitutes the best example found in the *Dark Lady Sonnets* to show and support our theory. Here, the change is complete, the movement from one conception to another completely different conception is pretty clear. This sonnet, compared to other poems by Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, Garcilaso, Quevedo and Cervantes himself, will make our analysis clearer. To start with, the first quatrain reveals the character of lady who "físicamente contradice todos los cánones de belleza isabelina."² and is "una mujer que aparece como un personaje real, exento de la perfección de las heroínas petrarquistas."³ That lack of perfection is what Shakespeare define this new image with, symbolized by the *unfair black colour*. For him, she is a perfect model of that new conception of beauty, an earthly figure opposed to those *Lauras*, *Dianas* and *Stellas* who were "dechados de perfección a la que se eleva a actitudes celestes u olímpicas, según el criterio que predomine."⁴ Sonnet CXXX is a mocking derogation of the poet's mistress,

¹. Abad 1986: 250.

². That is, "cabellos y ojos negros (127, 130, 132), su personalidad es decididamente indigna (130), es cruel, tirana (131, 133, 149), codiciosa (134), injusta (138), y obscena (134, 137), y su modo de comportarse no concuerda con su naturaleza (131, 147). (Abad 1986: 251)." We think these facts separate this new loving-lady with that traditional and idealized lady, so harmonized with nature.

³. Pérez 1986: 210.

⁴. Pérez 1986: .200.

a literary joke making fun of the petrarchan excesses in praise of lady-loves, as for example Spenser's *Amoretti and Epithalamion*, Sonnet IX, which offers a total contrast with Shakespeare's CXXX, presenting some of those images Shakespeare laughs at:

Spenser	Shakespeare
Long-while I sought to what I might compare	My mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun;
those powerfull eyes, which lighten my dark spright,	coral is far more red than her lips red;
yet find I nought on earth to which I dare	if snow be white, why then her breasts are dun;
resemble th'yimage of their goodly light.	if hairs be wires, black wires grow on her head.
Nor to the Sun: for they do shine by night;	I have seen roses damasked, red and white,
nor to the Moone: for they are changed never;	but no such roses see I in her cheeks;
nor to the Starres: for they have purer sight;	and in some perfumes there is more delight
nor to the fire: for they consume not never;	than in the breath that from my mistress reeks.
Nor to the lighting: for they still persever;	I love to hear her speak, yet well I know
nor to the Diamond: for they are more tender;	that music hath a far more pleasing sound.
nor unto Christall: for nought may them sever;	I grant I never saw a goddess go:
nor unto glasse: such basenesse mought offend her;	my mistress when she walks treads on the ground.
Then to the Maker selfe they likest be,	And yet, by heaven, I think my love as rare
whose light doth lighten all that here we see. ¹	as any she belied with false compare.

In Sidney's *Astrophil & Stella*, Sonnet LVIII, we find: "Th'anatomy of all my woes I wrate, / Stella's sweete breath",² which also contrast to Shakespeare's CXXX. This element of the lover's breath will be pointed out by Cervantes.

Perhaps, Miguel de Cervantes offers the best example (apart from Shakespeare himself) of this evolution and change from the *fair* to the *unfair*. Analysing the following text we have found the traditional qualities of the Petrarchan lady:

... pues en ella se vienen a hacer verdaderos todos los imposibles y quiméricos atributos de belleza que los poetas dan a sus damas; que sus cabellos son oro, su frente campos elíseos, sus cejas arcos del cielo, sus ojos soles, sus mejillas rosas, sus labios corales, perlas sus dientes, alabastro su cuello, marmol su pecho, marfil sus manos, su blancura nieve, y las partes que a la vista humana encubrió la honestidad son tales, según yo pienso y entiendo, que solo la discreta consideración puede encarecerlas y no compararlas."³

Here, Cervantes describes Petrarchan attributes which Shakespeare mocks at: eyes-like the sun, breath-perfume, lips-coral red, hairs-golden wires, etc, etc. The same attributes we have found before in Gongora's Sonnet CLXVI:

Mientras por competir con tu *cabello*,
oro bruñido al sol relumbra en vano;
mientras con menosprecio en medio el llano
mira tu *blanca frente* el *lilio bello*;
mientras a cada *labio* por cogello,

¹. González Corugedo, Santiago ed. *Edmund Spenser: Amoretti and Epithalamion*, Madrid, Cátedra, 1983, p. 88.

². Galván, Fernando ed. *Philip Sidney: Astrophil & Stella*, Madrid, Cátedra, 1991, p. 144.

³. Allen, John J. ed. *Miguel de Cervantes: Don Quijote de la Mancha*, Madrid, Cátedra, 1989, Part I. XIII, p. 186.

siguen mas ojos que al *clavel temprano*. (1-6).

Garcilaso's Sonnet XXIII,

en tanto que el *cabello*, qu'en la vena
del *oro* s'escogió con vuelo presto. (5-6).

and Lope de Vega's *Rima Sacra XLVI*, line 3 "tu *cabeza* es de *oro*, y tu *cabello*". But Cervantes' case is far more interesting because only three chapters after that traditional description, he offers (the way Shakespeare has done it) a new image when describing Maritornes:

los cabellos, que en alguna manera tiraban a crines, él los marcó por hebras de lucidísimo oro de arabia (*black wires grow on her head*), cuyo resplandor al del mismo sol escurecía. Y el aliento, que, sin duda alguna, olía a ensalada fiambre y trasnochada (*and in some perfumes there's more delight/ than in the breath than from my mistress reeks*), a él le pareció que arrojaba de su boca un olor suave y aromático (...), ni el aliento, ni otras cosas que traía en sí la buena doncella, no le desengañaban, las cuales pudieran hacer vomitar a otro que no fuese arriero; antes le parecía que tenía entre sus brazos a la diosa de la hermosura.¹

If we compare this extract with Sonnet CXXX, we see that the traditional images are criticized more or less in the say way. To set this fact even clearer we have put between brackets some lines of Sonnet CXXX expressing the same idea in Cervantes' text.

Let us analyse a few more poems and we will see certain similarities which are also worth commenting. In Quevedo's Sonnet *Aquí que fue Troya de la Hermosura* we can see that ironic aim:

Rostro de blanca nieve, fondo en grajo;
la tizne, presumida de ser ceja;
la piel, que está en un tris de ser pelleja;
la plata, que se trueca ya en cascajo.²

Compare now "My mistress eye's are nothing like the sun" to:

Para agotar sus luces la hermosura
en un ojo no más de vuestra cara,
grande ejemplar y de belleza rara
tuvo en el sol, que en una luz se mira.³

Quevedo offers again the aforementioned images and comparisons.

With all the textual evidences we have presented in this paper we think it is clear that Shakespeare evolves from that Renaissance tradition offering later "sustitución de la belleza rubia de virtud inaccesible de aquellas tradiciones, por una mujer morena de cualidades físicas y morales dudosas como objeto amoroso femenino."⁴

Now, the relationship between both lovers (poet / Dark Lady) changes as a logical conclusion from the changing of imagery. Even at the end, Shakespeare will state that his conception of love is not idealized and his love relationships are placed in the real world. The lovers don't walk along celestial spheres; they play an earthly game:

But why of two oaths do I accuse thee,
when I break twenty?. (CLII, 5-6).

At the end of the *Dark Lady Sonnets*, on the very last line of them, we find that the change from the *fair* to the *unfair* has been completed,

¹. *Ibid*, Chap. XVI, pp. 213-214.

². From *Parnaso*, 435, a; 251 in Blecua's edition.

³. From *Parnaso*, 202, 6; 310 in Blecua's edition.

⁴. Abad 1986: .242.

For I have sworn thee *fair*, more perjured eye,
to swear against the truth so foul a lie. (CLII, 13-14)

being these two lines a final joke similar, perhaps, to that poem by Bartolomé L. de Argensola *A una muger que se afeitaba y estaba hermosa* in which the poet shows a great deal of irony, connecting with some of the facts discussed on this paper:

Yo os quiero confesar, Don Juan, primero:
que aquel blanco y color de Doña Elvira
no tiene de ella más, si bien se mira,
que el haberle costado su dinero.

Pero tras eso confesaros quiero
que es tanta la beldad de su mentira
que en vano a competir con ella aspira
belleza igual de rostro verdadero.

Mas, ¿Qué mucho que yo perdido ande
por un engaño tal, pues que sabemos
que nos engaña así Naturaleza?.

Porque ese cielo azul que todos vemos
ni es cielo ni es azul: ¡Lástima grande
que no sea verdad tanta belleza!¹

I consider I have brought forward enough textual evidences to support our analysis. This paper has only been a brief approach to point out some facts worth commenting as far as the changing of imagery is concerned. Obviously, a more exhaustive study of the *Sonnets* will reveal more interesting things, as Shakespeare's sonnets are "often so multilayered that they can never be fully fathomed."²

REFERENCES

- Abad García, M. P. 1986: Shakespeare y el soneto. > Onega, Susana ed.: *Estudios Literarios Ingleses: Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid, Cátedra. pp. 241-277.
- Arriandaga, T. (1994: El género en la expresividad lingüístico-poética de los sonetos de Shakespeare. > Caramés J. L. & González, S. eds.: *Género y Sexo en el Discurso Artístico*. Oviedo, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo. pp. 91-102.

¹. Bartolomé L. de Argensola, Sonnet I, in Elias L. Rivers ed. 1990, *Poesía Lírica del Siglo de Oro*, Madrid, Cátedra, pp. 199-200.

². Quoted in Pérez 1986: 222 from Hiller's *Shakespeare's Sonnets*.

- Auden, W. H. 1972: The Sonnets. > Barnet, S. ed.: *The Complete Signet Classic Shakespeare*. New York, Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovitch. pp. 1722-1728.
- Booth, S. ed. 1977: *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Dillon, J. 1987: *Shakespeare and the Solitary Man*. New Jersey, Rowman and Littlefield.
- Herbert, T. W. 1980: Dramatic Personæ in Shakespeare's Sonnets. > Homan, J. ed.: *Shakespeare's More Than Words Can Witness*. Bucknell University Press. pp. 77-91.
- Knight, E. W. 1967: New Light on the Sonnets. > *Shakespeare and Religion*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul. pp. 253-265.
- Knights, L. C. 1967: Shakespeare's Sonnets. > Alpers, Paul ed.: *Elizabethan Poetry: Modern Essays in Criticism*. Oxford, OUP. pp. 274-297.
- Ogburn, C. 1984: *The Mysterious William Shakespeare*, New York, Dodd Mead and Company.
- Onions, C. T. 1986: *A Shakespeare Glossary*, Oxford, OUP. 3rd edition revised and enlarged by Robert D. Eagleson.
- Pérez Romero, C. 1986: El soneto inglés en los periodos renacentista y barroco. > Onega, Susana ed.: *Estudios Literarios Ingleses: Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid, Cátedra. pp. 199-224.
- Quennel, P. 1963: *Shakespeare: the poet and his background*, London, Penguin Books, pp. 120-140.
- Schoenbaum, S. 1980: Shakespeare's Dark Lady: a question of Identity. > Edwards, P. et alii eds.: *Shakespeare's Styles*, Cambridge, CUP.
- Simon Schuhmacher, L. 1986: Image and Symbol in Shakespeare's Sonnets. > *Scripta in Memoriam J. B. Alvarez-Buylla*. Oviedo, Servicio de Publicaciones Universidad de Oviedo. pp. 279-291.
- Ungaretti, G. 1970: Notes on Shakespeare's Art of Poetry. > Lewinter, O. ed.: *Shakespeare in Europe*. London, Penguin Books. pp. 340-345.

* * *

Teaching Shakespeare's Sonnets: time as *fracture* in sonnets 18, 60 and 63

Miguel Martínez López

UNIVERSITY OF GRANADA

Literary studies on the *Sonnets* before the seventies were usually part of larger works on Shakespeare or on the sonnet. Specialization and detailed analyses of individual and groups of sonnets is absolutely necessary before attempting any further generalizations, which so far have led nowhere.¹ In this paper I suggest a possible approach to the discussion of Shakespeare's poetic stance as regards the intellectual metamorphosis of human apprehension of time at the dawn of the Modern Age. My reading and analysis of three of the «time-sonnets» (nos. 18, 60 & 73) is set within the context of a final-year or graduate class, minimally fluent in rhetoric, in basic medieval and Renaissance philosophy and in the intellectual history of this period.²

My central contention is that Shakespeare superbly epitomizes in his poetry and drama the fear of death resulting from a radical change in the apprehension of time: *time passus* (the form typical of the M. A.) becomes now *time fractus*.³ Humankind is and has always been fearful of death (the ultimate consequence of the passing of time) but there is a historical period -broadly between the mid-fourteenth century and the mid-seventeenth century- in which existential anguish has been at its highest. For three centuries, a series of endless calamities assaulted Europe: the Black Death, the Hundred-Year War, the invasions of the Turks, the Great Schism of the Reformation... . In the Autumn of the M. A., Huizinga perceived a generalized pessimistic feeling about the supposed immediacy of the Apocalypse. Especially between 1575 and 1625, these generalized fears concentrated on the fear of the Devil, a strange awe that also took hold of the representatives of the governing establishment. These are the years of composition of *Dr. Faustus*, *Macbeth*, *Las Novelas Ejemplares*, and a myriad of theoretical treatises on the Devil, of which William Perkins' *A Discourse of the Damned Art of Witchcraft* and Matthew Hopkins' *The Discovery of Witches*⁴ are just two popular titles.

¹ Neugebauer, A. 1970: *The Sonnets. Shakespeare's Survey* 15: 18. «Wholesale interpretations of the sonnets will have to give place to a careful examination of individual sonnets or natural groups of them before new syntheses, based both on historical considerations and on assessments of intrinsic merits, can be profitably attempted».

² There is no need to justify either the importance of the *Sonnets* in Shakespeare's literary production or the convenience of including them in any syllabi of English Renaissance literature; critical literature on Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, on the other hand, is second only to *Hamlet's*, so students should be carefully guided through the critical maze. Good introductions to the *Sonnets* useful for our approach here can be found in the following texts: Muir, K. 1979: *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. London: G. Allen & Unwin. Turner, F. 1971: *Shakespeare and the Nature of Time: Moral and Philosophical Themes in Some Plays and Poems of W. Shakespeare*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Booth, S. 1969: *An Essay on Shakespeare's Sonnets*. New Haven, CT.: Yale U. P. Leishman, J. B. 1961: *Themes and Variations in Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Rpt. 1963, London: Hutchinson. Abad García, M^a P. 1986: *Shakespeare y el Soneto*. Susana Onega ed. *Estudios Literarios Ingleses. Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid: Cátedra, 241-278.

³ For an overview of this problem of time in the Renaissance, see Waller, G. F. 1976: *The Strong Necessity of Time: The Philosophy of Time in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Literature*. The Hague-Paris: Mouton.

⁴ About this, see Delumeau, J. 1978: *El Miedo en Occidente (Siglos XIV-XVIII. Una Ciudad Sitiada)*. Madrid: Taurus, 307-8; 374.

