

Selected Proceedings

The Seventeenth Annual

Northern Plains Conference of Early British Literature

May 1st and 2nd 2009

held at

The College of St. Benedict / St. John's University



Table of Contents

Muriel Brown	North Dakota State U	Pg. 3
“Imagining ‘so gay a popelote’ and ‘sad corage’: Chaucer’s Portrayal of Alisoun and Griselda”		
Robert J. De Smith	Dordt College	Pg. 13
“specified by Saint Paul v. Eph”: Spenser’s Use of Ephesians in Book One of <i>The Faerie Queene</i> ”		
Kirsten Collins	Ripon College	Pg. 26
“To Follow Divine Providence’s Will is the only Cure”		
Bruce Brandt	South Dakota State	Pg. 40
"Marlowe's Ovid: The Initial Sequence."		
Gayle Gaskill	College of St. Catherine	Pg. 52
Scholars, Directors, and the New Globe’s “Original Practices” <i>Twelfth Night</i> ”		
Nicholas Wallerstein	Black Hills SU, South Dakota	Pg. 67
"The Art of Glossing <i>King Lear</i> "		
Wesley J. Hellman	U of Mary, Bismarck	Pg. 76
“Surveillance and Fetishism: Desire for the Forbidden”		
Carolyn Baker	Mayville State U	Pg. 89
“Anne Bradstreet: Apocalyse Now!”		
Karen Foster	Dickinson State U	Pg. 113
“Marginal Discourse and Spatial Boundaries in Margaret Cavendish’s <i>The Convent of Pleasure</i> ”		
Judith Dorn	St. Cloud State U	Pg. 125
“‘Huge Porches to Small Hovels’: Proportion in National Histories and Women’s History”		
Douglas Northrop	Ripon College	Pg. 152
“Eighteenth-century science and the concurrent concepts of virtue”		
Jennifer Christoffersen	St. Cloud State U	Pg. 162
“The Phoenix in the Fire: Stirring the Ashes to Reveal Hidden Connections between <i>Frankenstein</i> and <i>Pride and Prejudice</i> ”		

Imagining “so gay a popelote” and “sad corage”:
Chaucer’s Portrayal of Alison and Griselda

Muriel Brown

North Dakota State University

Recently while teaching a course mostly devoted to Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*, probably the tale that aroused the most lively discussion and even outrage was The Clerk’s Tale. Both graduate and undergraduate students were very upset with Walter and his treatment of his wife, and they weren’t willing to abandon the literal meaning of the interaction of the characters with any symbolic interpretation of Walter as a God-like figure and the unjust actions meted out to Griselda as being similar to Job, a character who represents the adverse and undeserved outcomes that are a part of being human. This semester in a differently structured class, but still reading some Chaucer, the students were willing to assert openly that Malayne and her mother in the Reeve’s Tale were essentially victims of rape, but no protests were raised similarly about Alisoun in the Miller’s Tale or Griselda. Perhaps the difference can be easily noted as the differences between genres—the difference between fabliau and Christian romance or a secular saint’s life as the Clerk’s Tale is called. Perhaps the difference comes from students seeing action more and more from the point of view of female characters—the result of their being far more conscious of a point of view badly, (baldly?) skewed toward male perception. While it is true that genre considerations help to explain the different

responses to these tales, it is also true that much of my students' response to Alisoun and Griselda is built right into the characterization Chaucer creates.

While Griselda has become so identified through her character that her name might be written as a single word, "patient Griselda," a formulaic name that echoes throughout discussions of her character, Alisoun has no single epithet. Instead, evidence of this difference in characterization is shown dramatically in *The Life and Times of Chaucer* where John Gardner asserts that Alisoun is a "wonderful sex kitten" who "purrs and romps through the Miller's Tale" (188). Although Chaucer does not compare Alisoun to a kitten, he does compare her to a number of young animals. In fact, he creates a character which seems to walk right out of the edge of a medieval village with its evocation of the physical world of Chaucer's time. While one of the attributes of the medieval fabliau notes that the time is not the distant past of the romance but rather the contemporary, bourgeois medieval world, with the genre's "preoccupation with the animal facts of life" (Muscatine 59), we become convinced of that as we read the Miller's Tale. Thus the animals that Alisoun is compared to are familiar ones associated with rural life, evoking a sense of rebirth and spring time. Charles Muscatine, in his analysis of Chaucer's use of *effectio*, describes her as "the delectable little animal who is not to be won by a protracted, artificial wooing" and "the one precious illusion in the poem" (230), but I would add an illusion only if we have our eyes half shut. V.A. Kolve in *Chaucer and the Imagery of Narrative*, especially notes the tale's energy whose young characters embody "all animal energy, playfulness, and vulnerability" (181). In particular, Alisoun is portrayed as having the energy of "any kyde or calf" as she "skippe[s] and make[s] game" as well as "Wynsynge . . . as is a joly colt" (1.3259-60, 3263).

The one animal missing from this group and an expected animal, given the importance of the wool trade to Chaucer's England, is the lamb; however, a sheep makes its appearance in one line, describing her as "softer than the wool of a wether (1.3249), a term annotated in texts like *The Norton Anthology of English Literature* and even *The Riverside Chaucer* as a ram, an annotation that seems to be completely inconsistent with the idea of softness. Further investigation in sources like the OED reveals that ram is an oversimplification of Chaucer's vocabulary, for the wether is a castrated male sheep, probably castrated while the lamb was quite young. While the softness of the wether's wool may be because he is still a lamb and lamb's wool continues to be desired because of its softness, the detail of castration points to its nature being modified in order to make it more easily managed, perhaps like being "held . . . narrow in cage" (1.3224). M. L. Ryder, an agricultural historian, writes, "The main function of sheep in the early Middle Ages was to provide milk to make cheese for winter food; wool, manure and meat were by-products in that order of importance" (23). Keeping one or more wethers over the winter would appear to be a luxury for a person like the widow at the beginning of the Nun's Priest's Tale. However, economic historians like Eileen Power point to the role of monasteries and large estates such as the Duchy of Lancaster having large flocks of sheep raised mainly for their wool (16-17), with the wethers being particularly desirable because they "produce a heavier fleece than rams or ewes" (Davis 186). Part of the Duchy of Lancaster in the early 1400s relied entirely on wethers, necessitating the buying of replacement stock, economically feasible only when wool prices were high (Dyer 333). Chaucer's appointment by Edward III as controller of wool in 1374, a position he

held for twelve years, would indicate his keen awareness of the value of wether's wool in raising money to support the government and the military.

Like the softness of the wool, her body is further compared to a weasel as "gent and small" (1.3234), the youthful spirits of the farm animals replaced by an animal that may well remind us of the earlier assertion of her being "wild." In addition, the quality of her singing voice, "loude and yerne," is noted by a comparison, not to a nightingale singing away out of sight in a far off tree, but to a "swalwe sittynge on a berne" (1.3258), a bird that chooses its nesting site much closer to a domesticated space.

Her clothing conforms to the black and white of medieval wear for those belonging to the third estate, but the fabric from which it is made seems extraordinarily fine with its embroidered decoration, even for wearing on special occasions. The black silk may, however, be only parts of her dress since silk is particularly attributed to the "ceynt," the collar of her dress, the tassel on her purse, and the headband she wears. In contrast to the black is her apron, which is as white as morning milk" (1.3236), a detail that continues to connect her with domesticated animals. Other items dealing with her clothing seem ostentatious including the brooch she wears, with its size being compared to the boss on a "bokeler" (1.3266).

While we would seem to know everything about her animal like nature, the comparisons continue to pile up, with a whole series focusing on plants. Her plucked eyebrows are dark like the sloe berry and she is likened to a "pere-jonette tree" (1.3248), a type that ripens early and as noted elsewhere becomes rotten almost as it is ripe. She is compared to flowers, not the white and red flowers, perhaps roses and lilies, that Emeleye in the Knight's Tale weaves into a garland for her hair (1.1036, 1054), but to flowers that

might be growing along a country path, the “prymerole,” identified as a cowslip, daisy, or primrose, and the “piggesnye,” a name that can apply to several flowers blooming in England in the spring. Often it is annotated as the cuckooflower, named because of its associations with spring when the cuckoo sings, a choice that seems to be predictive of her later action. Identifying the flower by the name of “piggesnye” also is a reminder of the many animals with which she is associated. D. W. Robertson comments that the name of the flowers involves “a play on the daisy or ‘day’s eye’ (*primerole*) and the ‘pig’s eye’ (*piggesnye*). The daisy was a symbol both in literature and in art for faithful espousal, but the ‘pig’s eye’ suggests . . . [she is] the object of animal desire . . . ” (248-49). These final comparisons lead right into comments about class distinctions with “For any lord to leggen in his bedde, / Or yet for any good yeman to wedde” (1.3269-70). The determination of “hende” Nicholas, a person whose university status indicates at least aspirations to reach an upper class, to beguile the yeoman carpenter (who has wed her) seems in part to be class warfare while Carpenter John seeks to guard his new wife from such an attack. This final comment is typical of so many of the descriptions of her, with positive comments about Alisoun being undercut as the sentence moves to an end. For example, we are told she is easily imagined as “So gay a popelote or swich a wenche,” suggesting just beneath the surface illusion of innocence and inexperience is a nature that could easily be led to experience. In fact, we could argue as Paul Olson does that Nicholas and Absolon both read one aspect of Alisoun’s double nature with Absolon seeing only an attractive surface while Nicholas reads the suggested meanings behind the surface.

Chaucer spends thirty-eight lines describing Alisoun alone and an additional six lines portraying her and Carpenter John together, more lines than he spends on developing most of the pilgrims whose portraits make up the General Prologue, yet the details do not create a single impression, but multiple impressions. In contrast, when the Clerk tells the story of Griselda, Chaucer's whole method of characterization changes. While Alisoun has a "likerous ye." Griselda has "no likerous lust . . . thurgh hire herte yronne" (4.214). Instead of lines implying a divided nature, the emphasis is on the unity of Griselda's nature. Instead of multiple images of immature animals, we get one animal image. Interestingly, it is Griselda who is compared to a lamb, but only in a single line, emphasizing her innocence. While Griselda is a member of the lower class, we do not get long descriptions of her appearance. She is attractive, "the faireste under sonne" (4.212), but with no attempts to show exactly what details comprise that "virtuous beautee" (4.211). Instead, she is defined through what she does; we see her spinning while tending sheep, she cares for her aging father, she picks cabbages and other vegetables when returning home from herding the sheep, she gets water from a well, and she "shreds or boils" what Jancula and she will eat. While Griselda is probably younger than Alisoun's eighteen years when Walter sees her and decides he will marry her, instead of descriptions showing youthful exuberance, we encounter words like "rype" and "sad corage" (1.220), words which convey her maturity and seriousness. It may be that poverty and her hard work have made her grow up early.

The typical line when Griselda is first introduced is a statement of what she is as opposed to what she is not expressed as opposites. She drinks "Wel offer of the well than of the tonne" (4.215). She knew "wel labour but noon ydel ese" (4.217) "And made hir

bed ful hard and nothing softe (4.228). Before she is married to the marquis her old clothes are replaced with new but their color, whether made of wool, linen, or silk is left to our imaginations. A crown is placed on her newly combed hair, and gems, “set in gold and in asure,” are added to her clothing as well as “brooches and rynges” (4.254-55). The marquis places a ring on her finger and she rides on a snow white horse to the palace. As Griselda’s story continues, she continues to be defined by her actions—or lack of action. She does not respond as we would expect a mother to react as her daughter and then her son are taken away. Nor does she respond as we would expect when she herself is to be cast aside and a new wife is to take her place, even to being asked to make the preparations for the wedding night. Because she is presented in such a unified way and continues to represent the best of what humans are capable, we as readers begin to supply what her response might be. Thus her silence speaks very powerfully, probably more so than a more vocal response. Her silence, her ability to endure the unendurable demonstrate the medieval definition of what it is to be “patient.” As Marie Borroff notes, “To be patient was to be submissive in the very general sense of accepting one’s situation in life, especially when it was unfortunate, as decreed by God” (82).

These two characters, Alisoun and Griselda, along with their tales bring to my attention a major conflict of Chaucer’s day exemplified in the opening lines of another Alisoun, the Wife of Bath, who begins the Prologue to her Tale with these words

Experience, though noon auctoritee

Were in this world, is right ynogh for me

To speke of wo that is in marriage; (3.1-3)

Chaucer creates characters caught right in the middle of the conflict between authority and experience that would become more pronounced in religion, in science, as well in the way we tell stories. Another place where this conflict emerges is at the end of the *Canterbury Tales* with the Parson's Tale where in this penitential document, the Parson discusses the remedy for the sin of Luxurie: among the items of discussion, he notes a medieval commonplace that God made woman from a middle place, for she was made from Adam's rib, not from Adam's foot and he "made hire nat of the heved of Adam, for she sholde nat clayme to greet lordshipe. / For ther as the woman hath the maistrie, she maketh to mucche desray. Ther neden none ensamples of this; the experience of day by day oghte suffise" (X.925-26). Here it is not so much a conflict as experience corroborating what authority promulgates. Chaucer, throughout the *Canterbury Tales* seems to be working from these two extremes, relying on earlier telling of stories that he then repeats, using English, but adapting the story he inherited from Boccaccio and Petrarch in the Clerk's Tale. On the other hand, he uses several stories he has inherited, such as the fabliau of the Miller's Tale, weaves them together, but makes them his own largely through details from experience. Looking closely at these two characters may be useful in understanding something of a central concern in studying Chaucer. Perhaps my students' frustration with the Clerk's Tale and their more readily acceptance of Alisoun reflects the direction the conflict between experience and authority has taken.

Works Cited

- Borroff, Marie. "Introduction [to *Patience*]". *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, Patience, and Pearl: Verse Translations*. Trans. Borroff. New York: Norton, 2001. 81-89.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Canterbury Tales. The Riverside Chaucer*. Ed. Larry R. Benson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987. 3-328.
- . The Miller's Tale. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. 8th ed. Vol. 1. New York: Norton, 2006. 241-55.
- Davis, Simon J. M. *The Archaeology of Animals*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1987.
- Dyer, Christopher. *Making a Living in the Middle Ages: The People of Britain 850-1520*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2002.
- Gardner, John. *The Life and Times of Chaucer*. New York: Knopf, 1977.
- Kolve, V. A. *Chaucer and the Imagery of Narrative: The First Five Canterbury Tales*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1984.
- Muscatine, Charles. *Chaucer and the French Tradition: A Study in Style and Meaning*. Berkeley: U of California Press, 1964.
- Olson, Paul. "Poetic Justice in the Miller's Tale." *Modern Language Quarterly* 24 (1963): 203-13.
- Power, Eileen. *The Wool Trade in English Medieval History*. London: Oxford UP, 1941.
- Robertson, D. W. *A Preface to Chaucer: Studies in Medieval Perspectives*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1962.
- "Ram." *Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989.

Ryder, M. L. "Medieval Sheep and Wool Types." *The Agricultural History Review* 32.1
(1984): 14-28.

**“specified by Saint Paul v. Eph”: Spenser’s Use of *Ephesians* in Book One of
*The Faerie Queene***

**Robert J. De Smith
Dordt College**

Those who wish understand the structure of Spenser’s book “Of Holiness” (719),ⁱ Book 1 of his *Faerie Queene*, in its Scriptural context, usually turn first to John Hankins’s essay, “Spenser and the Revelation of St. John,” which suggests that the latter half of Revelation contains themes, images, and events that “find parallels in Spenser’s allegory and exercise a controlling influence upon it” (41). They may turn next to Virgil Whitaker, who in his “The Theological Structure of *The Faerie Queene*, Book I” argues that the “moral allegory” of the book “is theological in its structure and is based upon the arrangement of points customary in Renaissance confessionals” (101). John N. Wall more recently proposed that *The Faerie Queene* “derives its authority from its constant allusion to its biblical sources as mediated through their use in Prayer Book rites” (124). What these approaches share, besides an interest in structure,ⁱⁱ is the assumption that a Reformation understanding of Scripture and biblical theology inform Spenser’s epic.

Thomas Dughi offers a good summary:

Book 1 as a whole is inspired by the great dream of the Reformation: that the words of a book possess the power thoroughly to transform the soul’s deepest structures. Moreover, book 1’s narrative shape and method are rooted in basic Protestant insights into how God’s Word works its transforming magic. (22)

What has been less often noticed is the important role the book of Ephesians plays in Spenser's conception of his book's structure and themes. That he made use of Ephesians may at

ⁱFollowing the Northern Plains Conference's informal parameter that we take on whatever is contained in the first Volume of the Norton Anthology, I cite Spenser from this edition.

ⁱⁱThere are, of course, other ways to approach the structure of this work—notably rhetorical. For instance, Andrew Weiner (citing Paul Alpers and applying Sidney), writes regarding book 1: “I suggest that Spenser's stanzas evoke feelings within the reader which serve, structurally, to set up patterns of response within each canto and which, once they are recognized to be patterns, then become the basis for interpretation of the actions taking place not only within the canto but extending throughout the book” (35).

first glance seem obvious: after all, Spenser alludes to almost every biblical bookⁱⁱ, and his subject—holiness—invites a scriptural context. On the other hand, Ephesians may seem an unlikely source for anything but an apt, passing allusion because unlike, say, Revelation, this letter from Paul does not (with one prominent exception) offer images (like the dragon or the whore of Babylon) or a narrative (like war in heaven) which could contribute to Spenser's design. What it offers instead are some essential themes and patterns that, I hope to make clear, Spenser uses in specific and fruitful ways. And to return to Dughi for a moment, the kind of reading which a Protestant reliance on Scripture requires reinforces this kind of use. The first theme from Ephesians is that of being chosen “that we should be holy” (Eph. 1:4),ⁱⁱ a concept which gives Spenser his controlling theme: Redcrosse is depicted as just such a person—the Christian, in other words.

A second pattern, equally fundamental, is the book's contrast between belief and unbelief, between being dead in sin and alive to Christ: "And you hath he quickened, that were dead in trespasses and sinne" (2:1). This pattern—admittedly not one exclusive to a single New Testament book—evokes Spenser's many contrasts: Una and Duessa, Redcrosse and his many foils, the House of Pride and the House of Holiness. Tied as it is to the theme of grace—"For by grace ye are saved through faith, & that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God, Not of workes, least any man should boast himself" (2:8-9)—we see that the central concerns of Ephesians are also Spenser's. A final significant pattern is that of "edifying" (4:12) the Christian, a theme which can be seen as fundamental not only to Redcrosse's journey in Book 1 but also to interpreting the buildings he encounters. This latter connection, particularly the ways in which the book of Ephesians informs our understanding of the House of Pride, is perhaps the most surprising feature of this mode of inquiry.

In his Letter to Raleigh, Spenser relates a strange incident as he describes the premise of his first book. When a "clownishe young man," who has been dispatched to the floor by the Queen of Faeries as "unfitted through his rusticity for a better place" (718), presents himself for service to the "faire Ladye in mourning weedes," she is reluctant to accept his help. And when she suggests "that unless that armour which she brought, would serve him . . . that he could not succeed in that enterprise," it may well be that she has set for him a test which she is certain he will fail: it seems fair to believe that she hopes the armor will not fit—that trying it on will make it obvious to herself, the young man, the Faerie Queene, and everyone present, that the young man is not cut out for the task at hand.

But then the strange thing occurs: when the young man dons the armor, “he seemed the goodliest man in al that company, and was well liked of the Lady.” The clothes apparently do make the man. The young man is immediately knighted and sent out on an adventure at the behest of the Lady, where our first view of him in Book 1 replays this equivocal perception of Redcrosse (for that is the man): In the first stanza of canto 1, the “Gentle Knight” seems to be a seasoned warrior, since his armor exhibits “olde dints of deep wounds” (1.1.3); but we’re told, “Yet armes till that time did he never wield” (5). Similarly, in the next stanza, he is described both as “Right faithful true” and as “too solemne sad” (7-8). He is presented at the same time as bumpkin and knight, as seasoned warrior and untested neophyte, a condition reified in his equivocal fight with Error.

Of course, the detail I have been suppressing in this retelling (my warrant is that Spenser in his letter to Raleigh places this information within parentheses) is that the armor “is the armour of the Christian man specified by saint Paul v. Ephes” (718). If we conclude that it is the virtue of the armor, and not of the man, that causes Redcrosse’s transformation, we would be correct. But we may still ask just what the incident means.

Our first recourse may be to recall Spenser’s famous description of the purpose of his poem, stated at the outset of his letter: “The generall end therefore of all the booke is to fashion a gentleman or noble person in virtuous and gentle discipline” (716). We may see Redcrosse’s donning the armor as a particular example of this fashioning—and one that is fitted to the subject of the first book, namely Holiness. If so, our first lesson in fashioning is that we are fashioned rather than fashioning ourselves. This idea is consonant with the way Ephesians describes salvation: “For by grace ye are saved

through faith, & that not of yourselves” (2:8). Furthermore, the opening chapter of Ephesians describes the condition of believers in this way: “he hath chosen us in hym, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love” (vs. 4). “That we should be holy, ” as suggested above, is a succinct summary of Spenser’s concerns in Book 1, and I am suggesting that he was drawn to Ephesians, perhaps even to this particular phrase, since it fit precisely with his “generall end.”

More than simply a convenient allusion, then, Spenser’s dramatized use of Ephesians in his Letter to Raleigh is a kind of announcement that the patterns and themes of Ephesians will be important in Book 1. As I have been suggesting, these themes are, first, that Redcrosse represents the Christian knight (not unlike Erasmus’s “militant Christian”ⁱⁱ) and that the incident described in the Letter to Raleigh signals that Redcrosse has taken on the faith. Redcrosse’s journey, then, is about sanctification, not justification. This perspective helps us to understand the seeming contradictions in Redcrosse’s failings, failings which are summarized in the opening of canto 8: “Ay me, how many perils doe enfold / The righteous man, to make him daily fall?” (1-2). Redcrosse is simultaneously “righteous” and failing—he has been justified by grace (symbolized in his putting on the armor of God), but he is not yet fully sanctified. And this condition comes near to Spenser’s point: holiness is a term that describes the entire process, or rather, describes what God does in and through the Christian knight, not what the knight does himself.ⁱⁱ

This last concept, grace alone, suggests Spenser’s most pointed reliance on Ephesians. When Redcrosse, by the end of canto 9, has reached his lowest and weakest point, the narrator comments:

What man is he, that boasts of fleshly might,
And vaine assurance of mortality,
Which all so soone, as it doth come to fight,
Against spirituall foes, yeelds by and by,
Or from the field most cowardly doth fly?
Ne let the man ascribe it to his skill,
That thorough grace hath gained victory.
If any strength we have, it is to ill,

But all the good is Gods, both power and eke will. (cto. 10.1)

To take in the big picture here, when Paul in Ephesians tells his readers to put on God's armor, his reason is this: "For wee wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, and against the worldly governors, the princes of the darknes of this world, against spiritual wickednesses, which are in hie places" (6:13). This passage is a gloss of the first half of Spenser's stanza, giving Spenser his distinction between flesh and spirit: Redcrosse has been fighting in the flesh, that is, he has been relying on his own strength, and he does not understand that his battles have spiritual consequences. Ephesians also specifies the "spiritual foes," which suggest the dark power of Archimago, the evil of Duessa, and even the weighty flight of the dragon Redcrosse will soon meet.ⁱⁱ Furthermore, the second half of the stanza is essentially a restatement of one Ephesians's central arguments: "For by grace ye are saved through faith" (2:8). As suggested above, this key insight of Paul's becomes Spenser's theme.

When I began to explore how Spenser's poem is informed by the book of Ephesians, particularly in ways that transcend passing allusions, I set myself a stern test:

could I find Paul's epistle in the House of Pride? The project seems unlikely for at least two reasons. First, Spenser's two main sources for image and idea in cantos 4 and 5 are a classical understanding of the world, especially the underworld, and the culture of courtly love, sources that are (by Spenser's intention) unbiblical. Then there is Spenser's mode—irony—which does not seem compatible with Ephesians's argument. However, I think it can be demonstrated that Ephesians's influence reaches even into Lucifera's realm. This influence may be organized around three themes—fickleness, edification, and light and darkness. And it even extends to at least two instances of sharp irony as well as to the depiction of the Deadly Sins.

I discovered that most of the biblical references here center on chapters 4 and 5 of Ephesians, with a few excursions elsewhere. This is significant, I think, in the following way: Chapter 4 marks the center of Paul's letter and a change in subject (it begins, "Therefore"). The Geneva Bible's headnote to the chapter recognizes this shift when it says, "These three last chapters conteine precepts of maners"ⁱⁱ: a gloss adds "Another part of the epistle, conteining precepts of Christian life." In other words, these chapters—the second half of the book—focus on how the believer should live. "[M]aners" is an interesting word, which may have attracted Spenser, since it is the mannerly behavior of everyone in Lucifera's house, including Redcrosse, which is at issue in this episode.ⁱⁱ

Canto 4 begins with a warning—mostly unheeded—to Redcrosse:

Young knight, what ever that dost armes profess,
And through long labours huntest after fame,
Beware of fraud, beware of fickleness,

In choice, and change of thy dear lovèd Dame

* * *

For unto knight there is no greater shame,

Then lightnesse and inconstancy in love;

That doth this Redcrosse knights ensample plainly prove. (1.1-4; 7-9)

In Ephesians, being susceptible to deceit is evidence of the old way, even of the “olde man” (4:22) which must be put off: maturity in Christ means “That we hencefoorth be no more children, wavering and caried about with every wind of doctrine, by the deceit of men, and with craftinesse, whereby they lay in wait to deceive” (4:14).ⁱⁱ What is notable here is that both Spenser and the epistle pile up synonyms for beguiling: (“fraud,” “fickleness,” “choice,” “change,” “lightness,” and “inconstancy” in Spenser; “wavering,” “deceit,” “craftiness,” including childishness, in Paul).