As with poets, it is expected of teachers to help students make sense «of the ways we try to make sense of our lives.»¹ Whether we believe there was a $t=0$, that the world is eternal, that it was created or that time will eventually cease, everybody shares some interest in -some call it necessity- of relating human existence to a beginning and an end. Nobody remembers the moment of birth and no one can realistically anticipate the moment of his or her death. When we are born, as well as when we die, we find ourselves *in mediis rebus*. Indeed, human existence is far from being a *status termini*, like that of the rock or the sea, that *are* but do not *exist* because to exist is to consciously self-relate. Human existence is thus a task, a process, a state of fulfilling or begetting (*Geschehen*) and this human generating acts in time constitute human history (*Geschichte*). Therefore, a human being is never «finished» until he or she dies, i.e., when he or she ceases to be; and History will not be over until there are no more souls on earth to count time. *Human* then is synonym of *possible*, the possibility of being that exists threatened by the certainty that our possibilities end up in nothingness, that is in death. Shakespeare's position about this issue is not exactly conventional. While it is true that he uses the conventions of Renaissance literature, the immense complexity of his answer is often by-passed or simply ignored. In Shakespeare's sonnets, we find a scope that ranges from self-confidence in Sonnet 18 («So long as men can breathe, or eyes can see, / So long lives this and this gives life to thee», l. 13-14) to humble resignation, in the vein of Senecan Stoicism (may be also in an attitude of defiance) in Sonnet 146 («So shalt thou feed on Death, that feeds on men / And death once dead, there's no more dying then»). Through a poetry of profundity and resonance, the Bard successfully expressed the paradox of time and the paradox of life as a «heroic frenzy» against the limitations of human existence.² In Shakespeare's time sonnets³ we will meet Shakespeare's sonneteer convention of the poem as a speaking picture, where pain, love and beauty are omnipresent subjects of the portrait, a portrait that is, in a sense, eternal. Mainly through paradox, oxymoron and alliteration, Shakespeare emphasizes, in the form of abstraction and idealism inherited from Neoplatonism, the essential antithesis that lies at the core of human life: eros vs. charitas, possibility vs. reality, progress vs. perfection, time vs. eternity ...

TIME PASSUS VS. TIME FRACTUS

One of the greatest meditations on time ever written is in the eleventh chapter of St. Augustine's *Confessions* and Frank Kermode has linked it to *Macbeth*, illustrating the variety of meanings that the word «time» presents in Shakespeare's plays.⁴ Time in the *Confessions* ultimately is not astronomical or psychological, but mystical: it is a timeless awareness of the eternal. «Successiveness and multiplicity are simply the experience of the soul in the flux of

¹ Cfr. Kermode, F. 1967: *The Sense of an Ending*. Oxford: OUP., p. 3.

² «Implicit in Shakespeare's moral viewpoint are certain theological presuppositions, inasmuch as his philosophy is not confined to the earthly life of man, but "Like to the lark at break of day arising / From sullen earth, sings hymns at heaven's gate" (*Sonnet 29*). [...] Deep in his poems and his plays is a divine impatience with the limitations of "this vile world" (*Sonnet 71*; *Henry VI Part II v. 2*), "sad mortality" (*Sonnet 65*) and "devouring Time" (*Sonnet 19*; *Love's Labour Lost i, 1*) [...] If the moral philosophy of Shakespeare may be said to consist, like that of Socrates, in the task of preparing for a good death - as in Hamlet's "The readiness is all" (v.2) and Edgar's "Ripeness is all" (*King Lear v.2*); [sic] his theology may be seen as having its point of departure in the consideration of death itself and what lies beyond. In this respect, he follows the popular (as distinct from the scholastic) tradition of theology, which may be called a theology of "the four last things" - death, judgement, hell, and heaven. [...] Shakespeare's testament, to which he attached his signature, reads: "I commend my soul into the hands of God my Creator, hoping and assuredly believing through the only merits of Jesus Christ my Saviour to be made partaker of life everlasting, and my body to the earth whereof it is made"». Cfr. Milward, P. 1973: *Shakespeare's Religious Background*. Chicago: Loyola U. P., p. 244-6.

³ Common classifications of the sonnets suggest thirty-four within the general «tempus edax rerum» theme and, out of these, ten within «Poetry vs. Time» (Nos. 18, 19, 54, 55, 60, 63, 65, 74, 81 & 107). Cfr. Pérez Romero, C. 1987: *Monumentos de Amor: Sonetos de Shakespeare*. Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura, p. 14. See also John Benson's classification of our sonnets as «Imperious Time» in his octavo edition of 1640.

⁴ Kermode, F. 1971: *Shakespeare, Spenser, Donne*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, p. 188; see also, by the same author, the above quoted *The Sense of an Ending*, p. 84-89.

do measure them. The consequence is that I can only measure time once and because it has passed. Therefore, I do not measure the quantity of the syllables proper but what in my memory is left of them. It is in the spirit, in the soul, that we perceive and measure time. We measure the quantity/length of a long syllable through the quantity of a short syllable and we say that it is double; we measure the length of a poem through the number and length of its lines; and the length of a line through the number of its feet, and the length of the feet through the quantity/length of its syllables. St. Augustine once said of time that he knew what it was, if not asked, but, when asked, he did not know. If nothing passed away, he said, there would be no past; if nothing succeeded there would be no future; if nothing existed there would be no present. All we know is that the past is no longer and the future is not yet; and the present, if it remained present, would not be time but eternity, its very opposite. Of these considerations, Augustine concluded that time exists inasmuch as it tends not to exist: if, in order that the present be present and not eternity, it has to change into past, we must admit that the reason for being of the present is in its ceasing to exist as present. Therefore, time exists inasmuch as it tends not to exist.

A key concept of time experienced as duration is «change», and «change» was traditionally synonym of «imperfection»; perfection, on the contrary, lies in the permanence of beauty, in the eternal return of the cycles of nature. The Renaissance world had learned the lessons of change and mutability and it had learned them the hard way: the earth was no longer static but moved through space; the boundaries of the earth and the centrality of the West were now blurred as a result of the voyages of discovery; where were the Adams and Eves of the New Found World? Instability and change were the keys to a society that could no longer believe uncritically in the traditional image of life as passage, as pilgrimage from birth to the other world through death on which medieval eschatology had largely rested throughout the M.A. The Renaissance intellectual reacted against these feelings of instability in various ways. Against the excess in the number and the complexity in the nature of the questions and the limitations of the answers available, he went back to the classics and indulged in the philosophy of the *carpe diem* and in the three *libidos*: *libido sciendi*, *libido sentiendi* and *libido dominandi*. Everything came down to a desperate thirst for immortality of any kind, that had to be achieved at any cost. Shakespeare and his generation were fully conscious of the fact that they also shared the path, the speed and the force that drives men towards the same goal, towards the ultimate solitude of death; they may be sleeping, living, writing, but can never be properly dying, because death is fully «perfective», the present that never turns into past, the end of possibility and the end of history, for all that matters. These thoughts are especially upsetting to the intellectual avant-garde of a generation that was no longer sure of anything, even less of a tragically timeless present, which -in Montaigne's words- is not what we arrive at through linear time,¹ but «one single now» that «fills the ever» (*Essays*, I, 22). Besides, Shakespeare's personality is bent towards tragedy and thus, in a way, turned into tragedy everything he touched, both in his poetry and in his plays.

TIME AS «FRACTUS» IN SONNETS 18, 60 AND 73

SONNET 18 (FROM SHAKESPEARE'S «SONNETS»)²

Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?
Thou art more lovely and more temperate:

¹ About the rejection of the medieval vision of linear time, see: Panofsky, E. 1985: *Ensayos de Iconografía*. Madrid: Alianza, p. 115-130: «Pero a esta concepción circular se superpone, sobre todo en los niveles más cultivados de la sociedad, una noción pesimista del tiempo. Para los europeos del inicio de los tiempos modernos, éste apenas si tiene algo que ver con las alegrías terrenas. No incita a proyectos. No dirige hacia un progreso material (o espiritual) en este mundo. Es, por el contrario, el viejo amenazador de los *Trionfi* de Petrarca. El Renacimiento lo asimiló progresivamente al siniestro Saturno. [...] Desde luego «alimenta», pero también «reduce a la nada todo lo que existe».

² The text of the sonnets follows Dover Wilson, J. 1966: *The Sonnets*. Rpt. 1985; Cambridge: CUP, although I have modernized v & u and j & i. Dover Wilson's and M. Seymour-Smith's are probably the best modern editions of Shakespeare's *Sonnets* and the only two that keep the original spelling and punctuation.

Rough winds do shake the darling buds of May,
 And summer's lease hath all too short a date:
 Sometime too hot the eye of heaven shines,
 And often is his gold complexion dimmed,
 And every fair from fair sometimes declines,
 By chance, or nature's changing course untrimmed:
 But thy eternal summer shall not fade,
 Nor lose possession of that fair thou ow'st,
 Nor shall death brag thou wand'rest in his shade,
 When in eternal lines to time thou grow'st,
 So long as men can breathe or eyes can see,
 So long lives this, and this gives life to thee.

The three sonnets share the same central theme -the destructive power of time and the permanence of poetry- and they all elaborate on the Ovidian convention of the «Tempus edax rerum»;¹ however, they vary considerably in the means employed to portray the poet's anxious apprehension of time as fracture.²

The rhetorical question at the beginning of Sonnet 18 relates the human experience of time to nature. Cyclic conceptions of time are closer to timelessness than linear theories, of the type predominant in the M. A. From the very start, the poet links the beauty of the loved one to the cycle of the seasons; summer days are the shortest of the year and thus the comparison of life to this season already conveys an early glimpse of the ephemeral. The beloved one transcends the warmth and beauty of the season and sharply contrasts with the «rough winds» of time that «shake the darling buds of May», i.e., against youth and beauty. A metaphor drawn from the laws of tenure, «summer's lease hath all too short a date» -after those of Sidney's *Astrophel & Stella* 18- ends the first quatrain with an abstract reference to the ephemeral nature of time: «summer's lease», the amount of time of human life, regardless of the moment of the illocution, is always too short. Life, under the dictatorship of time, becomes a mere lease agreement with nature. This realization produces anger because it implicitly negates the belief that human beings can shape their own lives and destinies, that freedom indeed exists; the teaching of the Reformers and the image of the wheel of fortune maintained the same discouraging theses.

Shakespeare was probably in his thirties or forties when he wrote most of his sonnets, and by the standards of his age it is only natural that he should feel rather tired and old. The problem of time is not so much that it passes -and very quickly too- but that it lets one know and experience the anticipation of the end. Strife for life and awareness of the mutability and of the consequences of the passage of time -the perishable nature of the humane- is always very present in Shakespeare's works.

The second quatrain substitutes the simile of life and summer by that of sun and life. Shakespeare follows the conventional idea that the sun -referred to, in this case, through the metaphor «the eye of heaven»- is a positive source of energy and life, while night -after the

¹ Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, XV, 234; other classic sources commonly attributed to Shakespeare's sonnets are: Ovid's *Tristia*, IV, vi and the Horatian «exegi momentum».

² Before close-reading the poems, students should be familiar with basic information about Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, among which: 1. Editions: although the basic editorial work had been completed as early as 1780 by Malone, see: Rollins, H. E. 1944: *Shakespeare's Sonnets. New Variorum*, 2 vols. 2. Text: earliest and most authoritative is Thomas Thorpe's *Shake-Speare's Sonnets*, 1609, in Quarto. John Benson's *Poems: Written by Wil. Shake-speare. Gent.* in Octavo manipulates the text to present the male addressee as female and arbitrarily groups the sonnets under headings of his own invention. 3. Date of composition: most of them, probably, between 1597 and 1603; Shakespeare was probably in his forties and feeling old. 4. Sources: Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Italian Cinquecento sonnets, Sidney's *Arcadia*, etc.

Biblical texts- carries the connotation of physical and moral danger. The night is «the kingdom of darkness», the negation of all that exists. The beauty of «the eye of heaven», like the beauty of all that lives, is bound to be dimmed, though. The paradox implicit in the eye that cannot see (l. 4-5) is sustained in line 7, when the poet laments that «every fair from fair sometime declines»; the very same dimension that gives us a world of possibilities, of opportunities, of gifts and beauty and enables us to use them so that we will be happy, later kills us. Shakespeare offers variations on this same paradox in sonnets 60 («And time that gave does now its gift confound»), 73 («Consumed with that which it was nourished by») and others. The reason, quite simply, is that the wages of living is changing, and change is only possible in one single direction, i.e., for the worse.

The third quatrain, the opening of the sextet, tries to find an escape from the inevitability of death through the affirmation of the permanence of beauty contained in the metaphor of the «eternal summer». The poet builds up tension and expectation through holding back what is for him the key to timeless existence: in order to escape the consequences of time, the beloved will have to become him or herself time in the eternal lines of poetry. The ambiguity of the term «lines» that may stand for both, poetry and wrinkles, superbly expresses the upheld antithesis of the contradictory nature of all that is created and thus subject to change. Nevertheless, that way death will not be able to «brag thou wander'st in his shade», and thus the battle for survival will not be completely lost. The violence of the confrontation, the anger and terror at the thought of death, the repulsion and feeling of fracture it produces, are perfectly represented in the series of negative clauses and in the semantics of the verbs «untrimmed», «lose» and «brag». The poet regains a sense of balance at the end of the poem, when the final couplet is reached: Shakespeare's faith in the permanence of his poetry offers his beloved, the subject of his verse, a peculiar form of immortality, since his or her beauty will be preserved at least until the end of time, until the end of history. The alliteration of /s/ and the oblique reference to poetry through the repetition of the deictic («this») supply an air of mystery and silence that reminds the reader that the art of creation, the literary act, is indeed an act of remembrance.

SONNET 60

Like as the waves make towards the pebbled shore,
 So do our minutes hasten to their end,
 Each changing place with that which goes before,
 In sequent toil all forwards do contend.
 Nativity once in the main of light,
 Crawls to maturity, wherewith being crowned,
 Crookéd eclipses 'gainst this glory fight,
 And Time that gave does now its gift confound.
 Time doth transfix the flourish set of youth,
 And delves the parallels in beauty's brow,
 Feeds on the rarities of Nature's truth,
 And nothing stands but for his scythe to mow.
 And yet to times in hope, my verse shall stand
 Praising thy worth, despite his cruel hand.

While keeping part of the imagery of sonnet 18 («lines / wrinkles» and «light / darkness»), sonnet 60 represents one step forward towards abstraction and self-awareness of the universality of the issues at stake. The opening simile («Like as the waves make towards the pebbled shore, / So do our minutes hasten to their end») is based on an image of water as a sign of death, typical of this period. From Homer to Shakespeare, the worst of all kinds of death is that of drowning, being swallowed by the waves. Death by water is unnatural. Dying is often conceived in literature as a voyage through water; thus, the Stygian Pool, where the River Styx ends: this is the river of sadness, the path of darkness and synonym of sin in the Greek and Christian traditions as well as in classical mythology. It is the river that leads to the infernal regions of the middle of the earth.

Another classic example is Caronte's ship of death, the ship of the dead. Shakespeare is particularly keen on this image, which he uses repeatedly in his poetry and drama. River and sea-water, for the Bard, symbolize physical and moral annihilation: Ophelia surely commits suicide by failing to save herself having fallen into the river, while Gonzago, in *The Tempest*, prefers the most inhospitable land to the ocean.¹ In Shakespeare's sonnet 60, the minutes are compared to the waves and the end of life to the death of waves in a pebbled shore. There is an ineluctable sequence, a permanent change, that disguises itself in the form of repetition -one wave after the other, one minute after the other «in sequent toil», life after life, generation after generation-; and there is weariness and pain too in their struggle -«all forwards do contend»-. The personal referent of the *Sonnets* has disappeared and will not return until the very last line of the poem, where the beloved one is mentioned as the poetic addressee of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*.

The second quatrain concisely explores the ages of human life, emphasizing the repulsion that humans feel towards change and its immediate consequence, ageing. The verb «crawl» -like Grendel's «gliding in the black night, the walker in darkness»- bears unpleasant connotations that link the passage of time to the Biblical devil of the O.T. embodied in the serpent of *Genesis*. On the other hand, human life in this world is seen as a «crawling», slowly dragging the body towards death. The moment of maturity is represented as a particularly ephemeral one, in a participial clause that introduces, as soon as it is over, the battle that «Crooked eclipses 'against his glory fight». We are back again to the fear of a fading sun that leaves humankind in darkness and thus in anguish before an invisible reality that can be felt but not seen in any clear way. The end of the second quatrain is marked by a lapidary phrase that finds in the perfectly regular iambic rhythm of line eight («And Time that gave does now its gift confound») the harmony that presides over the paradox of the present, which is bound to turn into past. This rhythmic pattern reproduces the eternal regularity of the passing of time and anticipates the submissiveness of the poetic voice in the contemplation of this inexorable reality.

This sonnet differs from no. 18 in that its three quatrains constitute a *variatio* of the same thesis, whereas in the former sonnet the «volta» -refutation or solution to the problems posed- is anticipated at the beginning of the third quatrain, in what is clearly an early refutation. In sonnet 60, we have to wait for the couplet to see a way out of the misery of oblivion through poetry. This third quatrain is one more variation of the «Tempus edax rerum» motif, with an emphasis on the metamorphosis of human beauty because of its passage, with the wrinkles, again, as the central physical evidence. The personification of time enables it to «Feed[s] on the rarities of nature's truth» (l. 11). The conclusion of the long expository part of this sonnet brings to the fore a classic negative image of death as the end of time: «And nothing stands but for his scythe to mow» (l. 12). The impact of this image on Shakespeare's contemporaries can hardly be calculated today, when the scythe has become almost a cliché; however, to a Renaissance audience, born to the tradition and implications of the dances of death, the *artes moriendi*, apocalyptic sermons, demonology, astrological predictions and constant portraits of Doomsday, the scythe was probably more than a popular motif. The rhetorical and emotional *gradatio* reaches a climax in line twelve with the vivid image of the scythe mowing down everything that exists, turning existence into the anticipation of an ineluctable vacuum. The tone of the poem is pervaded by a deep sadness and pessimism not free from a certain degree of submissiveness.

The final couplet appeals to the future in a suddenly positive and defying tone: poetry is personified and depicted as «standing» against the passing of time and the oblivion that death is likely to carry along with it. The end of the poem modestly expresses the generosity of the poet, who is not so interested in the survival of his fame as in the survival of the beauty of the beloved one, immortalized by art. This lack of egotism on the part of the poet adds a note of pathos and grandeur, at the same time, while it constitutes one of Shakespeare's original notes in his treatment of the otherwise conventional theme of poetry's immortalizing power. The feelings of fracture that time now bears can be easily recognized in Shakespeare's references to this mysterious dimension as «cruel» and utterly destructive, always ready with «his scythe to mow».

¹ See about this the above quoted Delumeau, J.: *El Miedo en Occidente, Op. cit.*, p. 59-60.

SONNET 73

That time of year thou mayst in me behold
 When yellow leaves, or none, or few do hang
 Upon those boughs which shake against the cold,
 Bare ruined choirs, where late the sweet birds sang.
 In me thou seest the twilight of such day,
 As after sunset fadeth in the west,
 Which by and by black night does take away,
 Death's second self that seals up all in rest.
 In me thou seest the glowing of such fire,
 That on the ashes of his youth doth lie,
 As the death-bed, where it must expire,
 Consummed with that which it was nourished by.
 This thou perceiv'st, which makes thy love more strong,
 To love that well, which thou must leave ere long.

Sonnet 73 is perhaps the most complex and thematically far-reaching of all of Shakespeare's time sonnets. In an explicitly autobiographical tone -revealed in the abundance of first-person pronouns and in the use of a dialogical, conversational convention- the poet shares with his readers a deep though composed grief that the thoughts of time as fracture provoke (being vs. not being, being not to be). The intensity of feeling and the profundity of thought now reach a real climax. This sonnet indulges both in abstract reflection and in vivid images that try to make us literally see the drama behind the poet's apprehension of time as *fractus* and his fear of death; thus the estrangement techniques used and the repetition of verbs of perception. The permanent use of «thou» -in the poet's dialogue with the loved one and the reader- also transmits an impression of unanswerable objectivity and emotional estrangement to the poet's testimony: «That time of year thou mayst in me behold [...]» (l. 1). The reader's apprehension of the nature of time, as Shakespeare presents it, is dependant on a *gradatio* of verbs of vision that begins with the passive «behold» in l. 1, follows with the semantically unmarked «see» in lines 5 & 9 and ends with «perceive» in l. 13, simultaneous with the conclusion of the sonnet. These three stages of perception (behold, see and perceive), one per quatrain and one in the final couplet, suggest a structure in which realization of the true nature of time is a process, from pure contemplation to active awareness, that rules human reactions against the tyranny of time.

The first quatrain opens once more with a metaphor of nature, designed to introduce the reader to the concept of mutability. The cycle of the seasons, with the transformations it entails, stops now at the Autumn, when nature itself begins to dress up in the coat of death: it is an image of despair, subtly communicated by the absence of leaves on «boughs that shake against the cold» (l. 3). The reference to the «bare ruined choirs that shake against the cold» (l. 4) transfers the symbolic death of human beings to the death of England's catholic past. The line is pervaded by a feeling of nostalgia for this past «now dissolved and fallen into ruin like the medieval monasteries.»¹ This sonnet, if addressed to the young Earl of Southampton, may refer to the ruins of Beaulieu Abbey, on Southampton estate. If we accept 1594 as the date of composition, William Shakespeare, then 30, seems to identify himself with that catholic past, which inspires other similar references in his early plays. In closing, the first quatrain evokes the theme of mutability through a metaphor of the Fall and approaching winter as equivalent to dying and death. Cold, darkness and the ruins of England's catholic past help to provide a melancholy setting for this

¹ Cfr. Milward, P.: *Shakespeare's Religious Background*, *Op. cit.*, p. 78. Milward finds Shakespeare's feelings of nostalgia for the Catholic past of England in this sonnet and in other references to Cromwell's ruthless spoliation of the monasteries in two early plays, *The Comedy of Errors*, V, i, and *Titus Andronicus*, V, i.

sonnet, in which memory brings alive the life that once inhabited those places, like a final recollection of a human being at the end of his time.

The second quatrain could be divided into two parts: the first two lines run softly, as a reminder that time can also be passage: the twilight and the sunset fading in the west are images of transition and the alliteration of the phoneme /s/ ragelessly announces the silence of death. The abrupt interruption at the end of line six, followed by a sudden change in the rhythm of the line (made up of a sequence of monosyllables except for the final word), matches well its meaning: black night -the classic metaphor of death- takes life and time away, death being thus defined as the alter-ego of time. Shakespeare has imposed on language an intensity, directness and immediacy at once both highly economic and persuasive. Although time is often disguised, in the early stages of life, as a positive element, its true nature is revealed step by step and this is no other than fracture: time and death for the poet seem to be the same thing. There is violence too in death: «Death's second self [i.e. time] that seals up all in rest» (l. 8). Time-passus (l. 5-6) has become time-fractus in this lapidary phrase about annihilation (l. 7-8), placed exactly at the middle of the poem.

The last quatrain reinforces this image of time as fracture, but now through a series of new images that obliquely relate passion, fire, love, ashes, youth and finally death. The syntactic structure of these four lines is extremely complex and matches well with the hermetic meaning they seem to convey. On the one hand, we have an intricate network of deictics and phoric references that require careful elucidation on the part of the reader: the fire alluded to in line 9 probably refers to the poet's love, not necessarily passionate or directed towards the beloved one but love at large, love that does not look to qualities; therefore, it will continue to exist after the youth of the beloved one has turned into ashes (l. 10). A Biblical echo («Dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return») serves as term of comparison in the simile that links dust and death (l. 11). However, even love will come to an end when time is ripe for death; the poet can love once his youth and his lover's beauty are over, but this too will end in nothingness. The sonnet has become more and more gloomy in tone while the image of love choked by the ashes that once nourished it introduces a note of immense and sincere sadness and despair. Love, in the metaphor of fire, is consumed by time. The emotional content of these lines is intensified through pairings of words such as fire-ashes, ashes-youth, ashes-death, lie-deathbed and death-expire.¹ The paradox of time, can be observed now in the treatment of time as fracture in the sequence provided by these three sonnets: «every fair from fair sometimes declines» (Sonnet 18); «[...] Time that gave does now its gift confound» (Sonnet 60), and, finally, time is «Consumed with that which it was nourished by» (Sonnet 73).

The conclusion of this extended paradox arrives with the final couplet, that shows the perception of time as intimate and moral fracture «[...] [it] makes thy love more strong / To love that well which thou must leave ere long» (l. 13-14). Despite the inevitability of death, human life can regain a certain sense of purpose -not just by generation, childbearing (the solution offered in sonnets 1-17), or by that form of immortality that poetry may guarantee (see our commentary on sonnet 60) but simply through the intensity and truthfulness of love; love towards the things that most deserve to be loved, universal love that joins the cosmic forces of good that will prevail in the long run. Loving well will guarantee at least the survival of humanity, beyond the impossible individual survival of the self.

To conclude, Time, in Shakespeare's sonnets, as in many other writings of the Renaissance, manifests itself as the revealer of truth, because it uncovers the illusory values of this world. It is depicted by Shakespeare -in a quite orthodox way- by referring to basic Christian eschatological and apocalyptic imagery, after the Biblical affirmation that «the wages of sin is death». The

¹ About this, see: Traversi, D. 1982: Shakespeare: the young dramatist and the poet. Ford, B. ed. *The New Pelican Guide to English Literature*. Rpt. 1983; Harmondsworth: Penguin, p. 282: «The impression of the passage of time is conveyed with a fresh vividness that produces a pairing of words in cumulative and dynamic effect».

inner drama of a human being for whom time ends up in death while there are doubts about the existence and nature of the afterworld, induces two types of reactions: on the one hand, we have the unrestricted exaltation of the values of life, as an escape from the unbearable obsession with death.¹ Thus the exaltation of the three *libidos*. On the other hand, Renaissance men tried to combine the platonic sense of sublunary imperfection and mutability with Christian theology.² However, speculation cannot do away with the evidence that human aspirations -even the noblest ones, such as love, beauty, etc.- are often seen as destined to sterility. Shakespeare can then be seen as an outstanding forerunner of the existentialists, because his and their vision of time is similar in that both seem to share the idea that man is a being for death («El hombre es un ser para la muerte»). Augustine, Shakespeare and Heidegger all said this, but of the three Shakespeare was the one that put it in more beautiful and persuasive terms. They all shared a pessimistic view of life on this earth and a more or less unqualified negation of the concepts of freedom and possibility. Obviously Shakespeare does not suggest he has solved the enigma of time; probably he simply desires to share with us the infinite complexities and consequences of its nature in the myriad ways it affects us. Between time and eternity, he situates the third order of the Latin concept of *aevum*. Strife for life and awareness of mutability and of the consequences of the passage of time was ever consummatingly present before the devouring actuality of death. There is deep pain in the internal drama of Shakespeare's *time-sonnets*, but there is hope too. Nevertheless, in the poet's analysis of feelings and expectations, gloom often predominates over hope. Paradoxically enough, while our three sonnets (18, 60 & 73) seem to conceive poetry and love as the only possible reply in the battle against time and death, even their peculiar form of immortality is negated in other sonnets such as nos. 71 & 72, where the Bard seems to request the negative peacefulness of oblivion: «Do not so much as my poor name rehearse; / But let your love even with my life decay» (*Sonnet 71*, l. 11-12); and, in the following sonnet: «After my death (dear love) forget me quite, / For you in me can nothing worthy prove».

Time is killing us all, so it seems not unreasonable to try and become acquainted with our killer while we can. In this, as in other aims, Shakespeare proves his greatness and immortality as a writer.

* * *

¹ About this, see: Langer, W. L. 1958: The Next Assignment. *American Historical Review*, January, p. 298.

² See Turner, F. 1971: *Shakespeare and the Nature of Time: Moral and Philosophical Themes in Some Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Who's Who in *SEDERI* (1996)

*F. Javier Sánchez Escribano*¹

UNIVERSITY OF ZARAGOZA

Abbreviations & sigla

BI	Becario/a de Investigación (Research Fellow)
CU	Catedrático/a de Universidad (Professor - Chair)
PA	Profesor/a Asociado/a - Ayudante (Contract Lecturer)
PTU	Profesor/a Titular de Universidad (Tenure Lecturer)
RA	Research Areas
AAFVT	<i>Annals of the Archive of Ferran Valls i Taberner</i>
ADIUAB	<i>Anuario del Departamento de Inglés</i> . Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
BELLS	<i>Barcelona English Language and Literature Studies</i> . Universitat de Barcelona
BHS	<i>Bulletin of Hispanic Studies</i>
BSS	<i>Boletín de la Institución «Sancho el Sabio»</i> . Vitoria.
CEM	<i>Cuadernos de Estudios Murcianos</i>
CIF	<i>Cuadernos de Investigación Filológica</i> . Universidad de La Rioja.
ES	<i>Publicaciones del Departamento de Inglés</i> . Universidad de Valladolid.
RAEI	<i>Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses</i> . Universidad de Alicante
RCEI	<i>Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses</i> . Universidad de la Laguna.

AGUADO GIMÉNEZ, PILAR

Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Letras. C/ Santo Cristo, 1. 30071-Murcia. Tlf. 968-363188.

PA, Universidad de Murcia.

RA: Teatro Isabelino, W. Shakespeare.

AGUILERA LINDE, MAURICIO DAMIÁN (Dr)

C/ Faisán 20, Bl. 1, 4º M. 18014-Granada. Tlf. 958-282570.

PA, Universidad de Granada. RA: Poesía Victoriana y Teatro Contemporáneo.

Publications:

— From Fire to Water: A symbolic analysis of the 'elements' in the Elizabethan erotic discourse. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI* II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 9-22.

— 'Dulce et Utile': Sidney's Contradictory Poetic Theory. > M^a Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI* III. Granada, 1992: 19-30. Con Rosa Morillas.

¹ With the mischievous assistance of the general editor of *Sederi*.

AGUIRRE DABÁN, MANUEL (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Campus de Cantoblanco. Universidad Autónoma. 28049-Madrid. Tlf. 91-3975000.

PTU, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. RA: Literaturas Celtas; simbolismo medieval y renacentista; literaturas marginales; postmodernismo.

Teaching: Cursos sobre *Shakespeare* (1981-2), *The Hamlet Theme* (1983-4, 1995-6) en la Universidad de Amberes y UAM; *The Sources of Hamlet* (Tercer Ciclo) en la Universidad de Alcalá, 1991.

Tesina (Director): Faust-like Characters in Contemporary Horror Fiction. Universidad de Amberes, 1985-6.

Conferencias: Woman and Witchcraft in Renaissance England, Universidad de Alcalá, 1990; Shakespeare and the Renaissance Poetics, Universitet Antwerpen, 1991; Myth and Renaissance: Shakespeare's *The Tempest* and Calderón's *Life Is a Dream*, Universitet Amsterdam, 1992. Hammering Out a Conceit: *Richard II* and the Construction of Meaning in the Renaissance. Universidades de Bradford, Leeds y Amsterdam, 1993.

Publications:

— *The closed space. Horror literature and Western symbolism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990.

— The evolution of Dreams. *Neohelicon*, 17: 2, 1990: 9-26.

— The Dram of Evil: medieval Symbolism in *Hamlet*. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI II*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 23-28.

— Towards a Linguistic Ecology of the Renaissance. > M^a Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 31-38.

— Repetition, Metaphor and Conceit in the Renaissance. *SEDERI IV*, 1993: 5-10.

— A Literature of Reflection. *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 29: 3, 1993: 193-202.