More than that, invoking the passage helps us respond to Redcrosse, adding, as it were, a biblical warning to the narrator’s: Redcrosse is acting like a child and he is exhibiting a lack of Christian maturity. It also invites us to interpret Redcrosse’s seduction—by Duessa and by the House of Pride (they are really the same thing)—as spiritual, even doctrinal. Because he is not mature in the faith (and so not relying on grace), he is liable to false truth and false hope—a condition we see him live out as he enters the House of Pride.

In a sense, we do not fully understand the House of Pride until we discover the House of Holiness in canto 10. It is “an auntient house not farre away, / Renowmd throughout the world for sacred lore, / And unspotted life” (3.1-3). This building echoes the New Jerusalem from Revelation (Redcrosse receives a vision of that place in stanzas

57-59),ⁱⁱ but it also takes its meaning from Ephesians 4 and 2 (I cite from chapter 2 since it is the most direct):

Now therefore yee are no more strangers & forreingers. But citizens with
the Saints, and of the household of God,
And are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus
Christ himself being the chiefe cornerstone,
In whome all the building coupled together, groweth unto an holy Temple
in the Lord. In whom yee also are built together to be the habitation of
God by the Spirit. (2:19-22)ⁱⁱ

This house, in Spenser and Ephesians, represents the Church and the individual believer—both temples to God. The language here is of edification, a word which (in various forms) occurs three times in Ephesians chapter 4 (vss. 12, 15, and 29). Edification is a metaphor of building applied to spiritual growth. Thus for Spenser, the condition of his building suggests the condition of his representative believer, Redcrosse, a fact which brings us back to the House of Pride. This building is “without mortar laid,” is too high to be sturdy, has a “weake foundation,” and its “hinder parts” (reminiscent of the foul view of Duessa afforded Fra Dubio (at 2.41) “Were ruinous and old, but painted cunningly” (st. 4.4-5). Of course, the Dwarf discovers the true nature of this building at the end of canto 5, allowing Redcrosse to make an ingnomious retreat. But as it is introduced, and as Redcrosse rather cluelessly enters it, Ephesians helps us see that the building reflects his spiritual condition, while at the same time it points to the solution to his condition: he needs, to use Paul’s imagery of building, to be met “together . . . unto a perfit man” (4:13) and to be “knit together by every joynt . . . unto the edifying of itself

[his/the church's body] in love" (4:16). Ephesians, as it is built into both houses, explains and helps us respond to Redcrosse.

Besides the contrast of two buildings (and the concept of edification), Spenser uses the contrast between dark and light, which is particularly pointed in this episode, throughout book 1 to distinguish between the two paths of life he lays out. Indeed, light and dark is perhaps the central metaphor in book 1.ⁱⁱ And while it would be too much to locate what is a central biblical metaphor only in one New Testament book, the metaphor of light and darkness is important to Ephesians. The key passage is this one: "For ye were once in darkness, but are now light in the Lord: walk as children of light" (5:8). An earlier passage speaks of those who have "their understanding darkened" (4:18)—we think of blind Corceca and even of Redcrosse's blindness to his own condition and return to Ephesians's injunction to "have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkenesse" (5:11). These passages are used ironically when Duessa claims "That dreaded Night in brightest day hath place / And can the children of faire light deface" (5.24.4-5).ⁱⁱ Again, the words of Ephesians provide the basis for the metaphor and also norm Duessa's claim: those who walk in the light cannot be defaced by darkness, despite appearances.

There is a second striking example of the ironic use of Ephesians in canto 5. When Redcrosse has nearly been defeated by Sansjoy, Duessa calls out to the latter to finish him off. But Redcrosse believes Duessa is calling to him:

Soone as the Faerie heard his Ladie speak,
Out of his swooning dreame he gan awake,
And quickening faith, that earst was woxen weak,
The creeping deadly cold away did shake. (5.12.1-4)

The key phrase here is “quickenning faith,” which takes us to Ephesians 2:1: “And you hath he quickened, that were death in trespasses and sinnes.” The irony here could not be more deep: attending to the false encouragement of faithlessness, Redcrosse is “quickenning”—made alive—to a false faith. He has a false conversion, a fact which exposes both his foolishness and the direness of his condition. Ephesians points to being made alive in Christ—to the sanctification Redcrosse needs and seems very far from.

But what of the deadly sins? Are they to be found in Ephesians, too? Of course, there are many and varied sources for these figures, and Ephesians would be far down the list of productive places to go for shaping ideas and images. Nonetheless, it is not difficult to find references to each of the sins in Ephesians. Most can be located in two of Paul’s lists in chapters 4 and 5:

Let all bitternesse, and anger, and wrath, crying, and evil speaking bee put away from you, with all maliciousnesse. (4:32)

But fornication, and all uncleannesse, or covetousness, let it not bee once named among you, as it becommeth Saints,

Neither filthinesse, neither foolish talking, neither jesting, which are things not comely, but rather giving of thankes. (5:3-4)

I count 4 of the sins spread out among these lists, maybe more, and if we add Paul’s injunction against boasting (evidence of Pride; 2:9), his urging of the thief to “worke with his hands” (and so not be idle; 4:28) and Paul’s admonition against drunkenness (a sort of gluttony; 5:18), we’ve to them all. We could even add this advice: “Neither give place to the devil” (5:27) as a response to Satan’s appearance in cto 4.ⁱⁱ

One final observation about the effect of reading Ephesians alongside book 1 of *The Faerie Queene*: once Spenser has established that the key concepts and themes of Ephesians are imbedded in his own text, something happens. That is, having been made aware that Ephesians is a kind of musical accompaniment to the matter of book 1, our own reading and understanding of Ephesians begins to be productive for engaging Spenser's text: since Ephesians is kept on our minds, attuned readers may find themselves invoking Ephesians as a way to respond to the action we are presented with. Discovering Redcrosse's condition at the beginning of canto 7, for instance, it is not difficult to imagine a reader versed in Scripture responding, "Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience" (5:6) or even "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light" (vs. 14). Indeed, Heninger argues that Orgoglio's intrusion at this point in the narrative represents just the sort of Scriptural warning that these passages offer (129-130). In a similar way, when in canto 10 we read that "The faithfull knight now grew in little space/ by hearing her [Fidelia], and all her sisters lore, / to such perfection of all heavenly grace" (st. 21.1-3), we recognize that he is matured "unto a perfit man" (4:13) or has been "strengthened by his spirit in this inner man" so that he is "able to comprehend with all Saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth and height" of God's love (Eph. 3:16-19). Or when Redcrosse, rises "Out of the well, wherein he drenchèd lay" (cto. 11.34.2) after his first apparent defeat by the dragon, we recognize that the powers of the well come from Christ who "loved the church, and gave him selfe for it, That he might sancitifie it, and cleanse it by the washing of water through the word" so that "it should bee holy and without blame" (Eph. 5: 26-27).

Even the simplest actions in Book 1 take on a greater resonance when the context of Ephesians is invoked. I have already mentioned Ephesian's call to awaken from sleep. In addition, Redcrosse's numerous falls are tempered by Paul's injunction to "stand fast" (6:13—the verb is used three times in chapter 6). Also, Paul uses the metaphor of walking seven times in the book—"walke not at the Gentiles walke" (4: 17) and "walke as children of light" (5:8). The verb describes Redcrosse's (and Una's) most common activity in the book, investing it with a sense of moral weight. If Spenser's art directs us to this kind of reading, then he does the work of accomplishing his most fundamental goal, "to fashion a gentleman or noble person in virtuous and gentle discipline" (716). This goal, in turn, is consonant with the Protestant purposes with which we began, which is to apply the word to one's own heart. William Tyndale, giving advice to the readers of his fresh translations of Scripture, puts it urgently: "As thou readest, therefore, think that every syllable pertaineth to thine own self, and suck out the pith of the scripture, and arm thyself against all assaults" ("Prologue to Genesis," Duffield 38). If we note that Ephesians describes those assaults as the "fiery darts of the devil" cited in Ephesians 5, we have circled back to Redcrosse's arming in Raleigh's letter, making this a good place to say . . . Thank you!

**To Follow Divine Providence's Will is the only Cure: An Analysis of Wounds in
Book Three of The Faerie Queene**

**Kristin Collins
Ripon College**

While the political, religious, and marital issues of Queen Elizabeth I's reign have been explored, few have investigated how these themes affected Spenser and his contemporary audience on the matter of predestination.¹ Spenser supported the contemporary moderate Protestant views of free will and predestination: free will is limited within the structure of predestination. His beliefs are expressed through the use of love-leading-to-marriage wounds in comparison to lust-created injuries largely within Book Three of The Faerie Queene.² Lust and love hurt characters in different ways: each lesion's impact is dependent on the characters' involvement in fulfilling their divinely-appointed destiny. The seriousness of lust wounds depends on whether or not the character's will is aligned with God's plans, with the only cure being love. Love often comes in the form of an injury as well, but can only be cured in requited love that will lead to marriage—a destiny Elizabethans believed was God's destiny for most.

In sermons and government documents of Spenser's day, the Protestant doctrine of predestination and the Catholic belief in free will were greatly debated. Calvinists firmly believed good works were "useless in achieving salvation, futility pertaining closely to the *role of the will*," as noted by Spenserian scholar Richard Mallette (172, italics mine). The human will was corrupted since the body was undeniably evil, thus man was unable to achieve salvation by his own efforts. This Calvinistic belief was still widely believed in 1607 as the chaplain, Thomas Rogers, demonstrates: "Man hath free

will to perform the works of Satan” (48). Meanwhile, the Catholic belief in the will’s ability to do good, thereby achieving salvation, could hardly be supported during the time considering the anti-Spanish environment of the court with Spain seen as the defender of Catholicism. Moderates believed the human will was not completely corrupted and had the capability to perform good actions through God’s grace (Malette 27, 132). As late as 1620, Thomas Gataker demonstrated the continuing, popular moderate belief, in his explanation of free will and faith’s connection in Marriage Dvties Briefly Couched Together: “Without Faith, it is impossible to please God. And Faith is but dead without works” (B^r). Faith was needed to align oneself with God, and good works was an example of a pure relationship since good deeds were only possible through God’s assistance. The attitudes of the Elizabethan era towards predestination and free will are important in analyzing Spenser and are reflected in the wounds of Book Three of The Faerie Queene.

Regardless of their individual beliefs of predestination, the destiny of most Elizabethan society was marriage. The dominant pattern of marriage is shown with ninety percent of eligible people married during the time period (Cressy 285). Despite the displacement of the Catholic clergy and popular disdain for their celibacy, the ideal of virginity retained its value, but in a new light. Maintaining the status of purity was important in having a “Virgin Queen” as a ruler: one could not condemn virginity without attacking Her Majesty. During Queen Elizabeth’s rule, virginity and marriage were viewed as equally important, intertwined states. After Elizabeth’s death, the duality of virginity and marriage retained its high status as read in Matrimoniall Honour, the 1642 book by the Calvinist Daniel Rogers:

Knoweth not that virginity is precious? But grant it be so. What? Can it not be praised without the disgrace of marriage?...Chastity then (you see) is a general duty; for all them, who seeke to maintain their honour unstained, nothing doth cleave so deeply to marriage as this....Chastity is the maine support of union [marriage]. (11, 166,167)

Protestants preached the virtue of chastity not as a solitary entity but one leading to marriage, resulting in eternal chastity to a single person (Kaske). Thus, the leading virtue of Chastity in The Faerie Queene is not an individual virtue, but a relationship virtue; Britomart's love and chastity find fulfillment only in marriage to Artegall. While Belphoebe (a characterization of the Queen according to Spenser's letter to Sir Walter Raleigh) is important to the story of Book Three in demonstrating virginity's divine virtue, the extent of her purity leads Timias to love falsely and not in accordance with God's Will; hence, Belphoebe is not the main character, while Britomart is the embodiment of marital chastity.

The reformation of England's religious beliefs brought stronger opinions on the purpose of marriage. Protestants took Genesis 2:24, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: they shall become one flesh" literally, believing the union of a man and his wife was a physical, mental, and most importantly, a spiritual merge (Geneva glosses). As the joining of a couple in marriage had a religious significance, it also had a social one. According to Mallette, "married sexuality [was] respected and consecrated as Puritan art of love," indicating sex was supported and even encouraged by the Protestants (88). Sex within marriage was considered pleasing to God, as long as it was not done in excess, because it brought forth the most important purpose

of marriage: children (Cressy 290). This ideology can clearly be seen within *The Book of Common Prayer*: of the thirteen reasons given for marriage, the first is for the procreation of children. Not only was procreation an obligation for married women, it was considered their Christian duty (Cressy 15-18).

Despite Spenser's support of Protestant views on marriage and children, he assumed a moderate Protestant stance on the topic of freewill and predestination. Spenser had strong nationalistic sentiments and was hostile towards the Spanish, but unlike some of his counterparts, he did not completely transfer his enmity to Catholic doctrines. The moderation afforded by Spenser towards predestination and the role of the will was common for most Elizabethans, thus ensuring their acceptance of his works. As Mallette clarifies, "the good [use their willpower to] seek redemption while the [predetermined] wicked do not rehabilitate selves and are damned" (177-78). Although Spenser allows characters to choose to accept their divinely appointed destinies, the characters' ultimate endings always reflect God's predetermined salvation or damnation of them.