— Life, Crown, and Queen: Gertrude and the Theme of Sovereignty. *Review of English Studies* (en prensa).

ALVAREZ FAEDO, M^a JOSÉ

C/ Fernández Balsera 40, 2^o C. 33400-Avilés. Tlf.: 98-5104552.

PA, Universidad de Oviedo. Postgraduate Diploma in Modern Literature y M. A. in Modern Literature por la Universidad de Ulster. RA: Teatro británico.

Publications:

— Pirandello: apariencia, realidad y teatro en *Enrique IV* y *Seis personajes en busca de autor*. > *Mito y Personaje*, III y IV Jornadas de Teatro. Universidad de Burgos. Burgos: Ediciones Aldecoa, 1995: 131-138.

— Diversity in Language and Society in Shakespeare's *Henry V*. > Actas del Simposio Internacional *Lingüística y Sociedad*. Universidad de Salamanca, 1995.

ARAGAY SASTRE, MIREIA (Dr)

Departament de Filologia Inglesa i Alemanya. Divisió I: Ciències Humanes i Socials. Universitat de Barcelona. Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 585. 08007-Barcelona. Tlf. 93-3184266, Ext. 2715.

PTU, Universidad de Barcelona. RA: Teatro ss. XVI y XVII, siglo XX (inglés e irlandés).

ARIAS DOBLAS, M^a ROSARIO

C/ Padre Mariana, 2, 4^o D. 29013-Málaga.

BI, Departamento Filología Inglesa y Francesa, Universidad de Málaga. RA: Nuevos discursos sobre el Renacimiento, especialmente el enfoque feminista; estudios del género.

Tesis de Licenciatura: *Disfraz y género en la comedias de Shakespeare*. Universidad de Málaga, 1995.

Publications:

— Gender ambiguity and desire in *Twelfth Night*. *SEDERI VII*, 1996.

BALLESTEROS GONZÁLEZ, ANTONIO ANDRÉS (Dr)

Eurípides, 6, 1^o B. 28022-Madrid. Tlf. 91-3205255.

PTU, Universidad de Castilla - La Mancha, Ciudad Real.

Publications:

— 'El Jardín' de Andrew Marvell: técnica poética y recreación ovidiana. *Revista del Departamento de Filología Moderna*, I. Ciudad Real: Universidad de Castilla - La Mancha, 1992: 71-81.

- Digression and Intertextual Parody in Nashe, Sterne and Joyce. > *Laurence Sterne in Modernism and Post-Modernism: A Symposium*. Universidad de York, 1993.
- Un ejemplo de revisión clasicista y fabulación mitológica en el Renacimiento inglés: el caso de 'Hero and Leander'. > Lucía Mora González (ed): *Investigaciones filológicas anglo-norteamericanas*. Ciudad Real: Universidad de Castilla - La Mancha, 1994: 387-397.
- Renaissance Versions of an Italian Poem in English: Petrarch's *Rime* 190 in Wyatt's 'Whoso List to Hunt' and Spenser's *Amoretti*, 67. *SEDERI* V, 1994. (en prensa)
- Metaliterary parody in *The Unfortunate Traveller* and *Ulysses*. *Papers on Joyce*, 1. Alicante: Spanish James Joyce Society, 1995: 5-13.
- Shakespeare's *Sonnets* and the Adventure of Similitude. *Revista de Filología Moderna*, 5. Ciudad Real: Universidad de Castilla - La Mancha, 1995: 107-121. (Con Ana Mª Manzananas)
- Lost in Paradisiacal Beauty: Milton's Re-writing of the Narcissus Myth. *SEDERI* VI, 1995: 7-12.
- La sociedad isabelina y el sueño del Mediterráneo: *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. > *El Mediterráneo de Shakespeare*. Instituto Internacional del Teatro del Mediterráneo y Junta de Comunidades de Castilla - La Mancha. (en prensa)

CALVO LÓPEZ, CLARA (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Letras, Santo Cristo, 1. 30002-Murcia. Tlf. 968-363165, 968-214731.

PA, Universidad de Murcia. RA: Shakespeare, teatro inglés s. XVI y XVII; estilística; new historicism; cultural materialism; bibliography and editing.

Tesina: *Voices Imprisoned in Comic Discourse: the Speech of Domestic Jesters in the Plays of Shakespeare*. Madrid, Universidad Complutense, 1986.

Tesis Doctoral: *Power Relations and Fool-Master Discourse in Shakespeare: A Discourse Stylistics Approach to Dramatic Dialogue*. Universidad de Nottingham, 1990.

Publications:

- El germen de una tanática websteriana: *The White Devil*, Act. V, Sc. vi. *RCEI*, 10, 1985: 157-173.
- A Chev'ril Glove: on the distinction between two 'corrupted' words. *RCEI*, 1987: 35-52.
- *Power Relations and Fool-master Discourse in Shakespeare: A Discourse Stylistic Approach to Dramatic Dialogue*. Monographs in Systemic Linguistics, 3. University of Nottingham: Department of English Studies, 1991.
- Authorial Revision and Authoritative Texts: A Case for Discourse Stylistics and the Pied Bull Quarto. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI* II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 39-56.
- 'Too Wise to Woo Peaceably': The Meanings of *Thou* in Shakespeare's Wooing-Scenes. > Mª Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI* III. Granada, 1992: 49-60.
- Pronouns of address and social negotiations in *As You Like It*. *Language and Literature*, vol. 1, nº 1, 1992: 5-27.
- In defence of Celia: discourse analysis and Women's discourse in *As You Like It*. > K. Wales (ed): *Feminist Linguistics in Literary Criticism*. The English Association (Essays and Studies, 1994). Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1994: 91-115.
- Shakespeare and the Press: the Ideological Appropriation of *Romeo and Juliet*. > Ana Manzananas (ed): *SEDERI* VI. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 13-20.

CARVALHO HOMEM, RUI (Dr)

Rua do Agro, 180, 4-D. 4400-V. N. Gaia, Portugal. Tlf. (351-2) 307962.

Professor Auxiliar, Faculdade de Letras, Universidade do Porto, Portugal. RA: English Renaissance lyric and drama; translation studies; Irish studies.

M. A. Dissertation: *Entre o juiz e o louco: persursos da comédia de Ben Jonson de Volpone a Bartholomew Fayre*. Universidade de Lisboa, 1986.

Publications:

- Retórica do Riso: Comédia, Sátira, e um dia na Feira com Ben Jonson. *Revista da Faculdade de Letras - Línguas e Literaturas, In Honorem Prof. Óscar Lopes*. II Série, vol. XII, Porto, 1995: 301-347.
- Aos Pés da Donzela: Tradução, Cultura e *Decorum* num *Hamlet* em Português. *Tradução, Cultura, Sociedade: Actas das III Jornadas de Tradução do ISAI*. Porto, ISAI (forthcoming).

- ‘A More Familiar Straine’: Puppetry and Burlesque, or, Translation as Debasement in Ben Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair*. *SEDERI* VII: this volume.

CHAMOSA GONZÁLEZ, JOSÉ LUIS (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Francesa, Facultad de Filología, Campus de Vegazana. 24007-León. Tlf. 987-291093.

PTU, Universidad de León. RA: Traducción y crítica de la traducción; siglo XVI.

Tesis Doctoral: *La primera traducción inglesa de las Dianas de Montemayor, Gil Polo y Alonso Pérez: estudio crítico*. Universidad de León, 1985.

Publications:

- Sobre la traducción española de *Amoretti & Epithalamion* de Edmund Spenser. *Contextos*, III, 5, 1984.
- Difusión de un poema español del siglo XVI: ‘¡Cabellos, cuánta mudança!’ *Actas del IX Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de Murcia, 1986: 41-54.
- Bartholomew Yong: la traducción inglesa de las Dianas (1598). > J. C. Santoyo & I. Verdaguer (eds): *De clásicos y traducciones. Versiones inglesas de clásicos españoles (ss. XVI y XVII)*. Barcelona: PPU, 1987: 59-81.
- Traducciones de clásicos españoles: una aproximación crítica a su estudio. *Estudios Humanísticos. Filología*, 9, 1987: 19-30.
- Robert Southey, traductor de poesía española. > J. C. Santoyo & al. (eds): *Fidus Interpres*, 1. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987: 340-349.
- La versión de la Historia de *Félix y Felismena* que Shakespeare utilizó en *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. *Actas del X Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de Zaragoza, 1988: 257-268.
- Barnabe Googe: creador, adaptador, traductor. > J. C. Santoyo (ed): *Translation across cultures*. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1989: 65-73.
- Poetry translated from the Spanish: the case of England’s *Helicon*. > Javier Sánchez (ed): *SEDERI* I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 71-83.
- The strange fate of the English *Arnalte y Lucenda* by Diego de San Pedro. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI* II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 71-82.
- *El peregrino en su patria* de Lope de Vega viaja a Inglaterra. *Livius*, 2, 1992: 149-160.
- Los *Proverbios morales* del Marqués de Santillana y su traducción inglesa. *Livius*, 4, 1993: 49-60.
- Some Comments on Sir Philip Sidney’s *Certain Sonnets*: Two Different Approaches. > Ana Manzananas (ed): *SEDERI* VI. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 29-36.

CONEJO FORT, MARÍA ÁNGELES

Avda. Molière, 25, Esc. 2, 2º 3 (Edificio Nilo). 29004-Málaga. Tlf. 952-235838.

PA, Universidad de Málaga. RA: Literatura Inglesa (Novela del siglo XIX).

Teaching: Poesía Inglesa (siglos XV, XVI y XVII).

Publications:

- In and Out of the Bird-Cage: The Language of Confinement in *The Duchess of Malfi*. *SEDERI* IV 1993: 23-30.

CORA ALONSO, JESÚS

C/ París, 2, 3º C. 28850-Torrejón de Ardoz (Madrid). Tlf. 91-6751488.

PA, Universidad de Alcalá de Henares. RA: Teatro siglos XVI y XVII.

Tesis Doctoral: *Self-consciousness in Shakespeare and Jonson: the Shift from Metatheatre to Metadrama*. (en realización)

Teaching: Literatura Inglesa del siglo XVII.

Publications:

- Two Examples of Poetic Parallelism between John Donne and Lope de Vega. > Ana Manzananas (ed): *SEDERI* VI. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 21-28.

CRESPO GARCÍA, Mª BEGOÑA

Santa Cruz de Mondoy, s/n. Oza de los Ríos. 15319-Betanzos, La Coruña.

CRUZ CABANILLAS, ISABEL DE LA (Dr)

C/ Luis de Salazar, 16. 28002-Madrid. Tlf. 91-4158020. e-mail: fmicc@filmo.alcala.es.

PA. Departamento de Filología Moderna, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Alcalá de Henares. RA: Historia de la Lengua Inglesa.

DAÑOBEITIA FERNÁNDEZ, M^a LUISA

C/ de Alfacar, nº 9-45-46. Torre A 3^oC. 18011-Granada. Tlf. 958-153890. B. A. y M. A. por la Universidad de Toronto.

PTU, Universidad de Granada. RA: Edad Media y Renacimiento, novela del siglo XX.

Publications:

- Cleopatra's Role Taking: A Study of *Antony and Cleopatra*. *RCEI*, 12, 1986: 55-74.
- You have some cause: a study of *King Lear*. *Miscelánea*, 10, 1989: 17-45.
- A forgotten play and a dated hero: a study of Chapman's *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron*. *AAFVTL*, nº 5, 1989: 273-300.
- Role-playing and role-taking: a study of *Coriolanus*. *Atlantis*, XII, 1990. pp. 25-50.
- Duplication and emulation in *King Lear*. > Javier Sánchez (ed): *SEDERI I*. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 123-138.
- The Inevitable Death of Desdemona: Shakespeare and the Mediterranean Tradition. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI II*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 83-94.
- Una visión actualizada de la crítica shakespeariana en España. > J. M. González (ed): *Shakespeare en España*. Zaragoza: Pórtico, 1993: 119-135.
- Bibliografía española de William Shakespeare. (Con F. J. Sánchez). *Idem*, pp. 469-497.
- A Very Commonplace but Painful Case: A Study of *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*. > M^a Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 61-76.

DÍAS PINTO RIBEIRO, NUNO MANUEL

Rua Aguas Férreas, nº 7, 4^o esquerdo-B, 4050-Porto, Portugal. Tlf. 2002770.

Professor Assistente, Faculdade de Letras, Universidade do Porto, Portugal. RA: estudios ingleses; Renascimento.

Tesis Doctoral: *Ironia e cepticismo no drama de Christopher Marlowe*. (em preparação)

Publications:

- *Paradise Lost: o barroco e a utopia puritana*. Porto: Faculdade de Letras, 1990.
- O poder e a memória - rus et urbs: brevíssima nota acerca do drama de Shakespeare como registro de transição. *Ruralia. Revista da Ruralidade*, Arouca, nº 3, 1994: 123-133.
- Fausto debaixo do vulcão: o legado marloviano e os paradoxos da natureza e do humano em *Under the Volcano* (1947).
- Do Eden à Nova Jerusalém: Acerca das representações de Natureza em *Paradise Lost*, de J. Milton. (no prelo).

DÍAZ FERNÁNDEZ, JOSÉ RAMÓN

Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Francesa, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. 29071-Málaga. Tlf. 952-131789 / 131682 / 131681.

PA, Universidad de Málaga. RA: Historia del Teatro y Crítica Literaria.

Teaching: Historia del Teatro Inglés, Teatro Isabelino y Jacobeo.

Publications:

- 'This Star of England': *Henry V*, dirigido por Kenneth Branagh. > Lucía Mora (ed): *Investigaciones Filológicas anglo-norteamericanas*. Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1994: 419-426.

DOVAL SUÁREZ, SUSANA

Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Alemana (Sala de Becarios), Facultad de Filología. 15703-Santiago de Compostela. Tlf.: 981-575340.

BI, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela. RA: Historia de la Lengua Inglesa; planificación lingüística y sociolingüística.

ESTÉVEZ SAÁ, JOSÉ MANUEL

Rúa Ánxel Baltar, 3. Edif. Peregrina, 5^o C. 15706-Santiago de Compostela. E-mail: ia917710@usc.es. Tlf.: 981-521043.

RA: Literatura inglesa contemporánea; estudios comparativos; literatura inglesa renacentista y medieval; historia de la lengua inglesa: formación e influencias.

Trabajo de Investigación: Marlowe: the source of his genius.

ESTÉVEZ SAÁ, MARGARITA

Rúa Anxel Baltar, 3. Edf. Peregrina, 5º C. 15706-Santiago de Compostela. Tlf.: 981- 521043.

BI, Universidad de Santiago. RA: Literatura inglesa: medieval, renacentista y siglo XX; estudios comparativos: literatura inglesa, francesa y alemana.

Trabajo de Investigación: Milton: Darkness visible. Santiago de Compostela, 1993.

EXPÓSITO GONZÁLEZ, MARÍA DE LA CRUZ (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Moderna-Inglés, Facultad de Filología (Campus de Guajara). 38071- La Laguna, Tenerife. Tlf. 922-609509. E-mail: mcexposito@ull.es.

PA, Universidad de La Laguna. RA: Lengua Inglesa.

Tesina: *Construcciones relativas en la obra del Conde de Rochester*. Universidad de La Laguna, 1990.

Tesis doctoral: *La estructura del sintagma nominal en el inglés de la Cancillería*. Universidad La Laguna, 1995.

M. Ph. Universidad de Glasgow. Dissertation: *Trinity College (Cambridge) 323: the localisation of a Manuscript*.

Teaching: Historia de la Lengua Inglesa.

Publications:

— Relativization and Register: A Seventeenth Century Survey. *SEDERI IV*, 1993: 31-40.

FANEGO LEMA, TERESA (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Alemana, Facultad de Filología. 15704-Santiago de Compostela. Tlf. 981-575340. E-mail: iafanego@usc.es.

CU, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela. RA: Sintaxis Histórica.

Tesis doctoral: *Variantes lingüísticas en las ediciones de William Shakespeare en los Sonetos XVII y XVIII*. Universidad de Santiago, 1978.

Publications:

— 'Snuff' en *Henry IV, Part 1*. *Filología Moderna*, XVIII, 62, 1977: 79-85.

— El tratamiento de los Cuartos y el Primer Folio en la edición de Pope. *Atlantis*, I, 1979: 38-51.

— La lengua de los ciudadanos en dos comedias renacentistas: *The Shoemaker's Holiday* y *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. *Atlantis*, II, 1, 1981: 21-36.

— Las notas de Pope a su edición de Shakespeare. *Senara*, 4, 1982: 191-203.

— Notas en torno a las innovaciones léxicas en la obra de Christopher Marlowe (I). *RCEI*, 9, 1984: 13-40.

— Notas en torno a las innovaciones léxicas en la obra de Christopher Marlowe (II). *RCEI*, 10, 1985: 43-64.

— En torno a John Skelton y algunos aspectos de su dicción poética. > J. F. Galván Reula (ed): *Estudios Literarios Ingleses. Edad Media*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1985: 285-308.

— Del lenguaje shakesperiano y de sus críticos: algunas consideraciones en torno a *Antony and Cleopatra*, V. ii, 207-89. > R. Portillo (ed): *Estudios Literarios Ingleses. Shakespeare y el teatro de su época*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1987: 219-238.

— Finite complement clauses in Shakespeare's English, Part 1. *Studia Neophilologica*, 62/1, 1990: 3-21.

— Finite complement clauses in Shakespeare's English, Part 2. *Studia Neophilologica*, 62/2, 1990: 129-149.

— On the origin and history of the English syntactic type (*and*) *none but he to marry with Nan Page*. *English Studies*, 72, 1991: 513-519.

— *Infinitive complements in Shakespeare's English. Synchronic and diachronic aspects*. Universidad de Santiago: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992.

— Infinitive marking in Early Modern English. > Francisco Fernández *et al.*: *Papers from the 7th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics* (Valencia, 22-25 September 1992). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1994: 191-203.

— English historical syntax: approaches and problems. *Actas del XVI Congreso Internacional de AEDEAN*. Universidad de Valladolid: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1994: 13-28.

— The development of gerunds as objects of subject-control verbs in English (1400-1760). *Diachronica*, 13/1, 1996: 29-63.

- English *remember* and Role and Reference grammar: On Van Valin and Wilkins (1993). *Lingua*, 98/1, 1996: 15-26.
- On patterns of complementation with verbs of effort. *English Studies*, 77, 1996. (en prensa)
- On the historical development of English retrospective verbs. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 97/1, 1996 (en prensa).
- The gerund in Early Modern English: Evidence from the Helsinki Corpus. *Folia Linguistica Historica*. (en prensa)

FÉLIX GARCÍA, M^a DEL MAR

Pasaje Begoña, Ed. Garibay, 5, 9^o A. 29010-Málaga.

Publications:

- *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Los Comendadores de Córdoba*. Two Different Approaches to the Senecan Revenge Theme. > Ana Manzananas (ed): *SEDERI VI*. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 37-42.

FERNÁNDEZ SUÁREZ, JOSÉ RAMÓN (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. 47002-Valladolid. Tlf. 983-423000, Ext. 4267.

PTU, Universidad de Valladolid. RA: Cultura e instituciones británicas (políticas, jurídicas, religión, arte, ...); relaciones históricas y culturales entre España y Gran Bretaña; cultura británica vista por españoles.

Tesis doctoral: *Influjo de Fray Luis de Granada en John Donne*. Universidad de Valladolid, 1974.

Publications:

- Fray Luís de Granada en Inglaterra: Repercusiones en los Sermones de John Donne. *ES*, 4, 1974: 111-131.
- La primera actuación del Conde de Gondomar en Inglaterra: La *Defensio Fidei* de Suárez, 1613-1614. *ES*, 5, 1975: 43-69.
- La embajada inglesa en Madrid y la Española en Londres, 1607-1614. *ES*, 6, 1976: 83-139.
- Francis Cottington: su correspondencia inédita con el Conde de Gondomar, 1616-1619. *ES*, 7, 1977: 71-116.
- Joseph Creswell: al servicio de Dios y de su Majestad Católica, 1598-1613. *ES*, 8, 1978: 47-83.
- Relaciones diplomáticas españolas con la República inglesa de O. Cromwell, 1650-1658. *ES*, 9, 1979: 33-74.
- España ante la boda de Carlos II Estuardo y la Independencia de Portugal: la Diplomacia española, 1660-1666. *ES*, 10, 1980: 3-80.
- La persecución religiosa de Carlos II de Inglaterra a través de los embajadores españoles, 1666-1685. *ES*, 12, 1982: 3-60.
- Política y religión durante el reinado de Jacobo II a través de los Embajadores españoles, 1685-1688. *ES*, 13, 1983: 3-62.
- Por Valladolid ni al cielo quisiera ir ... *El Norte de Castilla*, 1, XI, 1988.
- El Colegio de los Ingleses en Valladolid, tan cercano. *ES*, 14, 1990: 45-61.
- Popularidad de Fray Luís de Granada en Inglaterra: valoración de su persona y de sus escritos. *Actas del Congreso sobre Fray Luís de Granada 1991*.
- Henry VIII's Learned Wives. > M^a Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 91-98.

FLOTATS CRISPÍ, ROSA

C/ Soler i Palet, 2, àtic-2^a. 08222-Terrassa (Barcelona). Tlf. 93-7832553. E-mail: rflotats@cesca.es.

Profesora Agregada de Traducción y de Inglés, Facultad de Traducción e Interpretación d'Osona. RA: Literatura y cultura inglesas siglos XVI y XVII. Traducción literaria. TEFL, especialmente en el campo de *literature in the EFL class*.

Tesina: *Cultural Transfer: Miltonic Thought reflected in the Catalan and Spanish Translations of Paradise Lost*. Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, 1994.

Tarabajo de Investigación Doctorado: *Cultural Transfer: Miltonic Thought Reflected in the Catalan and Spanish Translations of Paradise Lost*. Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, 1994.

Tesis Doctoral: *John Milton i Josep M. Boix i Silva. Estudi comparatiu de la traducció d'un clàssic al català*. (en preparació)

Publications:

- *Cultural Transfer: Miltonic Thought Reflected in the Catalan and Spanish Translations of Paradise Lost*. Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra, 1994.

— Milton: *Paradise Lost* and the Question of Kabbalah. > Ana Manzanás (ed): *SEDERI VI*. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 43-52.

GARCÉS GARCÍA, PILAR

Pl. San Juan, 14, 7º C. 47002-Valladolid. Tlf. 983-397546.

PA, Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Valladolid. RA: Lingüística Aplicada, Lingüística y Crítica Literaria.

Publications:

— The Place of Man in the Chain of Beins According to Sidney's *Defense of Poesie*. *SEDERI* IV, 1993: 63-68.

GARCÍA GARCÍA, LUCIANO

C/ Martínez Molina, 7, 2º D. 23004-Jaén. Tlf. 953-274619.

PA, Facultad de Humanidades, Jaén. RA: Literatura Isabelina y Jacobea.

Publications:

— Religion and Rebelliousness in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. > Mª Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI* III. Granada, 1992: 99-110.

GARCÍA GONZÁLEZ, FRANCISCO (Dr)

Rector Leopoldo Alas Hijo, 11, 6ºA. 33006-Oviedo. Tlf. 98-5273900.

Profesor de EOI, Escuela Oficial Idiomas, Oviedo. RA: Relaciones España-Irlanda-Inglaterra (finales del s. XVI).

Publications:

— Mateo de Oviedo, perhaps Ireland's greatest Spanish friend of all time. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI* II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 113-122.

GLEESON DE BIEL, MARY

C/ Cuesta del Caidero, 15. 18009-Granada. Tlf. 958-229420.

PA, Universidad de Granada. RA: medieval y renacimiento.

Publications:

— Celtic Undertones in *Macbeth*. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI* II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 123-134.

— Three Scenes of Sorcery: An Analysis of Witchcraft in *Macbeth*. > Mª Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI* III. Granada, 1992: 111-122.

GÓMEZ LARA, MANUEL JOSÉ (Dr)

Departamento de Literatura Inglesa y Norteamericana, Facultad de Filología, C/ Palos de la Frontera, s/n. 41004-Sevilla. Tlf. 95-4551554.

PTU, Universidad de Sevilla. RA: Estilística; teatro y manifestaciones paradramáticas en el Renacimiento; Emblemática; retórica de las ciudades.

Publications:

— El proceso amoroso de Cryseide: aproximación a una heroína con voz propia. *Actas del V Congreso de AEDEAN*, 1983: 109-201.

— Análisis textual del soneto XX de Shakespeare. *Gades*, 7. 1984: 373-384.

— Discurso irónico en *The Country Wife*. *Actas del VI Congreso de AEDEAN*, 1984: 155-164.

— 'O never was there queen / so mightly betrayed' (I, iii, 24-25): Locura de amor en *Antony and Cleopatra*. *Philología Hispalensis*, 2. 1987: 19-29.

— Shakespeare in the New Spain or What you Will. > *Shakespeare in the New Europe*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994: 208-220.

— Emblemas dramáticos: el caso de Gorboduc. *Actas del I Simposio de Literatura Emblemática Hispánica*. Universidad de La Coruña, 1994.

GÓMEZ SOLIÑO, JOSÉ (Dr)

Departamentode Filología Moderna-Inglés, Facultad de Filología (Campus de Guajara). 38071- La Laguna. Tenerife. Tlf. 922-609503.

PTU, Universidad de La Laguna.

Tesis Doctoral: *Variación y estandarización en el inglés moderno temprano: 1470-1540*. Universidad de Oviedo, 1981.

Publications:

— Hobbes, Hombre de Letras. *Liminar*, 4-5, 1979. pp. 26-31.

- Formas verbales de singular en ETH y (E)S en las novelas de Deloney. *RCEI*, 2, 1981: 1-25.
- Thomas Wolsey, Thomas More y la lengua estándar de su época. *RCEI*, 3, 1981: 74-84.
- Thomas Wyatt y el inglés estándar de su tiempo. *Homenaje a Esteban Pujals Fontrodona*, Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo, 1981: 200-216.
- Inglaterra y los ingleses vistos por un español del siglo XVI. *RCEI*, 4, 1982: 139-149.
- *Variación y estandarización en el inglés moderno temprano*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1984.
- Tradición e innovación en los estudios sobre el origen del inglés estándar moderno. *Actas del VIII Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de Málaga, 1984: 75-80.
- La génesis del inglés estándar moderno: historia y estado actual de la cuestión. *RCEI*, 11, 1985: 81-106.
- La normalización lingüística en la época de Enrique VIII. > S. Onega (ed): *Estudios Literarios Ingleses. Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1986: 19-44.
- Copistas y cajistas en la etapa postmedieval inglesa. *Actas del IX Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de Murcia, 1986: 21-28.

GONZÁLEZ ARILLA, JOSÉ ANTONIO.

C/ Francesc Macià, 4, 5º 5ª. 43850-Cambrils (Tarragona).

GONZÁLEZ FERNÁNDEZ DE SEVILLA, JOSE MANUEL (Dr)

Av. de Alcoy 115, Esc. 2º 1º A. 03009-Alicante. Tlf. 96-5252398.

PTU, Universidad de Alicante. RA: Literatura inglesa medieval y renacentista; Siglo XX.

Teaching: literatura renacentista. Cursos de Doctorado: Bipolaridad verbal fundamental en la obra de W. Shakespeare; Metadramática shakespeariana; Hacia una reinterpretación de la historia en el teatro renacentista inglés; Estrategias políticas y reivindicaciones feministas en el teatro de W. Shakespeare.

Cursos de Doctorado: Bipolaridad verbal fundamental en la obra de William Shakespeare; Metadramática shakespeariana; Hacia una reinterpretación de la historia en el teatro renacentista inglés.

Publications:

- El tema de la venganza en *Titus Andronicus* o el sinsentido trágico del existir. *RCEI*, 12, 1986: 123-137.
- *Hacia una teoría lingüística y literaria en la obra de William Shakespeare*. Madrid: Editorial de la Universidad Complutense, 1987.
- Ambientación alicantina para una tragedia jacobea: *The Changeling*. *Canelobre*, 9, 1987: 124-128.
- Teoría y práctica de la traducción en la Inglaterra isabelina. *RAEI*, 1, 1988: 99-108.
- El Mediterráneo en la literatura anglonorteamericana. *Canelobre*, 13, 1988: 200-207.
- *Don Quijote de la Mancha* en Inglaterra. *CEM*, 16, 1988. pp. 43-56.
- Two Critical Aspects of *An Apology for Poetry*. *Atlantis*, XI, 1 y 2, 1989: 39-54.
- Lo español en *The Spanish Tragedy*. *RAEI*, 2, 1989: 91-100.
- Political Strategies of Drama in Renaissance England. > Javier Sánchez (ed): *SEDERI I*. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 95-104.
- Tragedia, confusión y fracaso en *The Jew of Malta*. *Miscelánea*, 11, 1990: 69-82.
- Lo popular en el teatro de William Shakespeare. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo *et al.* (eds): *Studia Patriciae Shaw Oblata*, I. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1991: 307-315.
- La poesía metafísica de John Donne y Fco. de Quevedo. *Neophilologus*, 75, 1991: 161-170.
- Existential Needs and Political Deeds in *Coriolanus*. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI II*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 135-146.
- (Ed) *Shakespeare en España. Crítica, traducciones y representaciones*. Zaragoza: Pórtico, 1993.
- Vicisitudes y desventuras del Shakespeare español. *Idem*, pp. 17-38.
- Nick Dear's Adaptation of Tirso's *Don Juan*. > Mª Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 123-132.
- *A Midsummer's Night Dream* in Almagro. > Ana Manzanas (ed): *SEDERI VI*. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 53-58.

GONZÁLEZ Y FERNÁNDEZ-CORUGEDO, SANTIAGO (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Anglogermánica y Francesa, Facultad de Filología, Campus El Milán. 33071-Oviedo. Tlf.: (34) (8) 5104535. e-mail: cmsf11@vmesa.cpd.uniovi.es.

CU, Universidad de Oviedo. RA: Poesía y Retórica siglos XVI y XVII. Bibliografía, codicología y bibliología.
Teaching: Inglés Bajomedieval y Renacentista. Doctorados sobre: Literatura de pastores en la edad de oro inglesa y española (Universidad de Oviedo); Características formales del inglés bajomedieval y renacentista (Universidades de León y Oviedo).

Publications:

- Amorette & Epithalamion de Edmund Spenser. Edición bilingüe, introducción, traducción y notas. Madrid: Cátedra, 1983.
- Edmund Spenser: la reina de las hadas y su poeta. > S. Onega (ed): *Estudios Literarios Ingleses: Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1986: 319-342.
- Introducción a John Donne: Canciones y Sonetos. > *Scripta in Memoriam J. B. Alvarez-Buylla*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987: 7-35. (en colaboración con J. L. Caramés Lage).
- Ediciones de la poesía profana de Jorge de Montemayor. *Archivum* nº XXXVI, Oviedo, 1989 (1986): 413-420.
- Platonism and Love in Spenser's minor poetry. > Javier Sánchez (ed): *SEDERI I*. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 57-70.
- Co-texts in *The Shepherdes Calendar*. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo et al. (eds): *Studia Patriciae Shaw Oblata*, III. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1991: 172-192.
- Problemas formales de la traducción de *The Shepherds Calendar* de Edmund Spenser. > F. Eguíluz et al. (eds): *Transvases culturales: literatura, cine, traducción*. Vitoria: Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Alemana, 1994: 199-207.
- Editing Renaissance Classics in Spain in the 90's. > Ana Manzanás (ed): *SEDERI VI*. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 59-74.