A character's free will participation in her/his divinely-appointed destiny also coincides with what Spenser valued as true love. For him, true love was only achieved through active participation in one's destiny leading to marriage. A false love was a languishing, Petrarchan love in which one idly wasted away, pining for a love that would never be requited. The Spenserian scholar Mark Rose appropriately points out: "true love to Spenser is the opposite of sloth 'for loue does alwaies bring forth bounteous deeds'" (88; III.i.49). Thus in *The Faerie Queene*, since Britomart is actively pursuing her love, which is also her destiny, she will attain her goal, despite any injuries. Meanwhile,

Timias who merely laments his love and does not try to achieve a fruitful love that should, according to Protestant doctrine, lead to marriage, is never cured of his love-incurred wounds.

Wounds within Book Three of The Faerie Queene follow a pattern paralleling marital and moderate Protestant predestination teachings. Two types of wounds are important: wounds incurred when pursuing one's destiny and wounds originating from inactive avoidance of destiny. Injuries caused by others' lust are often intensely felt but, like the emotion itself, are quickly forgotten and/or cured due to the wounds' shallowness. Those who are most open to injury from lust are characters that are unwilling to fulfill their destiny of love completed in marriage. However, lust is not the cause of all of the wounds; love also inflicts wounds on characters, often deeper than lust's injuries. The only cure for love wounds is the fulfillment of destiny with required love leading to marriage. Thus, marriage, which is the submission to destiny, is the only cure for love wounds.

A reflection of consciously choosing to pursue one's fate, leading to fortune, lies of course in the heroine of Book Three, Britomart. The role of predestination for Britomart is clearly distinguished by Merlin early on: "Indeed the fates are firme, / And may not shrinck, though all the world do shake: / Yet ought mens good endeavors them confirme, / And guyde the heauenly causes to their constant terme" (III.iii.25). Within the textual notes, Hamilton translates this passage to mean: "the work of Fate and human will are subject to the will of providence" (III.iii.25n). In this passage, Merlin warns Britomart, and through her, the readers, that human will is limited within the structure of predestination since God's will is always dominant. However, Britomart does not need

such a warning since she exemplifies the moderate Protestant belief in the cooperative will of the saved. Being the epitome of married chastity, which is Britomart's destiny, she is granted God's protection and grace to fulfill her quest. According to the tenth article in The Thirty-Nine Articles, those granted grace by God have a good will, allowing them to complete good works. Without God's grace, Britomart may have chosen to neglect or even tried to avoid her destiny instead of actively achieving it. However, her will is God's, and Britomart seeks what has been divinely appointed to her.

Merlin gives Britomart advice on destiny in the context of directly stating what her destiny is: marriage to Artegall resulting in a long line of rulers through childbirth. Coinciding with the telling of her destiny, Britomart suffers from "her first engrafted payne" (III.ii.17) because she cannot yet fulfill marriage's destiny of children. Britomart first feels the pains of her "bleeding bowels" when she looks inside the mirror in her father's closet and sees her future husband (III.ii.39). The "round and hollow-shaped" description of the mirror and the space of the closet "symbolize a specifically female space of interiority associated with the womb" (III.ii.19; Wells 222). In the moment in which Britomart sees the man who is destined to impregnate her, it is appropriate for her wound to be linked to the womb. According to the scholar Marion Wells, Spenser's language in describing the wound as "poisonous gore" and a "running sore" is current with contemporary medical beliefs that menstruation blood, blood from the womb, was considered poisoned and diseased (III.ii.39). Britomart and her nurse's inability to find a cure for her injury indicates retention of the poisoned blood within her body as well as the seed associated with menstruation. Such "corruption of female seed is crucially related in medical texts to chastity....the disease was associated primarily with widows

and virgins” (Wells 230). Since Britomart cannot complete her destiny of procreation yet, she incurs a wound of the womb. However, her injury is healed when she hears Merlin’s prophecy because Britomart then knows she will eventually be able to procreate in the sanctified union of marriage.

Britomart’s first external injury also relates to the womb, but in a context not pertaining to her God-ordained destiny. The wound is inflicted by Malacasta’s knight, Gardante, who represents the first step in fulfilling one’s desire through gazing (III.i.45n). Unlike the internal wound, first received when Britomart views her future husband, the second is caused by lust. Therefore, as stated before, it is not as potent as a love wound since it is not of “eternall prouidence” (III.iii.24). Hence, the arrow which did “gore her side, yet was the wound not deepe,” represents how looking, and lust, are superficial, causing no permanent damage to Britomart, and are easily forgotten (III.i.65). Another reason why Britomart is not harmed by the arrow is because she is not playing the game of lust and looking. Britomart is in love as part of God’s plan for her future, allowing herself to be immune to Gardante’s wound. Lust is not of God’s creation, and since Britomart does not understand or know lust, she has the protection of love—God’s gift of grace for the saved.

Like the wound of Gardante, Britomart’s second external injury is caused by another lustful character, Busirane. A parallel is immediately established between the two wounds, for, as the first, the injury inflicted by Busirane is “nothing deepe imprest” and does not deter her from her quest (III.xii.33). However, the area of injury is notably different: the arrow of Gardante, who is commanded by lust, hits Britomart in the womb, giving it a sexual significance, while Busirane’s knife strikes Britomart’s

chest. Busirane does not lust after Britomart; he wants Amoret, and attempts to strike her first. Unlike Gardante who strikes at the womb which represents the ultimate purpose of marriage, Busirane aims for the heart since that is where marriage's key institution is located: love. He first wishes to steal Amoret's love for Scudamore, and when thwarted, goes to the next victim who is in love, Britomart. As stated in multiple Elizabethan pamphlets and books on the subject of marriage, love is demanded from both partners for a good union. If Busirane was successful in destroying or taking either lady's love, they would not be able to accomplish their divine destinies of marriage and children.

In contrast to Britomart's central point of the individual will being aligned with God's will to fulfill preordained destiny, Timias depicts the wicked will of the predetermined damned. He represents the second and worst type of wound caused by inactive avoidance of divinely-appointed destiny. Timias acts only when dealing with matters of lust, and is a Petrarchan when in love, refusing to actively achieve requited love in marriage. From the very beginning, Timias demonstrates an unwillingness to pursue destiny, for he chooses to pursue lust, and not the object (Florimell) that might have secured his future. While fighting the forester, who had chased Florimell, and his two brothers, Timias is shot in the thigh. In an area near the groin, the injury is obviously a lust wound and "exceeding griefe that wound in him empight," since he does not have the protection of true love as granted to Britomart (III.v.20). Timias's focus on lust, not love leaves him vulnerable to even shallow wounds of lust, since his will is wicked as expected of a damned man.

By not being able to participate in God's destiny of marriage for the saved, Timias's will causes him to suffer from a second wound: an injury from a false love.

Timias is taken care of by Belphoebe, who “heales up one and makes another wound” (III.v.42). The new wound is obviously not developed from lust, but from love which “hurt his hart, the which before was sound” (III.v.42). However, Timias’ love is a false love, for he loves the characterization of virginity, which is Belphoebe. Belphoebe’s purity is an individual virtue, and not the value of chastity to one person in marriage. In loving such an entity, Timias is not properly participating in chastity’s noble goal of loyalty to a partner in marriage. God does not grant protection the condemned, and Timias’ second injury is merely Spenser’s clarification of the wicked being unable to align their will with God’s will.

As a result of being damned, Timias is unable to act righteously, causing Belphoebe to flee from him, and Timias’s transformation into a Petrarchan lover who continually pines for an impossible, thus false, love. In Book Four, Belphoebe comes upon the transformed Timias and although she is unable to identify Timias, she is immediately able to identify the cause of Timias’ pain: his will. She states, “If heauen, then none may it redresse or blame, / Sith to his power we are subject borne” (IV.viii.15). Belphoebe recognizes Timias is “guilty of despising God’s grace by ‘wilfully’ withdrawing from a life of virtuous action” (IV.viii.15n). Her admonition is similar to Merlin’s warning before Britomart’s quest as a reminder of Spenser’s belief in the collaboration of free will and preordained destiny: the choices of the saved will inevitably coincide with God’s Will, only the damned would choose to follow something other than God’s Will. Even with Belphoebe’s advice, Timias continues to inactively avoid the righteous path of love leading to marriage. Due to Timias’ choices, he never gains true love, and thus is never cured of his love wounds. In Book Six he is again injured by the

characteristics of a false love, and Timias recovers from his wounds only when he “is ready of his ‘owne will’ to follow [the Hermit’s] counsel” (VI.vi.13n). Like Belphoebe, the Hermit knows “for in your selfe your onely helpe doth lie, / To heale your selues, and must proceed alone / From your owne will, to cure your maladie” (VI.vi.7). While Timias does eventually recover from his physical injuries, *due to his own conscious choosing*, he never has a love-oriented ending because he loves falsely as befitting a damned man. Since there never is any redemption for Timias, regardless of his choices, Timias is condemned by God. Unwilling and unable to achieve salvation, Timias is damned by Spenser for being a Petrarchan lover and for neglecting to fulfill God’s Will.

As a moderate Protestant, Spenser clearly demonstrates the possibilities and consequences of free will within the doctrine of predestination. All characters are granted the choice to pursue their God-created destinies, but regardless of their choices, their divinely predetermined futures will be fulfilled. Britomart freely involves herself in the fulfillment of God’s Will and thus is granted His protection from lust wounds and the inevitable cure of marriage for her love-incurred injury. Unlike Britomart, Timias is not elected to be saved, and thus his will governs his choice of love as well as his wicked inactivity to obey God’s destiny of marriage. In Book Three, characters are granted free will although it is limited in the structure of predestination: the good are expected obey God’s will, while the wicked characteristically ignore God’s destiny.

Footnotes

¹Within the *Spenser Encyclopedia*, under “Providence” only two authors are noted to have produced any works on the subject of the role of the will and/or predestination: and Richard A. McCabe’s *The Pillars of Eternity: Time and Providence in The Faerie Queene*, the latter which was referenced in this text. Besides these two sources, no recent, scholarly searches have provided any works on the subject matter.

²Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. Ed. A.C. Hamilton. 2nd ed. New York: Longman, 2007. All quotations are taken from this excellent edition.

³While Dr. Mallette recognizes procreation as part of the “three-fold purpose of marriage,” he largely argues that Reformation marriages were seen as a means to contain or restrain lust for both men and women (89). However, after reading the Book of Common Prayer that plainly states marriage “is commended of Saint Paul to be honourable among all men, and therefore is *not* to be enterprised *nor taken* in hande unadvisedly, lightly, or *wantonly*, to satisfie mens *carnall lustes and appetites*, lyke brute beastes” it is hard to fully support the theory of fornication prevention (S3^v, *italics mine*). Other contemporary authors, like Daniel Rogers (*Matrimoniall Honour*), also warn against unions conceived in lust and extensively explain the types of marriages that would be good or negative, with the first and foremost purpose of positive unions always being procreation.

⁶While it is not within my focus for this paper, the question of general or individual predestination within a marriage is interesting to quickly examine. Within Book Three and Four, the female characters who are searching for their lovers specifically know who they are to be paired with in marriage. Men, however, are merely expected to eventually be in a union although they do not know who with and do not care to seek out their future partner. Briotmart and Florimell both know and accept who their future husbands will be, while neither Artegall nor Marinell are concerned with love or marriage. For these two couples, Spenser seems to hold the contemporary standards of betrothed loyalty: women were to be destined for one specific man while men were simply expected to be married, regardless of who it was.

Works Cited

- Church of England. Articles, Whereupon it was agreed by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Prouinces, and the whole Cleargie; Jn the Conuocation holden at London in the yeere of our Lord God 1562. According to the computation of the Church of England. For the auoyding of the diuersities of opinions, and for the stablishing of consent touching true Religion. London: Robert Barker, 1612.
- . The booke of the common praier and administracion of the Sacramentes, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church. After the vse of the Church of Englande. London: Richardi Graftoni, 1549.
- . The Boke of common prayer, and administracion of the sacramentes, and other rites and ceremonies in the Church of Englande. London: E. Whitchurche, 1552.
- Cressy, David. Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-cycle in Tudor and Stuart England. New York: Oxford U P, 1997.
- Gataker, Thomas. Marriage dvties briefly covched together; [!] ovt of Colossians, 3.18, 19. London: W. Bladen -W. Iones, 1620.
- Geneva Glosses. Christian Classics Ethereal Library. Calvin College. 14 July 2008 <<http://www.ccel.org/g/geneva/notes/Genesis/2.html>>.
- Gouge, William. Of Domesticall Dvties. London: William Bladen -John Haviland, 1622.
- “Handfast.” The Oxford English Dictionary. I.1.a. 20 August 2008 <<http://dictionary.oed.com>>.
- Hieatt, A. Kent. “Scudamour's Practice of Maistrye upon Amoret.” PMLA, Vol. 77, No. 4 (Sep., 1962): 509-510. Modern Language Association. JSTOR. Ripon College Library, Ripon, WI. 30 July 2008 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/460576>>.
- Kaske, Carol V. “Chastity.” The Spenser Encyclopedia. 1990.
- Luther, Martin D. Special and chosen sermons / of D. Martin Luther, collected out of his writings and preachings for the necessary instruction and edification of such, as hunger and seeke after the perfect knowledge and inestimable glorie which is in Christ Iesu, to the comfort and saluation of their soules. London: Thomas Vautroullier, 1578.
- Mallette, Richard. Spenser and the Discourses of Reformation England. London: U of Nebraska P, 1997.