GREGOR, GRAHAM KEITH (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Letras, Santo Cristo, s/n. 30071-Murcia.

PA, Universidad de Murcia. Director de Grupo de Teatro. RA: Crítica literaria, Literatura Renacentista.

Tesis Doctoral: *The Politics of Courtship: Structures of Social and Sexual Power in Astrophil & Stella*. Universidad de Murcia, 1995.

Publications:

- The Death-Wound: Notes on a line by Sir Philip Sidney. *Actas del X Congreso de AEDEAN*. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1988: 347-353.
- Narrative and Its Representation in *Othello*. *SEDERI IV*, 1993: 69-76.

GRONOW, MICHAEL (Dr)

Departamento de Literatura Inglesa y Norteamericana. Facultad de Filología, Palos de la Frontera, 41004-Sevilla.

GUERRA BOSCH, TERESA (Dr)

Bravo Murillo, 26. 35003-Las Palmas. Tlf.: 928-361540.

PTU, Departamento de Filología Moderna, Universidad de Las Palmas. RA: Shakespeare; literatura comparada.

Teaching: Literatura Inglesa Medieval y Renacentista.

Publications:

- The Nature of Shakespearean Tragedy. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI II*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 147-156.
- On Cressida's Defense. > M^a Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 133-138.
- Some Analogies in *La Celestina* and *Troilus and Cressida*. *SEDERI IV*, 1993: 77-86.

HERNÁNDEZ SANTANO, SONIA

Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias de la Educación. Avd. de las Fuerzas Armadas s/n. 21071-Huelva. Tlf.: 959-270860, 271000.

BI, Universidad de Huelva. RA: Poesía isabelina, teatro isabelino y jacobeo.

HERRERO QUIRÓS, CARLOS (Dr)

C/ Juan García Hortelano, 9, 7º A. 47014-Valladolid.

PA, Universidad de Valladolid.

HERRERO VILLAPALOS, ROSA

C/ Valdeyernos, 30, 2º C. 45007-Toledo. Tlf. 91-7411277.

PA, Universidad de Huelva. RA: Historia de la Lengua.

HORNERO CORISCO, ANA MARÍA (Dr)

Doctor Cerrada, 29, 7º D. 50005-Zaragoza. Tlf. 976-551647.

PTU, Universidad de Zaragoza. RA: Lingüística Diacrónica (especialmente Inglés Medio).

HURTLEY, JACQUELINE (Dr)

C/ Rafael Llopart, 74. 08870-Sitges (Barcelona). Tlf. 93-8948622.

CU, Universidad de Barcelona. RA: La prosa a partir del s. XVII; la traducción como fenómeno socio-político y cultural (anglo-española).

Publications:

— Thomas More and Jonathan Swift: the utopia as satire. > *Anuario de Filología*, 11. Universidad de Barcelona, 1985: 393-399.

— Erasmo, Moro y la 'Locura'. > *IV Seminari d'Aplicacions Didàctiques*. Departamento de Historia Moderna, Facultat de Filosofia i Lletres, Tarragona. Universitat de Barcelona, 1986: 83-97.

— Mary y Elizabeth: de la desesperación a la esperanza. > *Actas de las Jornadas de Historia: Antoni Agustín (1517-1586) i el seu temps*. Tarragona, 1986.

KRAUEL HEREDIA, BLANCA (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Letras, Campus de Teatinos, Universidad de Málaga. 29071-Málaga. Tlf. 952-131791.

PTU, Universidad de Málaga. RA: literatura de viajes por España.

Publications:

— Events surrounding Thomas Malliard's Wiil, an English Merchant in Seville (1522-1523). > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo: *SEDERI II*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 157-166.

LOJO RODRÍGUEZ, LAURA

Los Tilos, C/ Roble, Chalet 7. 15886-Santiago de Compostela. Tlf. 981-801354. E-mail: ialojo@usc.es.

BI, Departamento Filología Inglesa y Alemana, Facultad de Filología, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela. RA: Literatura Inglesa.

Trabajo de Investigación: John Donne: an underrated art. Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 1993.

LÓPEZ-PELÁEZ CASELLAS, JESÚS

C/ Fuente del Alamillo, 5. Los Pórticos, 3, 4º, P3. 23006-Jaén. Tlf. 953-229082. E-mail: jlopez@piturda.ujaen.es.

PA, Universidad de Jaén.

Publications:

— The Inevitable Death of Desdemona: the conflict between Will and Reason. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI II*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 167-180.

— Saint Augustine of the Renaissance Concept of Honour. > Mª Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 139-148.

— Tragedy and Shared-Guilt: A Comparative Approach to *Othello* and *El pintor de su honra*. *SEDERI IV*, 1993: 103-110.

— Woman as Text in *Othello* and in Calderón's Dramas de Honor. > Ana Manzanos (ed): *SEDERI VI*. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 93-98.

LÓPEZ-PELÁEZ CASELLAS, MARÍA PAZ

Av. de Madrid, 68, P 2, 5º A. 23009-Jaén. Tlf. 953-229061.

Profesora Titular de Solfeo y Teoría de la Música, Conservatorio de Jaén.

RA: Historia de la Música.

Publications:

— La Música Sacra Inglesa en el Renacimiento. > Mª Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 149-148.

— El laúd en el Renacimiento inglés. *SEDERI* IV, 1993: 111-120.

LÓPEZ ROMÁN, BLANCA (Dr)

C/ Melchor Almagro, 16, 5º C, Esc. B. 18002-Granada. Tlf. 958-280530.

PTU, Universidad de Granada. RA: Shakespeare y teatro inglés contemporáneo.

Teaching: Shakespeare, Teatro Inglés.

Publications:

- El feminismo en Rosalind en el bosque de Arden. *EFI*, Vol. 6-7, 1979. pp. 105-119.
- Algunas consideraciones sobre las adaptaciones del drama de Shakespeare. *Atlantis*, Vol IX, nos. 1 y 2, 1987: 63-72.
- Transformaciones neoclásicas del *Macbeth* shakespeariano. *RCEI*, 17, 1988: 281-294.
- Procesos de transformación de Shakespeare en la traducción de *Hamlet* de Moratín. *BELLS*, 1, 1989: 117-123.
- Transformaciones galoclásicas en el texto de la traducción de *Hamlet* de Moratín. *Actas del XI Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de León: Secretariado de Publicaciones, 1989: 119-126.
- Transformaciones del *Macbeth* shakespeariano durante el siglo XIX. *Atlantis*. (en prensa)
- Transformaciones de las brujas de *Macbeth* desde Holinshed al collage neoyorkino de Marowitz. *Actas del XIII Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de Tarragona, 1991: 219-229.
- Sir William D'Avenant's so-called improvements of *Macbeth* (1674). > Javier Sánchez (ed): *SEDERI* II. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 211-222.
- Biografías españolas de Shakespeare. > J. M. González (ed): *Shakespeare en España*. Zaragoza: Pórtico, 1993: 137-160.
- Multicritical Introduction to Shakespeare Television Adaptations and the BBC *Hamlet* (1980, 1990). > Mª Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI* III. Granada, 1992: 159-170.
- The Shakespearean Performances in Spain. Review of Alfonso Par, 1935-1936. > Miguel Martínez López (ed): *Estudios de Literatura en Lengua Inglesa*, I. Universidad de Granada, 1995: 161-172.

LUIS MARTÍNEZ, ZENÓN.

San Salvador, 16, 1º D. 41013-Sevilla.

MANZANAS CALVO, ANA Mª (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Moderna, Universidad de Castilla - La Mancha. Paseo de la Universidad, 4. 13071-Ciudad Real. Tlf. 926-295300.

PTU, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha.

Publications:

- Ideological Tensions in Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko*. > Ana Manzananas (ed): *SEDERI* VI. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 99-106.

MARTÍNEZ LÓPEZ, MIGUEL (Dr)

C/ Obispo Hurtado, 11, 5º E, Esc. dcha. 18002-Granada. Tlf. 958-520900.

CU, Universidad de Almería. RA: El *Dr. Faustus* de Ch. Marlowe y la literatura utópica inglesa.

Teaching: Literatura Inglesa (hasta el s. XVIII); doctorado sobre El tema del mal y la presencia diabólica en el *Dr. Fausto* de Ch. Marlowe y seminario sobre Utopías del Renacimiento; Técnicas de investigación: métodos y fuentes para el estudio de las literaturas en lengua inglesa.

Tesis Doctoral: *Forms of Faustus' solitude: humanist themes and conventions of the Italian Renaissance in Ch. Marlowe's Dr. Faustus*. Dirigida por Vita Fortunati y Ezio Raimondi. Universidad de Bolonia, 1988.

Publications:

- Marlowe's *Faustus* at the crossroads: mediæval elements and diabolical games. Capítulo en *Literature, Culture and Society of the Middle Ages*, ed. with an introduction by Miguel Martínez. Barcelona: PPU, 1989: 2639-2718.
- Two forgotten sources of Ch Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*. A reappraisal. > *Actas del II Congreso Internacional de SELIM*. Córdoba, 1989 (1993): 126-132.
- Principales resultados de un análisis semiótico del Texto-A (1604) de *The Tragicall History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus*. > *Actas del III Simposio Internacional de la Asociación Andaluza de Semiótica*. Granada: Microfilms de la Universidad, 1990: 17 p.

- The Philosophy of Death in Ch. Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*. > Javier Sánchez (ed): *SEDERI* I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 105-122.
- The discovery of solitude and Ch. Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*. *Il Confronto Letterario*, VIII, 16, 1991: 349-361.
- The 'Domus Yspanica' and the English spirit of the medieval College: the Oxford and Cambridge models. > *Proceedings of the International Symposium Bologna, Italian Culture and Modern Literatures*. University of Bologna. Ravenna: Longo Editore, 1992: 109-122.
- The Thomist Concept of Virtue in Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. > M^a L. Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI* III. Universidad de Granada, 1992: 171-182.
- The mediaeval background of Thomas More's *Utopia*. > J. Juis Chamosa (ed): *SELIM*, V. León: Universidad de León, 1992. (en prensa)
- Renaissance Visions of Paradise: Ancient Religious Sources of Thomas More's *The Best State of a Commonwealth and the New Island of Utopia*. *SEDERI* IV, 1993: 121-132.
- Linguistics and the drama in the E. F. L. literature class: a dramatological analysis of the prologue of Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. *Proceedings of the International Conference of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. I. Granada: ICE-Universidad de Granada, 1993: 521-533.
- One mediaeval source and a forgotten game in Ch. Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*. > *SELIM*, II. Córdoba: Universidad, 1993: 126-133.
- The Life of the Essenes and the Life of the Utopians. A Case Study. *Moreana*, Vol. 31, Nos. 118-119, Junio, 1994: 43-59. Special issue on More's *Utopia*, ed. by E. McCutcheon & C. H. Miller.
- *Y seréis como dioses. Estudio sobre Christopher Marlowe y Doctor Fausto*. Granada: Universidad, 1995.
- The idea of a commonwealth according to the Essenes and St. Thomas More's *The Best State of a Commonwealth and the New Island of Utopia*. > A. Cousins and D. Grace (eds): *More's Utopia and the Utopian Inheritance*. New York: University Press of America, 1995: 53-68.
- Overreaching flesh and soul: Ch. Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and Tirso de Molina's *Don Juan*. > Ana Manzananas (ed): *SEDERI* VI. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 107-116.
- Sir John Mandeville's *Travels* and the origins of English utopian literature, *SELIM*, VI. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 1995 231-240.
- The influence of Thomas More in the creation and development of utopia as a literary genre. *Proceedings of the 5th International Thomas More Symposium*, Mainz: Thomas-Morus Gesellschaft, en prensa.
- Thomas More's utopia and the medieval monastic ideal. *Proceedings of Selim*, VIII. Castellón de la Plana: Universidad de Castellón, 1995. (en prensa)
- Towards a definition of English utopian literature. *Actas del I Congreso de Lengua y Literatura Anglo-Norteamericana*. Ciudad Real: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1995: 461-467.

MARTÍNEZ LORENTE, JOAQUÍN (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Facultad de Letras. C/ Sto. Cristo, 1. 30071-Murcia.

PA, Universidad de Murcia. RA: Narrativa inglesa en general, literatura utópica.

Tesina: *Elementos utópicos en Gulliver's Travels*. Universidad de Murcia.

Tesis Doctoral: *Literatura utópica inglesa y teoría de los géneros literarios. Estudio de Utopía, New Atlantis y Gulliver's Travels desde un punto de vista genérico*. Universidad de Murcia.

Publications:

- More's *Utopia* or Utopia's *Utopia*? How to Handle Textual and Generic Doubling. *SEDERI* IV 1993: 133-142.
- Possible-World Theories and the Two Fictional Worlds of More's *Utopia*. > Ana Manzananas (ed): *SEDERI* VI. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 117-124.

MELE MARRERO, MARGARITA

Departamento de Filología Moderna-Inglés, Facultad de Filología (Campus de Guajara). 38071-La Laguna. Tenerife. Tlf. 922-609516.

PA, Universidad de La Laguna.

Publications:

- Cony-Catchers and cazadores de gatos: An Examination of the Lexis Related to Thieves and Swindlers in England and Spain in the 16th and 17th Centuries. *SEDERI* IV, 1993: 143-154.

MONNICKENDAM, ANDREW (Dr)

Passatge Romaní, 1, 17003-Girona. Tlf. 972-217386.

PTU. Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona. RA: Milton, Scottish literature, literary theory.

Teaching: The Metaphysical Poets and the Poetry of John Milton; Poetry, Politics and Puritans; Shakespeare.

Publications:

- *Paradise Lost* as a novel. > Javier Sánchez (ed): *SEDERI* I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 179-190.
- Fallen Fruit, Fallen Man and a Fallen State: Images in Marvell's Pastoral Poetry. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI* II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1991: 180-192.
- All About Eve. > Manuel Barbeito (ed): *Paradise Lost: the World, the World, the Words*. Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Cursos e Congresos, 1991: 85-101.
- Anti-Scottish Sentiment and the Rise of Englishness. > M^a Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI* III. Granada, 1992: 195-208.
- The Poet and the Bard. *SEDERI* IV, 1993: 155-164.

MUÑOZ VALDIVIESO, SOFÍA

C/ Almansa, 14, Esc. A, 2º D. 29007-Málaga. Tlf. 95-2610873.

PA, Universidad de Málaga. RA: Crítica Literaria, Poesía Inglesa.

M. A. Thesis: *The Spanish Legend in Lord Byron's Don Juan*. Temple University, Philadelphia PA, USA.

Publications:

- Northrop Frye's Critical Approach to Shakespeare's Last Plays. *SEDERI* IV, 1993: 165-172.

MURILLO MURILLO, ANA MARÍA

Avda. Clavé, 47, 2º B. 50004-Zaragoza. Tlf. 976-282385.

Publications:

- *The Spanish Jilt*: the first English version of *La Pícaro Justina*. > Javier Sánchez (ed): *SEDERI* I. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 157-178.
- Love and Chastity in Two Early English Versions of *La Celestina*. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI* II. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 193-206.
- Spanish Books in Captain Stevens' Library. > M^a Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI* III. Granada, 1992: 209-218.
- Redefining Characters in Translation: A Case. *SEDERI* IV, 1993: 173-180.
- Cultural transfer in different literary contexts. The case of *La Celestina*. > F. Eguíluz *et al.* (eds): *Transvases culturales: literatura, cine, traducción*. Vitoria: Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Alemana, 1994: 51-56.
- Wit, Faithfulness and 'Improvements' in English Translation: Anthologies of Spanish Popular Literature (1700). > Harald Kittel (ed): *International Anthologies of Literature in Translation. Göttinger Beiträge zur Internationalen Übersetzungsforschung*, Band 9, 1995: 30-39.

NAVARRO ERRASTI, M^a PILAR (Dr)

C/ Cesáreo Alierta, 6, 10º dcha. 50008-Zaragoza. Tlf. 976-229176.

PTU, Universidad de Zaragoza. RA: Pragmática; traducción; historia del inglés.

Tesis Doctoral: *Estudio lingüístico comparativo de la primera versión inglesa del Buscón*. Universidad de Zaragoza, 1979.

Publications:

- Inglaterra y Quevedo. *Letras de Deusto*, 20, 1980: 147-164.
- Predicados, nombres y roles en *Romeo y Julieta*. *Homenaje a Esteban Pujals Fontrodona*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1981. (s. p.).
- *The Witty Spaniard*, un héroe importado. *Actas V Congreso AEDEAN*. Madrid: Alhambra, 1983: 240-248.
- Quevedo en lengua inglesa. > J. C. Santoyo & I. Verdaguer (eds): *De clásicos y traducciones. Versiones inglesas de clásicos españoles (ss. XVI y XVII)*. Barcelona: PPU, 1987: 165-187.
- J. D. Primer traductor inglés del *Buscón*, reconstrucción de su biografía a través de los prefacios de sus traducciones. *Miscelánea*, 8, 1987: 33-60.

NÚÑEZ PERTEJO, PALOMA

Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Alemana, Facultad de Filología. 15704-Santiago de Compostela. Tlf.: 981 - 575340.

BI, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela. RA: historia de la lengua inglesa; lingüística histórica.

Publications:

— 1995: The development of the Progressive from OE to eModE. *Proceedings of the VIII Conference of SELIM*. Universidad de Castellón. (en prensa)

OLIVARES MERINO, EUGENIO MANUEL

C/ Almona del Boquerón 10, 1º C. 18001-Granada.

PA, Universidad de Jaén. RA: Literatura medieval y Shakespeare.

Publications:

— On Prospero's Abjuration of His 'Rough Magic'. > Mª Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 219-232.

OLIVARES RIVERA, CARMEN (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Alemana, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Zaragoza. 50009-Zaragoza.

CU, Universidad de Zaragoza. RA: Análisis contrastivo, Pragmática.

Publications:

— Romeo y Julieta como conversación. *CIF*, VII, 1981: 23-27.

OLIVERA VILLACAMPA, MACARIO (Dr)

Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Alemana. Colegio Universitario. Plaza. de la Universidad, 3. 22002-Huesca. Tlf. 974-221050, Ext. 214.

TU, Universidad de Zaragoza. RA: Lengua y Lingüística inglesas, Estudios Renacentistas Ingleses.

Tesina: *Estudio comparado de actualización del lenguaje bíblico en inglés y en español y sus denotaciones semánticas*. Universidad de Zaragoza, 1979.

Tesis doctoral: *Dimensiones de la actualización del lenguaje y lingüística comparada en las biblias inglesa y española*. Universidad de Zaragoza, 1981.

Publications:

— Las causas de divorcio en *Utopía*. *Miscelánea*, 6, 1985: 45-56.

— Uso actual de las formas en *thou*. *Didáctica de la Lengua y la Literatura*, II. Colegio Universitario de Huesca, 1985: 25-34.

— The birth of the Bible in English. > Javier Sánchez (ed): *SEDERI I*. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 37-44.

— The allegory of the sower. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo *et al.* (eds): *Studia Patriciae Shaw Oblata*, III. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1991: 333-340.

— Providence and science in Bacon's *New Philosophy*. *Actas del XV Congreso AEDEAN*. Logroño, 1992: 529-534.

— Your Majesty, the Head of the Church of England. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI II*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 207-216.

— King James Bible: Language and Times. > Mª Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 233-242.

— *The Book of Common Prayer: Its Making and Language*. *SEDERI IV*, 1993: 181-190.

O'NEILL, MARIA

Departament d'Anglès. Universitat de Lleida. Plaça Víctor Siurana, 1. 25003-Lleida. Tlf. 973-702000.

PA, Universidad de Lérida. RA: Lengua y Literatura del siglo XVI.

Tesina: *Richard Mulcaster: the aloness of attempt*. Universitat de Lleida, 1996.

Tesis Doctoral: *The first part of The Elementarie: influence and impact*. (en preparación)

Publications:

— As the river flows: reform and change in *The Elementarie*. *Actas del XIX Congreso de AEDEAN*, Vigo, 1995.

PANDO CANTELI, MARÍA JESÚS

Departamento de Filología Inglesa. Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. Universidad de Deusto. 48080-Bilbao. Tlf. 94-4453100, Ext. 378.

PA, Universidad de Deusto, Campus de San Sebastián. RA: Siglo XVII, Literatura Comparada.

Publications:

- The Treatment of the Feminine in Donne's Love Poetry: Some Traces of the Roman Elegy. > M^a Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI* III. Granada, 1992: 243-254.

PÉREZ VALVERDE, M^a CRISTINA

C/ Cruz 2, 4^o F. 18002-Granada.

PRIETO PABLOS, JUAN ANTONIO (Dr)

Ciudad Jardín Triana, 32. 41960-Sevilla. E-mail: ppablos@cica.es.

PTU, Universidad de Sevilla.

Tesis Doctoral: *El inglés coloquial en el Diario de Samuel Pepys, 1660-1669*. Universidad de Sevilla, 1985-6.

Publications:

- *Una Gramática de Pepys*. Tesis de Licenciatura. Universidad de Sevilla, 1980.
- Falstaff y la iniciación de Hal: perspectiva ritual de *Henry IV*. *Actas del V Congreso de AEDEAN*. Madrid: Alhambra, 1983: 283-290.
- Diarios y cartas del siglo XVII. > Bernd Dietz (ed): *Estudios literarios ingleses. La Restauración, 1660-1700*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1989: 245-264.

RIBEIRO DE PAIVA CORREIA, MARIA HELENA (Dr)

Rua Cidade de João Belo, n^o 6, 3^o Esq^o. 1800-Lisboa, Portugal. Tlf. (01) 8519520.

Professora Catedrática, Departamento Estudos Anglísticos, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal. RA: literatura renacentista; teoría de la literatura (teoría de los géneros); literatura comparada.

Tesis doctoral: *Shakespearean comedy*. Lisboa. Y *Shelley's Defence of Poetry*.

Publications:

- Shakespeare, the Beauty and the Beast. *Revista Portuguesa de Estudos Anglo-Americanos*, 2, 1992: 109-113.
- Inventions Fine: Sir Philip Sidney's successful handling of conventional rhetorical devices. *Revista Portuguesa de Estudos Anglo-Americanos*, 3, 1993: 3-11.

RODRÍGUEZ FERNÁNDEZ, CARLOS

C/ Atabalero, Blq. 1, 2^o B. 29010-Málaga. Tlf. 952-392597. Licenciado.

RA: Literatura Isabelina y Jacobea.

Tesina sobre los Contemporáneos de Shakespeare. (en preparación)

RODRÍGUEZ LEDESMA, M^a NIEVES (Dr)

C/ Guadarrama, 22, 2^o izda. 41005-Sevilla. Tlf. 95-4639740.

PA, Facultad de Humanidades, Universidad de Huelva. RA: Historia de la lengua inglesa. Escocés.

Tesis Doctoral: *Anglificación y estandarización lingüísticas en The Complaynt of Scotland*. Universidad de Sevilla.

Publications:

- El escocés del siglo XVI en la dedicatoria de *The Complaynt of Scotland*. *Actas del Simposium Internacional Henry Sweet*. Córdoba, 1992.
- Scots / English interaction in *The Complaynt of Scotland*. *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Medieval and Renaissance Scottish Literature and Language*. Glasgow, 1993.

RODRÍGUEZ PALOMERO, LUISA FERNANDA (Dr)

Isabel la Católica, 1, 1^o izda. 47001-Valladolid. Tlf. 983-354473.

PTU, Universidad de León. RA: El artista, teoría literaria.

SÁEZ HIDALGO, ANA

C/ Veinte de Febrero, 4, 4^o B. 47001-Valladolid.

PA, Departamento de Lengua y Literatura Inglesa y Alemana, Valladolid. RA: Traducción (Renacimiento); relaciones culturales hispano-inglesas en los ss. XVI y XVII.

Tesina: *Democritus Junior to Nowadays Reader: Problemas en la traducción de tecnicismos en la Anatomy of Melancholy de Robert Burton*. Universidad de Valladolid.

Traducciones:

— Prólogo de *Anatomy of Melancholy*, de Robert Burton. *Revista de la Asociación Española de Neuropsiquiatría*, 56 (Suplemento), 1995: 6-110.

— *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, de Robert Burton. (en preparación)

SÁEZ GONZÁLEZ, ROSA

C/ Cuba, 1, 2º C. 06800-Mérida (Badajoz). Tlf. 924-373266. Licenciada en Filología Inglesa y MA in Foreign Languages and Literatures.

Profesora de EOI, Escuela de Idiomas de Mérida.

Tesis: *Bonds of Interest in The Merchant of Venice*. University of Delaware. Newark: Delaware, 1989.

Publications:

— Religion, Law and Justice in *The Merchant of Venice*, *Los Intereses Creados* and *La Ciudad Alegre y Confianza*. > Mª Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 267-276.

— Masks and Characters in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Los intereses creados*. *SEDERI IV*, 1993: 191: 202.

SÁNCHEZ ESCRIBANO, F. JAVIER (Dr)

C/ Panamá 8, 1º 1ª. 50012-Zaragoza. Tlf. 976-332987.

PTU, Universidad de Zaragoza. RA: literatura inglesa medieval y renacentista; relaciones hispano-inglesas en el siglo XVII; teoría literaria: historicismo, estética de la recepción.

Teaching: Teatro Isabelino, Literatura Inglesa Medieval y Renacentista.

Cursos de Doctorado: Influencia literaria española en la Inglaterra de los siglos XVI y XVII; Literatura española en la Inglaterra de los siglos XVI y XVII: traducciones y traductores; Historia y Literatura: Teatro histórico renacentista inglés; Literatura pastoril en el renacimiento inglés.

Tesina: *Estudio de las fuentes de The Tempest*. Universidad de Zaragoza, 1973.

Tesis Doctoral: *James Howell: un hispanista inglés del siglo XVII*. Universidad de Zaragoza, 1979.

Publications:

— James Howell: un galés del siglo XVII, viajero por el País Vasco. *BSS*, XXIII, 1979: 139-155.

— *James Howell: un hispanista inglés del siglo XVII*. Universidad de Zaragoza: Secretariado de Publicaciones, 1980. (Resumen Tesis Doctoral).

— Tamburlaine y su teoría del poder. *Miscelánea*, 1, 1980: 55-62.

— La pronunciación del inglés según las gramáticas de James Howell. Sus fuentes. *Miscelánea*, 2, 1982: 55-72.

— *The Tempest* y dos novelas francesas: análisis temático. *Miscelánea*, 3, 1983: 27-51.

— Los diccionarios políglotos de James Howell: fuentes y aportaciones personales. *Atlantis*, 5, 1983: 5-22.

— Los dioses en *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. *Miscelánea*, 5, 1984: 9-20.

— Paremiología comparada: la primera colección de refranes españoles publicada en Inglaterra. *Actas del IV Congreso de AEDEAN*. Salamanca, 1984: 183-196.

— La unidad de tiempo en *Romeo and Juliet*. *Miscelánea*, 6, 1985: 71-80.

— Traducción de refranes españoles al inglés en el siglo XVII. *Actas de las Jornadas de Traducción*. Ciudad Real: Facultad de Letras, 1986: 233-247.

— La traducción de *Le Cid* de Corneille al inglés: un problema de fechas (Las traducciones de Joseph Rutter). *Actas de las I Jornadas Nacionales de Historia de la Traducción*. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987: 277-282.

— La versión inglesa de Hipólito y Aminta, de Francisco de Quintana: estudio bibliográfico. *Fidus Interpres: Actas del XI Congreso de AEDEAN*. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987: 173-181.

— La versión inglesa de *Experiencias de Amor* y *de Fortuna*, de Francisco de Quintana: aportaciones bibliográficas. > J. C. Santoyo e I. Verdager (eds): *De clásicos y traducciones. Clásicos españoles en versiones inglesas: los siglos XVI y XVII*. Estudios de Literatura Española y Comparada. Barcelona: PPU, 1987: 189-204.

— English translations from the Spanish through French in the 17th century. > Javier Sánchez (Ed.): *SEDERI I*. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 139-156.

— The Spanish Match through the Texts: Jonson, Middleton and Howell. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI II*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 230-246.

- Bibliografía española sobre Shakespeare. (Con M^a L. Dañobeitia) > J. M. González (ed): *Shakespeare en España: crítica, traducciones y representaciones*. Zaragoza: Pórtico, 1993: 469-496.
- Learning Spanish in England in the 16th and 17th Centuries. > M^a Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 277-292.
- Tamburlaine, the Scourge of God: Mexía, Marlowe and Vélez de Guevara. *SEDERI IV*, 1993: 203-216.
- Who's Who in SEDERI. *SEDERI IV*, 1993: 281-305.
- Ricardo II de Inglaterra: historia de una rebelión. > *Homenaje a María Luisa Ledesma*. Dept. de Historia Medieval, Universidad de Zaragoza, 1993: 827-842.
- Medieval into Renaissance: The case of Kings Richard II and Henry IV. *SELIM*, VI, 1995: 325-335.
- *Proverbios, Refranes y Traducción*. Zaragoza: SEDERI 1996.
- Shakespeare's *Richard II*: a Historical Reading. > Ana Manzananas (ed): *SEDERI VI*. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 163-174.

SÁNCHEZ ROURA, MARÍA TERESA (Dr)

Parque Municipal, 26, B 1. 15680-Ordenes (La Coruña).

Publications:

- Addressing the Audience of the *Towneley Plays*. > Ana Manzananas (ed): *SEDERI VI*. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 175-188.

SASTRE COLINO, CONCHA (Dr)

C/ Velardes, 10, 2º B. 47002-Valladolid.

PTEU Facultad de Educación. Valladolid.

Publications:

- The Romance in Shakespeare: *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Tempest*. *SEDERI IV*, 1993: 217-228.

SHAW FAIRMAN, PATRICIA (Dr)

Yela Utrilla, 2, B, 13º A. 33007-Oviedo. Tlf. 98-5237637.

CU, Universidad de Oviedo. RA: Lengua y Literatura Medieval Inglesa; Literatura y Lengua de los siglos XVI y XVII; Literatura Inglesa en general.