-
- McCabe, Richard A. The Pillars of Eternity: Time and Providence in *The Faerie Queene*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1989.
- Penny, D. Andrew. Freewill or Predestination: The Battle over Saving Grace in Mid-Tudor England. Irthlingborough, GB: The Boydell Press, 1990.
- Roche, Thomas P., Jr. 'The Kindly Flame': A Study of the Third and Fourth Books of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton U P, 1964.
- Rogers, Daniel. Matrimoniall Honour. London : Philip Nevil –Th. Harper, 1642.
- Rogers, Thomas. The faith, doctrine, and religion professed and protected in the realm of England and dominions of the same : expressed in thirty nine articles, concordably agreed upon by the reverend bishops and clergy of this kingdome at two several meetings or convocations of theirs in the years of our Lord 1562 and 1604. 1586 Cambridge: John Hayes -Edw. Brewster, 1607.
- Rose, Mark. Heroic Love: Studies in Sidney and Spenser. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U P, 1968.
- Spenser, Edmund. The Faerie Queene. Ed. A.C. Hamilton. 2nd ed. New York: Longman, 2007.
- Wells, Marion A. The Secret Wound; Love-melancholy and Early Modern Romance. Stanford, CA: Stanford U P, 2007.
- Wentworth, Peter. A pithie exhortation to Her Maiestie for establishing her successor to the crowne. : Whereunto is added a discourse containing the authors opinion of the true and lavvfull successor to Her Maiestie. Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1598.
- Wilson-Okamura, David Scott. "Spenser and the Two Queens." English Literary Renaissance. 32.1 (2002): 62-84. Academic Search Premier. EBSCOhost. Ripon College Library, Ripon, WI. 3 June 2008 <<http://search.epnet.com>>.

Other Readings

- Judson, Alexander C. The Life of Edmund Spenser. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1945.
- Meyer, Arnold Oskar. England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth. Trans. Rev. J. R. McKee. 2nd ed. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1967.
- Oram, William Allan. Edmund Spenser. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1997.

Schaff, Philip. The History of Creeds. Vol. 1. New York: Harper, 1877. 3 vols.

Spenser, Edmund. "A Letter of the Authors expounding his whole intention in the course of this worke: which for that it giueth great light to the Reader, for the better vnderstadning is hereunto annexed." 23 January, 1589. Letter to Sir Walter Raleigh in The Faerie Queene. Ed. A.C. Hamilton. 2nd ed. New York: Longman, 2007.

Steadman, John M. Moral Fiction in Milton and Spenser. Columbia, Missouri: U of Missouri P, 1995.

Stubbs, John. The discoverie of a gaping gulf, whereinto England is like to be swallowed by an other French marriage, if the Lord forbid not the banes, by letting Her Maiestie see the sin and punishment thereof. London: W. Page -H. Singleton, 1579.

The Order of Marlowe's *Certain of Ovid's Elegies*

Bruce E. Brandt

South Dakota State University

Among Christopher Marlowe's many literary firsts is his translation of Ovid's *Amores*. There were a number of Latin editions of the *Amores* during the sixteenth century, but Marlowe's translation into English was the first translation of these poems into any modern European language (Gill, *Works* 5-6, Orgel ix). In addition, it also constituted the first extended use of the heroic couplet in English Renaissance poetry (Brown 112-3). The decision to translate the *Amores* must have seemed daring, even transgressive, for these poems were deemed much more prurient by readers of Marlowe's time than they are to present-day readers (Brown 110-1). Classicists have noted errors in Marlowe's translation, and there are many places where the syntax is convoluted as Marlowe tries to fit Ovid's meaning into the confines of the heroic couplet (see Gill, "Snakes" 135-150; & *Works* 4-6). At their best, however, these poems are witty and energetic, and Marlowe has succeeded in infusing them with his own voice.

Marlowe is usually thought to have translated Ovid's *Amores* during his student years at Cambridge University, but there is no hard evidence for this assumption. None of the editions are dated, and all show the place of publication as Middleborough.¹ This Dutch imprint is most likely spurious, a subterfuge of an English publisher used for a book whose contents might be deemed objectionable. The early editions all include Sir John Davies's *Epigrams* as well as Marlowe's *Elegies*, and topical allusions by Davies show that the first two editions could not have been printed before 1594-95, a year or

more after Marlowe's death in 1593. However, an edition was clearly in print by 1599, when the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Canterbury ordered Marlowe's and Davies' poems to be seized and burned. Since the seizure was part of a crackdown on satire, the target may have been Davies rather than Marlowe. The third edition includes a poem by Ben Jonson that dates it to 1602 at the earliest. The fact that concerns us here is that the first two editions, in which Marlowe's section was entitled *Certain of Ovid's Elegies*, contained only ten of the Elegies. From the third edition on, Marlowe's portion was titled *All Ovid's Elegies*, and translated the 48 poems of the *Amores* in their entirety.

Criticism has focused on the complete translation, and most critics would agree with Stephen Orgel, who characterized *Ovid's Elegies* as being Marlowe's sonnet sequence, a series of related poems revealing the interior obsession and struggle of the poet and lover who narrates them and the woman depicted in them (Orgel ix). Seen in this way, as Patrick Cheney has emphasized, Marlowe's adulterous and very human Corinna becomes a fascinating foil to the pure and distant Petrarchan ladies of the conventional sixteenth-century sonnet sequence (*Collected Poems*, 8). Additionally, Ovid's *Amores* describes a pattern of poetic development in which the poet progresses from amatory poetry to tragedy, and in *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood*, Patrick Cheney has argued that Marlowe's entire literary career was consciously modeled on this Ovidian pattern—that it was his alternative to the Virgilian model of poetic development followed by Spenser.

However, the 10 poems printed in *Certain of Ovid's Elegies* have received little independent discussion. Was there an underlying rationale for the selection, as the word "certain" would seem to suggest, and is there a reason for the order in which they were

printed? We may note that the ten elegies are drawn from throughout the three books of the *Amores*: six from Book I, and two each from books II and III. The selection, in short, was made from the whole sweep of the *Amores*, including poems from very near the end. Moreover, the order in which they are presented suggests that there is an underlying principle to the sequence. If one were simply selecting poems that one liked, and one were including the first three poems (as is the case), why would one not present them one, two, three? Instead, Elegy I.ii is plucked from its position between I.i and I.iii and placed in the tenth position. Such revamping suggests a deliberate ordering of the chosen poems, and while such order might be imposed by a thoughtful reader or printer, it seems more likely to me to reflect the poet and translator. What I would argue is that Marlowe deliberately constructed a mini-equivalent of the sonnet sequence—that he ordered a series of poems so that while each poem works independently as a poem, the movement from poem to poem is suggestive of a larger narrative. In a sense this concept relates to Orgel's description of *Ovid's Elegies* as Marlowe's sonnet sequence, but Orgel was referring to the achievement of the entire translation and to its place in Marlowe's development as poet. The order of the 48 elegies, no matter how fully Marlowe made them his own, is Ovid's. What I am suggesting, in contrast, is that in the 10-poem sequence Marlowe constructed a sonnet-sequence-like narrative that used selected poems as its building blocks. The loose narrative framework of the typical sonnet sequence takes us through the various stages of a love relationship, with poems relating to such things as the narrator falling in love, struggling to win the heart (or even the attention) of the beloved, suffering from unrequited love, joying as love is returned, and lamenting as the relationship ends. We can see, I will suggest, a similar narrative loosely tying together the

ten poems in the first edition of *Ovid's Elegies*. Differences will certainly be evident.

Drawing upon Ovid rather than Petrarch, Marlowe is drawing upon a tradition in which sexual relationships can be consummated. Moreover, unlike the self-pitying Petrarchan lover, we will find a narrator who is able to move on when the relationship has ended.

Certain of Ovid's Elegies opens with Elegy I.i, which begins by describing how Ovid's intention of writing epic poetry had been transformed into writing elegiac verse: instead of writing about war, he finds that Cupid has altered his meter and led him to write about love. The extrapolation that this is the proper order for a poet, writing love elegies before epics, makes this one of the "programmatically" poems in the *Amores* that Cheney sees as defining the poetic path that Marlowe was actually to follow in his career (although the pattern is truncated by his early death) (*Counterfeit Profession* 10).

However this may be, as the poem progresses we learn that Cupid has struck Ovid with his arrow, and that he now burns, and "Love in [his] idle bosom sits" (30).² He is forced to write love poetry because he loves. This is analogous to the opening of Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*, the first and foremost of the Elizabethan sonnet cycles, and one which was likely known to Marlowe. Astrophil decides to write because he loves. For Astrophil, of course, the problem was not what kind of poetry to write, but how to overcome writer's block: "But words came halting forth, wanting Invention's stay; / Invention, Nature's child, fled step-dame Study's blows" (9-10). What Astrophil learns is that he must "look in thy heart, and write" (14). In his heart, of course, he will find the image of his love, Stella, and thus will be able to express his love. Marlowe's Ovid has not yet identified his love, but he writes as he does precisely because he loves.

In Elegy I.iii, Ovid's beloved is still unnamed. What he asks, though, is for his love to be requited: "would she but let me love her; / Love knows with such like prayers, I daily move her" (3-4). His chief promise to her is his fidelity: "I love but one, and her I love change never, / If men have faith, I'll live with thee for ever" (15-6). Needless to say, sonnets asserting the speaker's love and entreating that it be returned are ubiquitous in the sonnet sequences, and in those poems, the Petrarchan lover typically suffers lengthy pain and doubt before his love is returned. When love is at last returned, the sonnet lover is overwhelmed by happiness. In Astrophil's words, "Gone is the winter of my misery; / My Spring appears; O see what here doth grow; / For Stella hath, with words where faith doth shine, / Of her high heart given me the monarchy" (sonnet 69, 8-10). The moment may be signaled with a kiss, as in Sonnet 64 of Spenser's *Amoretti*, which begins "Comming to kisse her lyps." However, Marlowe's meta-narrative does not linger over a chaste Petrarchan kiss. With Elegy I.v, Marlowe's sequence moves directly to the relationship's sexual consummation. Corinna comes to her lover's bed, and after pulling off her gown, the narrator tells us that "I clinged her naked body, down she fell. / Judge you the rest: being tired she bade me kiss; / Jove send me more such afternoons as this" (24-6). Moreover, as Marlowe knows, these moments in the sonnet sequences when love blossoms are often tied to a heightened appreciation of the beloved's beauty. In Spenser's Sonnet 64, for example, the narrator uses an elaborate set of floral similes to praise his lover's lips, cheeks, brows, eyes, neck, breast, nipples, and sweet body odor. Ovid's poem praises Corinna's white neck and dangling tresses, and then, when her gown has been snatched away, her perfect arms and shoulders, breasts, belly, legs, and wen-free body.

Marlowe next selects a poem from late in Book III to introduce the idea that loving a woman of exquisite beauty may leave a man feeling insecure about his ability to retain her affection and fidelity. The speaker in *Elegy III.xiii* is certain that so faire a woman will not be true, but asserts that he will be content so long as she does not reveal the truth about her affairs: “Seeing thou art fair, I bar not thy false playing, / But let not me, poor soul, know of thy straying. / Nor do I give thee counsel to live chaste, / But that thou wouldst dissemble, when ’tis past” (1-4). It is an act of will on his part. If she will “walk as a puritan,” i.e., hypocritically project a moral façade, then he will agree to “think [her] chaste” (13-4). The idea is not one commonly explored in sonnet sequences, though we may glimpse a similar notion in Shakespeare’s sonnet 138: “When my love swears that she is made of truth / I do believe her, though I know she lies” (1-2). There the narrator maintains that her transparent lies imply that she thinks him young enough to be taken in, and he enjoys the thought (fictional though it be), that she thinks of him as young. The Ovid-Corinna trade is actually simpler: If she teach her “tongue to say, ‘I did it not’” (48), then he will wink at her indiscretions.

The poet-lover next reflects on the immortality that poetry can bestow: “all the world may ever chant my name” (*I.xv.8*). Though *Elegy I.xv* primarily emphasizes the fame to be attained by the poet, it includes one clear example of such immortality being bestowed upon the poet’s lover. Just as the amatory poet Cornelius Gallus “shall be known from east to west” (29), so shall the name of Lycoris, the woman “whom he lovèd best” endure longer than “flint and iron” (30-1). The notion is rather common in the sonnets. Shakespeare’s sonnet 55 promises that “Not marble, nor the gilded monuments / Of princes, shall outlive this powerful rhyme; / But you shall shine more bright in these

contents / Than unswept stone besmeared with sluttish time” (1-4). Spenser’s promise to Elizabeth Boyle in Sonnet 75 of the *Amoretti* is similar: “my verse your vertues rare shall eternize, / and in the heuens wryte your glorious name. / Where whenas death shall all the world subdew, / our love shall liue, and later life renew” (11-4). One need not construe too tightly the framing narrative that Marlowe is constructing with Ovid’s elegies, but following a poem based on the assumption that Corrina will not be true, one may perhaps read the promise of poetic immortality as a kind of bribe. He will have it, and like Gallus, he can bestow it on his beloved.