Publications:

- El Madrid y los madrileños del siglo XVII según los visitantes ingleses. *Anales del Instituto de Estudios Madrileños*, I. Madrid: CSIC, 1966: 137-145.
- Samuel Pepys y España. *Filología Moderna*, VI, 21-22, 1966: 3-28.
- Un turista inglés en España a principios del siglo XVII. *Homenaje al Profesor Alarcos*, II. Universidad de Valladolid, 1966: 809-827.
- *Macbeth* and the Critics. *Filología Moderna*, XIV, 50-51, 1974: 203-231.
- James Howell: un galés del siglo XVII curioso de las gentes y de las cosas de España. *Archivum*, XXVI. Universidad de Oviedo, 1976: 403-419.
- Noticias y conocimientos acerca de la lengua española en la Inglaterra del siglo XVII. *Estudios ofrecidos a Emilio Alarcos Llorach*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1979: 325-347.
- Testimonios ingleses contemporáneos sobre la figura de Gondomar. *ES*, 9, 1979: 109-132.
- A Sixteenth Century *Pamela*: Gabriel Harvey's *A Noble Mans Sute to a Cuntrie Maide*. *Homenaje a Esteban Pujals*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1981: 367-383.
- *España vista por los ingleses del siglo XVII*. Madrid: SGEL, 1981.
- Calderón y la Corte de Carlos II de Inglaterra. *Nueva Conciencia*. Mieres del Camino: Instituto «Bernaldo de Quirós», 1984: 119-127.
- Características de la narrativa isabelina en prosa. > S. Onega (ed): *Estudios Literarios Ingleses. Renacimiento y Barroco*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1986: 129-170.
- Los aciertos dramáticos de Thomas Middleton. > R. Portillo (ed): *Estudios Literarios Ingleses. Shakespeare y el teatro de su época*. Madrid: Cátedra, 1987: 255-279.
- The Miseries of Mavillia: a Miniature Novel of the Late Sixteenth Century. > *Scripta in Memoriam J. B. Alvarez-Buylla*, Universidad de Oviedo, 1987: 267-277.
- Ale-Wives, Old Wives, Widows and Witches: The Older Woman in English Renaissance Literature. > Javier Sánchez (ed): *SEDERI I*. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 9-36.

- Philip II and Seduction *a la española* in an Elizabethan *Roman à Clef*. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI II*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 289-302.
- Valores literarios del madrigal inglés. *Programa de Conciertos en la Universidad: Música Coral Inglesa*. Universidad de Oviedo, 1992: 9-12.
- Estudio y docencia de Shakespeare en la Universidad Española. > J. M. González (ed): *Shakespeare en España*, Zaragoza: Pórtico, 1993: 95-118.
- 'I Like My Wiues Deuise Well': Resourceful Women in Deloney's Fiction. > M^a Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 293-302.
- El *Macbeth* de Shakespeare, fuente literaria del *Macbeth* de Verdi. *Programa de Macbeth*, XLVI Festival de Ópera de Oviedo, Teatro Campoamor, Sept. -Oct. 1993: 7-17.
- La inacceptabilitat de estar subjecte a la monarquía d'una dona: dones destacades a *Història de la Gran Bretanya* de J. Milton. > *Miscel·lànea d'homenatge al Rd. Esteve Pujals*, Barcelona: Columna, 1994: 325-335.
- *The bewties of the fut-ball*: Reactions and References to this 'Boysterous Sport' in English Writings, 1175-1815. > *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense*, n^o 2, 1994: 47-57.

SHEPHERD, ROBERT (Dr)

Pasaje Conde de Belchite, 3, 3^o D. 28027-Madrid. Tlf. 91-7423343. B. A. Griego e Inglés (Canterbury, University of Kent), PhD en Literatura Anglo-irlandesa (Trinity College, Dublin).

PA, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. RA: Literatura comparada y modernismo, especialmente T. S. Eliot y Ezra Pound.

Teaching: Curso de Doctorado Influencia de teatro isabelino y jacobeo (Kyd Webster, Ford) en *The Waste Land*.

Publications:

- Shakespeare's Henry V: person and persona. > S. G. Fernández-Corugedo (ed): *SEDERI II*. Universidad de Oviedo: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1992: 303-312.
- Edmund Waller Impounded. > M^a Luisa Dañobeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 303-312.
- Criseyde / Cresseid / Cressida: What's in a Name? *SEDERI IV*, 1993: 229-236.
- How Scottish Weather Affected the English Literary Climate. > Ana Manzananas (ed): *SEDERI VI*. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 189-196.

SOUBRIET VELASCO, BEATRIZ

C/ Calatrava, 4, 1^o. 13001-Ciudad Real. Tlf. 926-255751.

Profesora de EOI, Escuela Oficial de Idiomas de Tomelloso. RA: Renacimiento inglés (literatura)

Tesis de Licenciatura: *El epilío erótico en la poesía inglesa del siglo XVI*. U. Complutense de Madrid, 1993.

Publications:

- Chaos and Harmony in Middleton's *A Game at Chess*. > Ana Manzananas (ed): *SEDERI VI*. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 197-202.

STONE, JOHN A. G.

Departament de Filologia Anglesa i Alemanya, Facultat de Filosofia y Letras. Gran Via, 585, 08007-Barcelona. Tlf. 93 - 3184266, Ext. 2065. (B. A. y M. A. McGill University).

Profesor Asociado, Universidad de Barcelona.

TAZÓN SALCES, JUAN EMILIO (Dr)

C/ Las Acacias, 33. Urb. Soto de Llanera. 33192-Pruvia-Llanera. Asturias. Tlf. 98-5265771.

PTU, Universidad de Oviedo. RA: Literatura e Historia inglesas.

Tesis Doctoral: *Presencia española en Irlanda en el siglo XVI*. Universidad de Oviedo, 1985.

Publications:

- *R. Hakluyt: Principales viajes, expediciones, tráfico comercial y descubrimientos de la nación inglesa*, 1. Madrid: Atlas, 1988.
- Politics, literature and colonization: A view of Ireland in the 16th century. *Dutch Quarterly Review*, vol. 18. (También publicado en C. C. Barfoot and Theo D'haen (eds): *The Clash of Ireland: Literary Contrasts and Connections*. *D. Q. R. Studies in Literature*, 4). 1988.
- Spain and Terra Australis: Early Voyages of Discovery. *Westerly*, 1. University of Western Australia, 1989.

- Dialectical tension in Sir Walter Raleigh's life and work. (Con S. Suárez). > J. Sánchez (ed): *SEDERI I*. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 45-56.
- The Humble Informs: Three Spanish Historical Cases in 1590. *Studia Patriciae Shaw Oblata*, III. Oviedo, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo, 1991: 430-441.
- Caliban's choice in the 'Irish Tempest'. (Con U. Viñuela). Fernández-Corugedo, S. G. ed.: *SEDERI II*. Oviedo, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo, 1992: 321-329.
- *R. Hakluyt: Principales viajes, expediciones, tráfico comercial y descubrimientos de la nación inglesa*, 2. Madrid: Atlas, 1992.
- La Mueca y el Cambio: Tomás Moro en la encrucijada de la Reforma. *Endemu*, VI, 1994: 81-90.

TEJERA LLANO, DIONISIA (Dr)

C/ Manuel Allende, 19, 4º izda. Esc. 1. 48010-Bilbao. Tlf. 94-4211747.

CU, Universidad de Deusto, Bilbao. RA: Literatura medieval y del siglo XVII.

Teaching: Literatura Inglesa del Renacimiento.

Publications:

- Thomas Gage. *Letras de Deusto*, nº 21, 1981.
- Ediciones y Traducciones de The English American. *44th International Congress of Americanists*. Manchester, 1982.
- *Thomas Gage. Su personalidad y su obra*. Madrid: CSIC, 1982.
- *The English Survey*, a political translation in the 17th century. *Primer Congreso de Traductores*. León.
- Dos traducciones políticas del siglo XVII (1648 y 1663). > J. C. Santoyo & al (eds): *Fidus Interpres*, Vol. I. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987: 115-122.
- *Viajes por Nueva España y Guatemala*. *Historia* 16, Mayo, 1987.
- *The English American*: la crónica de un hereje. *Hispania Sacra*. Centro de Estudios Históricos, CSIC, 1988.
- Decisiva Influencia de Thomas Gage en el 'Western Design' de Oliver Cromwell. > Mª Luisa Dañoibeitia (ed): *SEDERI III*. Granada, 1992: 329-342.
- Dr. Faustus and Don Juan: Two Baroque Heroes. *SEDERI IV*, 1993: 243-250.
- Spanish-English Relationship in the Work of Thomas Gage, al. Tomás de Santa María. > Ana Manzananas (ed): *SEDERI VI*. Salamanca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, 1996: 203-208.

TRONCH PÉREZ, JESÚS (Dr)

Carrer Badía, 108-3. Montcada, 46113-Valencia. Tlf.: 96-154818.

PA, Departamento de Filología Inglesa y Alemana, Facultad de Filología, Universidad de Valencia. RA: teatro isabelino y jacobeo; crítica textual.

Tesina: Editor *Hamlet*, Editor un Enigma: Aproximació. Reflexions sobre la crítica bibliotextual shakespeariana en l'exemple de *Hamlet*. Universidad de Valencia, 1994.

Publications:

- *Un primer Hamlet*. Valencia, Fundación Shakespeare de España, 1994.
- Edición del texto de *Hamlet* del Instituto Shakespeare. Valencia, Fundación Shakespeare de España, 1994.
- *Shakespeare: La Cavallerie. Estudi Preliminar*. Notebooks of the Shakespeare Foundation of Spain, 4. Valencia, Fundación Shakespeare de España, 1994.

UNGERER, GUSTAV (Dr)

Känelgasse 11. 3052-Zollikofe, Suiza. Tlf. 31 572094.

Professor of Modern English Literature, Englisches Seminar, Universität Bern. RA: Shakespeare; Anglo-Spanish relations in the 16th cent. ; 17th-century drama.

Publications:

- *Anglo-Spanish Relations in Tudor Literature*. Bern: Francke, 1956. (rpt AMS Press, N. Y., 1972).
- An Unrecorded Elizabethan Performance of *Titus Andronicus*. *Shakespeare Survey*, 14, 1961: 102-109.
- Two Items of Spanish Pronunciation in *Love's Labour's Lost*. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 14, 1963: 245-251.
- The Printing of Spanish Books in Elizabethan England. *The Library*, 20, 1965: 177-229.
- Letters of Antonio Pérez to Don Juan de Zúñiga. *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 27, 1965: 672-81.
- Bibliographical Notes on the Works of Antonio Pérez. *Cuadernos de Historia*, 16-18, 1963-5: 247-260.

- Unamuno and Shakespeare. > Germán Bleiberg & E. Inman Fox: *Spanish Thought and Letters in the 20th century*. Nashville, 1966: 513-532.
- Lost Government Publications in Spanish and Other Languages (1597-1601). *The Library*, 20, 1974: 323-329.
- The French Lutenist Charles Tessier and the Essex Circle. *Renaissance Quarterly*, 28, 1975: 190-203.
- *A Spaniard in Elizabethan England: The Correspondence of Antonio Pérez's Exile*. Vol. I and II. London, 1975 y 1976.
- Antonio Pérez' politische Aphorismen. > Gerhard Neumann: *Der Aphorismus. Zur Geschichte, zu den Formen und Möglichkeiten einer literarischen Gattung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1976: 427-51.
- 'My Lady's a Catayan, we are politicians, Maluolios a Peg-a-ramsie'. *Twelfth Night*, II. iii. 77-78. *Shakespeare Survey*, 32, 1979: 85-104.
- Roland du Jardin: Author of *A discourse of the Married and Single Life?* *The Library*, Sixth Series, 2, 1980: 211-216.
- La defensa de Antonio Pérez contra los cargos que se le imputaron en el Proceso de Visita. *Temas Aragoneses*, 29. Zaragoza, 1980.
- Sir Andrew Aguecheek and His Head of Hair. *Shakespeare Studies*, 16, 1983: 101-133.
- The Viol da Gamba as a Sexual Metaphor in Elizabethan Music and Literature. *Renaissance and Reformation*, 20, 1984: 79-90.
- Shylock's 'Gaping Pig'. *Liber Amicorum Willem Schrickx*. Ghent, 1985: 267-76.
- Edward Phillips's *The Mysteries of Love and Eloquence* (1658) and Its Shakespeare Allusions. *Seventeenth-Century News*, 43, 1985: 38-42.
- George Baker: Translator of Aparicio de Zubia's Pamphlet on the 'Oleum Magistrale'. *Medical History*, 30, 1986: 203-211.
- 'The Equinoctial of Queubus'. *Shakespeare Studies*, 19, 1987: 101-110.
- Shakespeare in Rutland. Sir John Harington of Exton: Patron of the 1595/96 Christmas Festivities at Burley-on-the-Hill and of the Chamberlain's Man. *Rutland Record*, 7, 1987: 242-8.
- Thomas Digges and Sancho de Londoño's Military Ordinances of 1568. > J. C. Santoyo et al. (eds): *Fidus Interpres*, I. Universidad de León: Servicio de Publicaciones, 1987: 130-139.
- The Alleged Milton Epitaph on Moll Cutpurse. *Milton Quarterly*, 23, 1989: 20-26.
- Thomas Shadwell's *The Libertine*: A forgotten Restoration Don Juan Play. > Javier Sánchez (ed): *SEDERI I*. Zaragoza: Librería General, 1990: 223-240.

VÉLEZ NÚÑEZ, RAFAEL

Apartado de Correos, 320. 11080-Cádiz. (C/Jorge Juan, 2, 3º A). Tlf. 956-278826.

PA, Departamento Filología Francesa e Inglesa, C/ Bartolomé Llompart, s/n. 1103-Cádiz. Tlf. 956-245083. Universidad de Cádiz. RA: literatura efímera, especialmente las mascaradas de corte de Ben Jonson; estudios multidisciplinares, esp. música y literatura.

Tesina: Machina Versatilis: *la mascarada jonsoniana como forma literaria múltiple*. Universidad de Cádiz, 1995.

Publications:

- Retórica musical, afectos y melancolía en la Inglaterra del Renacimiento. *Actas del II Encuentro sobre Retórica, Texto y Comunicación*. Cádiz, 1994. (en prensa)
- Entendiendo el Renacimiento: reyes y amigos ambiguos. Representaciones literarias de la homosexualidad en el Renacimiento inglés. > *Stylistica*, 1. Sevilla, 1995.

VERDAGUER CLAVERA, ISABEL (Dr)

Pº San Gervasio, 6, 2º 1ª. 08022-Barcelona. Tlf. 93-2128942.

PTU, Universidad de Barcelona.

RA: traducciones al inglés de los clásicos españoles.

Tesis Doctoral: *El Guzmán de Alfarache en Inglaterra*. Universidad de Barcelona, 1981.

Publications:

- El *Guzmán de Alfarache* en Inglaterra: causas de su éxito. *Anuario de Filología*, 8, 1982: 505-508.
- Wordplay in *The Rogue*. *Actas del VI Congreso de AEDEAN*. Barcelona, 1984.
- Traducciones al inglés del *Libro de la Vida*. *Actas del X Congreso de AEDEAN*. Zaragoza, 1986: 497-502.
- y J. C. Santoyo (eds): *De Clásicos y Traducciones*. Barcelona: PPU, 1987.

- Traducciones inglesas del *Libro de la Vida*. *Idem*, pp. 81-88.
- Traducciones inglesas del *Guzmán de Alfarache*. *Idem*, pp. 115-128.
- Problems in Translating *Guzmán de Alfarache* into English. *SEDERI* IV 1993: 273-280.
- *Tirant lo Blanc* en lengua inglesa. *Atlantis* XVI, 1994: 217-229.

WHITLOCK, KEITH (Dr)

Parsifal College, 527 Finchley Road. NW3 7BG London.

Staff Tutor in Literature, Arts Faculty. RA: Jacobean and Caroline Drama.

Publications:

- Course materials published by the Open University: Culture and Belief, 1450-1600; Shakespeare; Literature in the Modern World; Introduction to Literature, Writers, Readers, Texts.

* * *