In the sixth poem, Elegy I.xiii, the couple is sleeping together: “Now in her tender arms I sweetly bide, / If ever, now well lies she by my side. / The air is cold, and sleep is sweetest now ...” (5-7). Unfortunately, dawn comes, personified as the goddess Aurora. She is not a welcome guest. The poem lists seamen, travelers, soldiers, schoolboys, lawyers and their clients, and housewives among the men and women who love her not. Worst of all, from the speaker’s viewpoint, is that the woman with him rises. Who could endure this, he asks, except a man who always sleeps alone. Modern readers no doubt recall the echoes of Ovid’s poem in John Donne’s “The Sun Rising,” which begins with the speaker chiding the sun for waking him and his lover, directing him instead to awaken schoolboys and apprentices, huntsmen and farm workers. We are also apt to be familiar with Marlowe’s more famous allusion to this poem in a line from Doctor Faustus’s last soliloquy: “*O Lente, lente currite noctis equi!*” (A-text: 5.2.74). The Latin adaptation is, if anything, more effective than this poem’s “Hold in thy rosy horses that they move not” (10). In *Doctor Faustus*, of course, the speaker wants time to pass slowly because at

midnight he will go to hell. In Ovid, and in Marlowe's translation, the lover merely longs to spend more time in bed with his lover.

At some point in most sonnet sequences, the burgeoning relationship begins to cool. The lover's feelings are no longer reciprocated, and he is left forlorn. Thus, in sonnet 86 Sidney's Astrophil laments: "Alas, whence came this change of looks? If I / Have changed desert, let mine own conscience be / A still felt plague, to self-condemning me" (1-3). In other words, "if I deserve to suffer, let me punish myself. Don't withdraw your affection from me." In perhaps the best known of the poems in Michael Drayton's idea, sonnet 61, the speaker hopes for a clean break: "Since there's no helpe, come, let us kisse and part; / Nay, I have done: you get no more of me, / And I am glad, yea glad with all my heart / That thus so cleanly, I my self can free" (1-4). Of course, he is less glad than he claims, and by the sonnet's end suggests that in fact the pair might yet recover their love.

The seventh elegy chosen by Marlowe creates the analogue to this climactic moment. The problem, though, is not that her ardor has cooled. Rather, it is that he has a roving eye. He chastises himself; he claims to loath his behavior, but he says, "I cannot rule myself, but where love please / Am driven like a ship upon rough seas. / No one face likes me best, all faces move, / A hundred reasons make me ever love" (II.iv.7-10). The bulk of the poem lists the types of women that appeal to him: those who are modest, coy, sour, learned, or simple, those who like his writing and those who don't, those who are nimble or musical or athletic, those who are short or tall, white, yellow, or brown, blonde or dark-haired. In short, he is not choosy, and he is not faithful.

The result of his roving, we learn in the next selection, is that he now loves two women equally, both of whom are rich and fair: “Which is the loveliest it is hard to say” (II.x.6). He briefly complains as the poem begins: “Venus, why doublest thou my endless smart? / Was not one wench enough to grieve my heart?” (11-2). However, he concludes that two is better than none, and the greater part of the poem is boasting about his sexual prowess. “Though I am slender, I have store of pith,” he says, and “Oft I have spent the night in wantonness, / And in the morn been lively ne’er the less.” (23,27). Marlowe then jumps ahead fifteen poems to Elegy III.vi in order to find poetic justice for this braggart., depicting his shame at suffering a bad case of erectile dysfunction. As Marlowe has reordered these poems, it may well be that two women is in fact too many! And it appears that this woman, suspecting that he has already been with another, will have no more to do with him,

Marlowe concludes his selection of elegies with the second poem in the *Amores*, in which the narrator can not sleep because he is Love’s captive. In the original order Elegy I.ii had been simply the beginning of a courtship and an elaboration on the emotions that had drawn the narrator from writing epic poetry to amatory verses. Marlowe’s revised order now makes it the beginning of a new cycle. The speaker will once again praise his lady’s lovemaking and beauty, suffer doubts, promise poetic immortality, enjoy their fleeting time, and ultimately complicate their relationship because he is attracted to others. And then he will do it all again. This is not, of course, the normative story told by most sonnet sequences. There the Petrarchan lover suffers because he falls in love, suffers because his cruel mistress does not requite his love, is briefly happy, and then suffers because the relationship either cools or ends. It is not he

that ends it, and most typically he longs for it to be restored. The story created by the order of Marlowe's *Certain Elegies* is more skeptical than this. It violates the rules of the genre, but needless to say, such innovation is what we might expect from Marlowe. The idea that such a framing narrative might be constructed from existing poems does presume that Marlowe is particularly attentive to the possibility of exploiting patterns in Ovid. But if Cheney's *Counterfeit Profession* is right, that is precisely what Marlowe did in defining his entire poetic career. It seems a lesser step to imagine him imaginatively choosing and reordering poems that he had translated.

Notes

¹ For dating and the relationship between the early texts, see Bowers (309-14) and Gill (*Works*, 6-12).

² The text cited is Patrick Cheney and Brian Striar's *The Collected Poems of Christopher Marlowe*, which modernized Roma Gill's old-spelling edition of *All Ovid's Elegies* in her Oxford edition. Comparing the passages cited to Fredson Bowers' old-spelling edition, which used *Certain of Ovid's Elegies* as the copy text for the ten poems discussed here, reveals no differences beyond the modernization of spelling and punctuation.

Works Cited

- Bowers, Fredson, ed. *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*. Vol II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Brown, Georgia E. "Marlowe's Poems and Classicism." *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*. Ed. Patrick Cheney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 106-126.
- Drayton, Michael. *Poems of Michael Drayton*. Ed. John Buxton. Vol.1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Cheney, Patrick. *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Cheney, Patrick, and Brian J. Striar, eds. *The Collected Poems of Christopher Marlowe*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Donne, John. *John Donne's Poetry*. Ed. Donald R. Dickson. New York: W.W. Norton, 2007.
- Gill, Roma. "Snakes Leap by Verse." *Christopher Marlowe*. Ed. Brian Morris. London: Ernest Benn, 1968.
- Gill, Roma, ed. *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*. Vol. 1. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Marlowe, Christopher. *Doctor Faustus: A- and B-Texts (1602, 1616)*. Ed. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussens. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.
- Orgel, Stephen, ed. *The Complete Poems and Translations*. 1971; New York: Penguin, 2007.

Shakespeare, William. *Complete Works*. Ed. David Bevington. 6th Ed. New York:

Pearson/Longman, 2009.

Sidney, Sir Philip. *Sir Philip Sidney*. Ed. Latherine Duncan-Jones. Oxford Authors.

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Spenser, Edmund. *Poetical Works*. Ed. J. C. Smith and E. De Selincourt. Oxford

Standard Authors. London: Oxford University Press, 1912.

Scholars, Directors, and the New Globe's "Original Practices" *Twelfth Night*

Gayle Gaskill

St. Catherine University

When London's new Globe Theater toured its "original practices" *Twelfth Night* to Minneapolis's Guthrie Theater in the fall of 2003, I scheduled the production into my syllabus and naively persuaded my students they would see Shakespeare's comedy as the playwright intended it. They obliged me by cheerfully noting specific staging details, and recalling favorite line deliveries for months afterward. A student teacher escorting her first high school class believed the Globe's Malvolio addressed his gulling letter soliloquy (2.5) directly to her pupils, and like young John Manningham at the first recorded performance in the Middle Temple, they found it "a good practise" (qtd. Greenblatt 3307). Malvolio's dark house scene, on the other hand, which has troubled decades of psychoanalytic critics, never dampened their delight. The production was so successful in Minneapolis that the Globe toured its "original practices" *Measure for Measure* to the Guthrie two years later.

Surprisingly, the most compelling element I found in the Globe's *Twelfth Night* seemed a side effect of the historically authenticated costumes, musical instruments, and all-male casting that created headlines. The highly theatrical performance style, which eschewed cinematic verisimilitude in favor of self-conscious artifice, revealed that the comedy focused not on a wistful Viola, as years of productions had taught me to expect, but on an absurdly funny Olivia, the prosperous countess struggling to assert her will in the throes of sudden romantic love. The Globe's managing artistic director at the time,

Mark Rylance, played Olivia with resolute melancholy quickly melding into giggling bewilderment. As a man in middle age, Rylance brought authority and dignity to a role that over the past century had evolved into a silly foil for sweet Viola. Moreover, while like an artful storyteller he persuasively evoked Olivia's character, he never aimed at a realistic female performance. Rather, he maintained a distance between characterization and audience empathy by stressing the art of feigning.

The whole production emphasized artifice, and thus it disposed nicely of disturbing critical questions roused by earnest twentieth-century productions based on psychological realism. Has a callow Sebastian cruelly misled Olivia in substituting himself as her bridegroom for the Cesario she pursues? On the contrary, in the Globe's production, Olivia greeted the discovery of a double Cesario by clapping her hands, and eagerly exclaiming, "Most wonderful!" (5.1.218). The interchangeability of twins simply resolved the plot; it did not invite speculation regarding a sequel. Malvolio's mockery, Toby's alcoholism, Antonio's final separation from Sebastian, and even the courtship of one woman by another, remained within the bounds of a funny play, where actors resolutely maintained an artificial comic distance by speaking through the fourth wall directly to a highly visible audience. More than hand-sewn costumes or a sackbut, the most intriguing "original practice" was the privileging of theatricality over realism.

My insight was not universal. Several scholars disputed the authenticity of the Globe's staging, while others were drawn to the homoerotic implications of single-sex casting, most notably a frisson evoked by Orsino's nearly kissing the disguised Viola, while the Clown sang "Come away, death" (2.4). James C. Bulman, for example, both complained of the Globe's "amusement-park version of Elizabethan culture" and argued

that an all-male cast “coaxes audiences . . . if only for the duration of the play, to entertain queer thoughts” (575). I thought about the Duke’s abruptly clapping his hand over his page’s hand and crossing social boundaries as he drew close to Cesario’s face, though I only recalled a comic sense of anti-climax, but because Bulman stated his conviction that the production “offered up a subversive sexual politics . . . under the guise of archeological work,” I questioned whether my discovery of Olivia’s centrality reflected my own feminist convictions. Is Shakespeare’s Olivia really formidable, or was I making it up? The Globe’s forceful, central Olivia sent me back to the script, where I found that all four courtship plots turn on Olivia, and that she appears or is named in every scene except the two where Sebastian’s arrival foreshadows the resolution of her dilemma. Moreover, the script begins with a declaration of love for Olivia and concludes when Olivia announces she is married and then sorts out her husband’s identity. The Duke’s substitution of Viola for his bride and Malvolio’s lingering hostility are in part their responses to Olivia’s explanations. “Original practices” clarified what was originally written.

Critics were quick to challenge the advertised historical accuracy. Christopher Rawson summed up a commonplace: “Today’s audience and actors can never be Elizabethan,” and director Tim Carroll recognized that the claim of authenticity “is begging to be shot down. [The Globe] picks and chooses what to explore from a whole range of Elizabethan theater practices” (Rawson, part 1, pars. 8-9). Bulman’s reading of “subversive” politics in Orsino’s 2.4 display of affection, for example, falls into that gulf between the conjectural historic practice and modern titillation.

Indeed, the all-male casting drew most of the critical attacks on authenticity, while its practical success questioned the tradition that immature boys—rather than the new Globe’s adult males—consistently played all the Elizabethan female roles. Theater historian Andrew Gurr confirmed what we learned in high school: “So long as the boys were young enough to have unbroken voices (real apprentices signed on at 17, by when their voices would have broken) they played the women’s parts” (Gurr and Ichikawa 39), and Katherine Duncan-Jones remarked, “‘Original practice’ would have shown us grown men flirting with and sometimes kissing children, and, almost more offensively, in the Viola-Orsino plot, a child falling passionately in love with a mature male” (par. 3), while Bulman objected to the new Globe’s “adult male actors’ . . . social empowerment” (575). Bulman concurred: “Adult male actors on the new Globe’s stage are fundamentally different—in physical appearance, maturity, voice, professional training, and social empowerment—from the boy apprentices who performed at the original Globe” (575). On the other hand, Claire van Kampen, the Globe’s “master of theatre music” and Rylance’s wife, questioned the familiar assumption as she defended the adapted practice: “I just don’t believe it was young boys.” Children, she noted, could hardly play such complex roles. “‘Mark’s well suited to female roles. . . . It’s not to do with age, but with vocal tract and the physiology of his face’” (Rawson, section 3, pars. 2-3). She invoked the onnagata, Kabuki theater’s male performers of women’s parts. Perhaps scholars of theater history, influenced by “original practices” productions, will discover or reinterpret evidence of some adult males playing women’s roles on the Elizabethan stage. The “social empowerment” that Bulman questioned is exactly what I relished in Rylance’s Olivia.

The new Globe opened *Twelfth Night* in the dining hall of the Middle Temple on 2 February 2002, exactly four centuries after the original Globe's shareholders had offered the play's earliest recorded performance, in the same space. This was the Globe's first fully "original practices" production, a determined effort to illustrate the extensive and imaginative scholarship in theater history that stood behind Sam Wanamaker's anachronistic replica of Shakespeare's theater beside the Thames. All two weeks of the Middle Temple performances sold out before the production opened (Nightingale, par. 3), and when it was re-blocked and transferred to the Globe, the next hundred performances sold out as well (Bulman 576). In 2003 it toured Minneapolis and four other American cities, publicizing the rebuilt Globe's meticulous attention to historical details and restoring most of the Middle Temple blocking.

Initially critics claimed the "original practices" *Twelfth Night* literally recreated the production of four centuries past. The London Times took Oliver Cotton as Malvolio for the ghost of Burbage (Nightingale, par. 4), and the London *Independent* candidly announced, "There has never been a *Twelfth Night* quite like this. Or, rather, there was once—precisely 400 years ago" (Taylor, par. 1). Subsequent critics, however, soon observed that the production could not recreate history. As John Russell Brown comments, what stood out as exotic and perhaps romantic to audiences of 2002-2003 was originally unremarkable (*Shakespeare* 161). The "original practices" *Twelfth Night* represented a careful negotiation between scholarly research, public expectation, and good theater practice.

Before the building went up, the Globe Playhouse Trust persuaded Andrew Gurr to chair its Academic Advisory Committee, and in 1989 Gurr and John Orrell published

the generously illustrated *Rebuilding Shakespeare's Globe* to introduce general readers to Elizabethan theater conventions. Scale models illustrated the precise angles of afternoon sunlight in the Globe's proposed location (Gurr and Orrell 22-24). Revisional scrutiny of late Elizabethan- and Stuart-era etchings justified the precise dimensions of the platform stage that would thrust into its standing audience. As architects prepared to apply his research, Gurr predicted, "The final experiments can only begin once the Globe is available for staging plays in front of an audience willing to endure the Elizabethan audiences' discomforts" (Gurr and Orrell 43). The new Globe would be a laboratory for acting styles and audience behaviors. Thoroughly conscious of one another in the sunlight and not distracted by realistic proscenium scenery and technology, playgoers would be "eager . . . to use their imaginations to strengthen the illusion" (Gurr and Orrell 54, 67). Optimistic scholarly conjecture awaited the test of performance.

Neither the books nor the building, however, could allay what one newspaper critic called "extreme distaste for heritage theatre and the dead hand of a purely scholarly treatment" (Taylor, par. 4). The Globe's highly visible experiment held its directors under suspicion of wishing to produce the equivalent of a classroom exercise, and in 1997 its opening productions neglected some of the project's scholarly vision. As late as 2001, Tim Carroll's *Macbeth* sported a-historical tuxedos and party hats.

Even for *Twelfth Night* Carroll gave precedence to a modern audience's interests as he chose among historical conjectures. For example, the jig that according to Thomas Platter's 1599 account concluded the first Globe's performance of *Julius Caesar* may or may not have provided an historical precedent for the new Globe's use of a lively dance at every curtain call. Nor did scholars agree that the theatrical jig was a dance. It may

have been a short bawdy ballad. It may have been a short bawdy ballad. It may have been used only for some plays, or at some playhouses, or on some occasions (Gurr and Ichikawa 162; --- and Orrell 54). Platter's record may have indicated the jig's novelty rather than its customary practice. Scholars entertain all possibilities, but directors choose one. In 2002-2003 the sprightly dance offered a celebratory conclusion to *Twelfth Night*, particularly as the dancing actors struggled comically to distinguish between the identically costumed male and female Cesarios. Popular success impressed audiences that they were witnessing history. Moreover, it summed up the production's joyful interpretation of a comedy that for most of the previous century had been played for melancholy realism. Two years later, a company jig concluded the Globe's all-male touring production of *Measure for Measure*.

Directors have long claimed to employ Shakespeare's original practices. In 1912, Harley Granville Barker promised an original practices *Twelfth Night* at London's Savoy Theater. His streamlined direction rescued the script from Victorian cuts and clutter, and he instructed Viola, his petite wife Lillah McCarthy, to imagine herself a boy actor (Kennedy 137-40). With stylized topiaries and curtains of rich fabric, Granville Barker's proscenium stage set was more detailed than Carroll's table, chair, bench, and moveable box hedge, but it was drastically simplified from the elaborate gardens created by Henry Irving and Herbert Beerbohm Tree. With rapid scene changes he performed the whole script in only three hours. Granville Barker, in turn, was inspired by the insistently unadorned stagings of William Poel, the scholar-director who founded the Elizabethan Stage Society and who produced *Twelfth Night* in the Middle Temple about a century before the new Globe did so (Gurr and Orrell 29). Granville Barker's oriental costumes

were as lavish as his set was simple, another tribute to theater history. By highlighting his melancholy, vulnerable little Viola, he seriously counteracted the Victorian actor-managers' farcical exaggeration of Sir Toby's and Sir Andrew's drunken high jinks.

Granville Barker's earnest reading of *Twelfth Night* proved convincing. Peter Hall adapted it for the RSC in 1958-1960, and John Barton again in 1969 with a wistful Judy Dench as the little orphaned twin. In 1996 Michael Pennington, co-founder of the English Shakespeare Company, endorsed Granville Barker's interpretation, declaring "the real emotional force at the end [of *Twelfth Night*] is not so much in the resolution into marriage, . . . but actually in the reunion of a lost brother and sister" (Brailow 30). That year Trevor Nunn recreated and recorded Barton's interpretation in an artfully cut and cross-cut film with the pensive, athletic Imogen Stubbs as Viola. Shot on the rugged and picturesque Cornish coast, Nunn's film interpolated scenes in which each of the isolated twins stared longingly at the crashing waves. "Cinema is certainly the ideal medium for Shakespeare," wrote an enthusiastic scholar of cinematic performance (Osborne 90). Announcing the ideal Shakespeare medium, like advertising an "original practices" production is a long, slippery tradition of attributing the director's thinking to the author's intention.

Practical modern theater refines scholars' notions of original theater practices. Katherine Duncan-Jones concluded her review of the Globe's *Twelfth Night* by speculating, "Next season, it would be an interesting experiment to offer at least one all-female 'original practices' production. I suspect that this could be . . . just as revelatory of neglected details of Shakespeare's text" (par. 9). A year later, Rylance announced all-female productions of *Richard III* and *The Taming of the Shrew*. Like Duncan-Jones, he

invoked “original practices” to support the decision: “We have explored modern theatre practices, sometimes radical modern practices, and what we call ‘original’ theatre practices. I never call this work authentic. It isn’t. We choose the known practices that may be helpful to the modern relationship between actor and audience.” Shakespeare’s original actors were neither female nor aristocrats of Illyria. “Acting,” Rylance emphasized, “has more to it than behaving naturally.” Like the Globe’s wooden columns, which were painted to resemble marble, he insisted, “in Shakespeare, nothing is only as it appears, and a discernable distance between the reality of the performer and their role is suitable to the architecture of his plays. . . . The essential archetypes explored by Shakespeare are just as accessible to women as men” (Rylance, pars. 1, 4, 6, 8). After a year of acting on historical scholarship, Rylance confessed that the hallmarks of “original practices” were not lace ruffs or even trans-gender casting but characterizations based on archetype, a deliberately presentational style, and fidelity to the original script.

The “original practices” *Twelfth Night* brazenly appealed to an audience’s desperate but natural curiosity to see the play as Shakespeare intended it. When I saw the play I was completely taken in, as were many in Granville Barker’s audience. Study of Elizabethan women’s apparel taught the actors how to put on their social and gender roles. Stays, stomachers, farthingales, and floor-grazing hemlines restricted physical movements just as social conventions of high rank and the proprieties of mourning restricted self expression and self perception. Paul Chahidi, who played Maria in London, frankly acknowledged the impact of the confining historical clothing, which “was as good as weeks of movement practice. Because in that costume you have to take small steps, and if you need to move fast you have to glide. It told me so much about

feminine deportment” (Rosenthal, pars. 9, 5). Maria’s first comical, gliding entrance (1.3) prepared the audience to recognize the gliding Olivia (1.5) as a woman struggling to master the social responsibilities and emotional constraints of her duties as countess just as she had mastered the constraints of her garments. Olivia anxiously changed her gait, however, when yielding to the imperious demands of love and bearing a halberd to quell Sir Toby’s armed attack on Sebastian, she strode so vigorously that she lost a shoe (4.1). Her deportment, at once touching and comical, reflected the Elizabethans’ uses of clothing, gestures, and weapons to exhibit and to violate social rank. Like Sir Toby, Sebastian flourished his gentlemanly status with his rapier, just as Cesario and Sir Andrew humiliated themselves by lacking the stomach to use the same weapon. Olivia’s halberd, however, was the weapon of a lower-class soldier (Gurr and Ichikawa 35, 67). The blocking choice comically violated historical roles of gender and class. Strong enough to heft the heavy halberd, Rylance carried off the trick, while the mismatched battle gear, like the suddenly vigorous footwork, displayed the powerful, confusing emotions that welcomed Cesario’s astonishing obedience.

Olivia’s prominence in this production, with her agony between dignified restraint and newly awakened amorousness, roused the comic script from its twentieth-century melancholy. Her chalk-powdered, unsmiling visage evoking portraits of Elizabeth I, Olivia established her highest seriousness when Malvolio unctuously seated her in the domestic equivalent of a great chair that lacked only a dais and a canopy to signal its occupant was a queen (1.5) (Gurr and Orrell 85). The play’s unquestioned internal critic, she rapidly approved the fool (1.5.64), rebuked Malvolio (1.5.77), disciplined her drunken uncle with the ministrations of a fool (1.5.120), and invited the young stranger at

her gate to approach (1.5.145). Only her unruly kinsman foreshadowed the lurking danger to her dignity. Instead of belching at his entrance line, Sir Toby broke wind, then shamelessly addressed his excuse to the audience: “A plague o’ these pickle herring!” (1.5.105-06), so the ill-digested humor seemed an “original practice.” Sir Andrew’s historic costume drew laughs. A towering man with a great ruff, he jammed his high-crowned, ostrich-plumed hat over a sad comb-over, the aristocratic finery of a pathetic old wooer.

Popular audiences equate “original practices” with an all-male cast. The Globe’s Viola and Sebastian, slender young men of comparable height, wore identical wigs and costumes after 1.2, so though the courtship plots required the twins to be fraternal, audiences participated in the early modern theater convention that they were identical and interchangeable. Gurr had predicted the effect: “In *Twelfth Night* Viola and Sebastian were made into identical twins not by their faces but by their similar dress” (Gurr and Ichikawa 53). Twentieth-century critical anxiety over Olivia’s and Orsino’s deceptions dissolved. “With men in the female roles, you watch and listen, and Shakespeare’s words work for you,” remarked director Edward Hall, who had staged an all-male *Twelfth Night* three years earlier (Rosenthal, par. 11). Carroll’s display of gender-as-performance investigated the nature of identity.

Under the guidance of “original practices,” the theatricality of Malvolio’s characterization as archetypal naysayer rescued the comedy from psychological realism. The script introduced Malvolio and the Clown as opposing agents of Olivia’s will—figures of melancholy and festival (1.5). Directors who ignore this dramatic archetype may justify Malvolio’s comeuppance with his being labeled “a kind of Puritan” (2.3.125).

Others, including Henry Irving, who in a ponderous 1884 production hoped to revive his success as Shylock, pity Malvolio as the victim of his humorless sense of duty (Hughes 190-202). The Globe's Malvolio, however, theatrically confided his ambitions in a broad invitation directly to what Gurr called "the visible 'understanders' around the stage" (Gurr and Orrell 54), while the box hedge spies competed for audience support with their clamorous asides. Theatrical distancing minimized compassion for the comic villain even in his rolling dark house. Exaggeration realized the script's label of "improbable fiction" (3.4.115). Irving's tragic reading of Malvolio, however, is not to be defeated in one "original practices" production. One scholar who remained disturbed by Malvolio's character, "not as it played in this production" but because like "Shylock he is too sorely done by," quizzed Timothy Walker, who played Malvolio on tour, but Walker only answered enigmatically "that he had learned to live with it" (Muinzer 112). Though Malvolio's parting threat and long stage exit had, as always, made him linger in the mind (Brown, *Shakespeare* 72; —, *Shakespeare's Plays* 56), he was only a vanishing theatrical artifice.

The new Globe is one of several theaters whose architects and directors have built upon the scholarly conjectures of theater historians, all in the tradition William Poel founded with the Elizabethan Stage Society in 1894. "Original practices" staging is inevitably based more on directors' pragmatic decisions than on scholars' research, simply because directors must surmise what audiences can grasp with sufficient zeal to fill the theaters. The Globe's US tour heralded its historicity to expand its London audiences. From the present distance, their production looks conservative as new directors reinterpret "original practices." In Staunton, Virginia, for example, Ralph

Cohen's American Shakespeare Company realizes Andrew Gurr's research by staging early modern plays in a replica of the Blackfriars Playhouse. In Minneapolis during the fall of 2008 the Ten Thousand Things Theater Company's Michelle Hensley directed an all-female *Twelfth Night* following her successful all-male *Richard III* the year before. In all these more or less "original practice" productions, theatrical artifice trumps cinematic realism, lighting is uniform, audiences are visible on all sides of the performers, sets are simple and technology invisible, costumes reveal character, actors address the audience directly, and the most prominent feature is the original script.

Works Cited

- Brailow, David G. "Twelfth Night across the Continents: an Interview with Michael Pennington." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 14 (1996): 29-30.
- Brown, John Russell. *Shakespeare Dancing: A Theatrical Study of the Plays*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- . *Shakespeare's Plays in Performance*. Rev. ed. New York: Applause, 1993.
- Bulman, James C. "Queering the Audience: All-Male Casts in Recent Productions of Shakespeare." *A Companion to Shakespeare and Performance*. Ed. Barbara Hodgdon and W. B. Worthen. Malden MA: Blackwell, 2005: 564-87.
- Duncan-Jones, Katherine. "Displays Sublime but Inauthentic." Rev. Twelfth Night, by William Shakespeare. Dir. Tim Carroll. TLS 7 June 2002. Times Online. 11 Oct. 2007. <http://www.timesonline.co.uk>.
- Greenblatt, Stephen, gen. ed. *The Norton Shakespeare Based on the Oxford Edition*. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 2008. All textual citations come from this edition.
- Gurr, Andrew and Mariko Ichikawa. *Staging in Shakespeare's Theatres*. Oxford Shakespeare Topics. Ed. Peter Holland and Stanley Wells. New York: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Gurr, Andrew with John Orrell. *Rebuilding Shakespeare's Globe*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989.
- Hughes, Alan. *Henry Irving, Shakespearean*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.
- Kennedy, Dennis. *Granville Barker and the Dream of Theater*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1985.

Muinzer, Louis. "The 2002 Season at Shakespeare's Globe." *Western European Stages* 14 (2002): 109-14.

Nightingale, Benedict. "Working the Night Shift." *London Times*. 29 Jan. 2002. 7 Oct. 2007. <http://www.lexisnexis.com>.

Osborne, Laurie. "Cutting Up Character: The Erotic Politics of Trevor Nunn's *Twelfth Night*." *Spectacular Shakespeare: Critical Theory and Popular Cinema*. Ed. Courtney Lehmann and Lisa S. Starks. Madison NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2002. 89-109.

Rawson, Christopher. "Brave New Globe: Under Mary (sic.) Rylance's Leadership, Shakespearean Company Brings an Original *Twelfth Night* to Pittsburgh." Rev. *Twelfth Night*, by William Shakespeare. Dir. Tim Carroll. Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. 2 Nov. 2003. Sunday five-star ed. Arts & Entertainment G-1. 10 Feb. 2005 <http://web.lexis-nexis.com>. .

Rosenthal, Daniel. "Treading the Broads." *London Independent*. 22 May 2002. 4 Oct. 2007. <<http://arts.independent.co.uk>>.

Rylance, Mark. "Unsex Me Here." *Guardian* 7 May 2003. 4 Oct. 2007
<http://arts.guardian.co.uk>.

Taylor, Paul. "Mark Rylance: A *Twelfth Night* to Remember." *London Independent*. 2 Feb. 2002. 4 Oct. 2007 <<http://arts.independent.co.uk>>

Techniques in Glossing *King Lear*

Nicholas Wallerstein

Black Hills State University

I chose *King Lear* as the subject of my study of how scholars go about the task of glossing Shakespeare not because *Lear* is notoriously difficult to edit. Editing is one activity; glossing is different. But there does seem to be an art to glossing. My choice to investigate *Lear* is somewhat arbitrary, though I will say that some of the most fascinating and creative Shakespeare glossing I've yet encountered is in numerous editions of *Lear* that I have perused. I shall address, for instance, the glossing of *Lear* as it is found in the highly comprehensive Yale *Annotated Shakespeare* series, glossed by the great linguist Burton Raffel. I will also look at David Bevington's *Shakespeare: Script, Stage, and Screen*.ⁱⁱ Raffel's and Bevington's glossing is creative in a way that perhaps transcends mere linguistic precision. This is to say that glossing is not an exact science, that it often involves guessing or surmising, which is seen in the fact that often an editor will provide multiple glosses for one word or phrase. How does an editor arrive at an accurate glossing? One method is to use what linguist David Crystal and his actor son, Ben Crystal, call "triangulation" in their lexicon titled *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary & Language Companion*:

We opted for a system which we call *lexical triangulation*—adapting a standard mapping technique to linguistic use. For most headwords we have provided three glosses. Because there are no such things as perfect synonyms, each gloss provides a slightly different slant on the sense of the

headword we are trying to capture and thus enables us to focus more sharply on the word's semantic "core." (x; Crystal and Crystal's emphasis)

Burton Raffel's method is somewhat similar—using the *OED*, he aims at a plethora of definitions and synonyms that will attempt to triangulate the headword, somehow getting toward a sense of what it might mean. In fact, sometimes Raffel will use more than three synonyms, sometimes five or six. I shall look at Raffel and Bevington, along with editions of *King Lear* such as Grace Ioppolo's *Norton Critical Edition*, Stephen Greenblatt et al.'s *Norton Shakespeare*,ⁱⁱ and Russell Fraser's *Signet Classic Shakespeare*. Finally, I shall cross-check these glossings against the Crystals' lexicon. One quick note, however: often an editor will not merely triangulate by providing multiple synonyms. Often, he or she will take an entire phrase or line and rewrite it in modern-day parlance, translate it, as it were, into modern idiom. I shall investigate the creative and linguistic differences between these two methods.ⁱⁱ

As I've mentioned, the method Raffel employs is often to give as many as five or six synonyms. And sometimes the synonyms may relate to three or four different senses in which Shakespeare may have meant the word to be taken, as in a pun, for instance, or when Shakespeare left ambiguity in the word or words. For instance, take the words of Kent when he has disguised himself in order to return to serve Lear in Act 1, Scene 4. Lear asks him, trying to figure out who Kent is and what he wants, "What dost thou profess? What wouldst thou with us?" (1.4.11). Kent responds,

I do profess to be no less than I seem, to serve him truly that will put me in trust, to love him that is honest, to converse with him that is wise and says

little, to fear judgment, to fight when I cannot choose, and to eat no fish.

(12-16)ⁱⁱ

Raffel's gloss of these last words about not eating fish clearly are a crux for him, for they don't seem to be in the same vein as Kent's earlier description of what he professes, they don't seem to fit. Raffel seems to struggle with the line, and arrives at this gloss for the phrase "and to eat no fish":

(1) I am a Catholic, *or* (2) I am a meat-eater, *or* (3) I avoid whores, *or* (4) just see how funny I can be, ending with an irrelevancy like this. (37, n. 11; Raffel's emphases)

Bevington glosses the line thusly:

eat no fish i.e., eat a manly diet (?), be a good Protestant (?). (717, n. 17)

Both editors clearly admit to ambiguity, Raffel dealing with the seeming ambiguity apparently by throwing out as many half-way possible glosses as he can, Bevington using fewer possibilities and using parenthetical question marks to show that he (and presumably no one) really knows what Kent means.

Ioppolo approaches the ambiguity from another perspective, suggesting that the not eating of fish signals a "strict principle" of Kent, yet a strict principle that is somehow unknown. Here is her gloss:

eat no fish: adheres to some (unexplained) strict principle (possibly signaling that he refuses to eat fish on Fridays, as Catholics must do in order to abstain from meat). (20, n. 16-17)

Russell Fraser (1189, n. 18) and Greenblatt et al. (606, n. 4) gloss the line similarly, focusing on Kent's not being Catholic or that he's a "manly man" (Greenblatt et al.), all

in rather prosaic fashion. For my money, the Raffel gloss is the most creative, while being simultaneously comprehensive in its variety of explanations. By “creative” I suppose I mean that Raffel moves from mere linguistic analysis to actual *interpretation* when he suggests the line may mean “just see how funny I can be, ending with an irrelevancy like this.” Raffel’s extrapolation, then, moves beyond the obvious “I’m no Catholic,” that all the editors picked up on, and moves into the realm of creative analysis, by actually taking the Shakespearean phrase and rewriting it in modern-day parlance—and rewriting it in a way that allows Raffel to participate in the creation of meaning in the play.

Often, of course, glossing entails explaining one simple word that is unknown or unclear to a modern audience. Let us look at some other lines of Kent, still in disguise, this time taking on the obnoxious Oswald. The Duke of Cornwall—Lear’s son-in-law—wishes to know how a quarrel commenced between Oswald and Kent. Oswald states “This ancient ruffian, sir, whose life I have spared at suit of his gray beard—” (2.2.57-58), to which Kent interjects:

Thou whoreson zed, thou unnecessary letter! My lord, if you will give me
leave, I will tread this unbolted villain into mortar, and daub the wall of a
jakes with him. Spare my gray beard, you wagtail? (59-62)

Raffel glosses no less than eleven of the 36 words in Kent’s speech—close to one third of them—including “zed,” “leave,” “tread,” “villain,” “mortar,” “jakes,” “wagtail,” and the phrases “unnecessary letter” and “unbolted villain,” each with two words. Bevington glosses five of the words in the speech, Ioppolo six, Fraser and Greenblatt et al. four. “Jakes” is relatively easy to gloss, with all of our editors glossing it as “privy,”

“outhouse,” or “toilet.” The editors have a bit more trouble with Kent’s disparaging word for Oswald, “wagtail,” since the word has a literal meaning but also functions as a metaphor for describing Oswald’s contemptuous behavior. Raffel discusses both in his gloss:

contemptible fellow (literally, a small bird with a constantly wagging tail).

(69, n. 55)

Russell likewise addresses both the literal and the metaphorical meanings:

wagtail a bird that bobs its tail up and down, and thus suggests

obsequiousness. (1196; n. 69)

Bevington’s gloss is very similar to Russell:

wagtail i.e., bird wagging its tail feathers in pert obsequiousness. (725; n.

68)

Greenblatt et al. only address the literal meaning, going into quite a bit of ornithological detail:

A common English bird that takes its name from the up-and-down flicking of its tail; this, and its characteristic hopping from foot to foot, causes it to appear nervous. (763; n. 4)

On the other hand, Ioppolo addresses only the metaphorical meaning:

wagtail: contemptuous term for a young man. (39; n. 61)

And curiously enough, Ioppolo’s approach of only giving the metaphorical meaning is echoed in David Crystal’s and Ben Crystal’s lexicon:

wagtail (*n.*) [contemptuous form of address] tail-wagger, bower and scraper. (486)

Thus we see that Greenblatt et al. leave the metaphorical connection of the bird to Oswald up to the reader's imagination, while Ioppolo and the Crystals make the connection explicit, but leave out the lexicographical meaning of the word—which, in the case of the Crystals is especially odd, seeing as one would expect the lexicographical meaning of a word to be found in a lexicon. At any rate, neither approach is quite satisfactory for the modern reader, thus I feel the fuller glossing of Raffel, Russell, and Bevington is more appropriate and useful, giving both the literal meaning and the metaphorical interpretation.

Finally, one of the issues raised when looking at the art of glossing Shakespeare goes beyond a discussion of what choices and decisions an editor must make. Choices and decisions are going to be made differently based on one's relationship to Shakespeare. As we have seen in the editions discussed here, we, in a way, have two kinds of glossers: some have been linguists, like Burton Raffel and David Crystal; some have been Shakespeareans, like Greenblatt et al., Ioppolo, and Bevington. Who do we want glossing Shakespeare, a linguist or a Shakespearean? Or both? Raffel is a linguist but not a Shakespearean, but his linguistic skills are so prodigious that he elucidates much of what the Shakespeareans ignore or perhaps can't handle. And sometimes the Shakespeareans are able to gloss more proficiently than a linguist due to the thoroughness of their Shakespearean backgrounds.

Sometimes, however, it appears that a word can be so problematic that neither the linguist nor the Shakespearean can help. And I don't mean corruptions in the text making full explanation impossible. I mean a word where glossing proves useless because no one knows the answer. Take, for instance, one little word from *Romeo and Juliet*: "Susan." In

Act 1, Scene 3, the Nurse and Lady Capulet are discussing Juliet's age. Juliet's Nurse speaks:

Even or odd, of all days in the year,
Come Lammas Eve at night shall she be fourteen.
Susan and she (God rest all Christian souls)
Were of an age. Well, Susan is with God,
She was too good for me. (16-20)ⁱⁱ

While some texts ignore the issue, such as Russell's *Signet Classic*, most gloss "Susan" as being the Nurse's dead daughter. Bevington, for example, glosses in this manner:

Susan the Nurse's own child, who has evidently died. (512, n. 19)

The word "evidently" says much here, for it points up Bevington's lack of certainty. In fact, it's the same word Greenblatt et al. use in their gloss:

The Nurse *evidently* suckled Juliet after her own daughter died. (198, n. 5;
my emphasis)

What are we to make, therefore, of a very strange emendation to Harold Bloom's book, *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*, and what this emendation might tell us about the art of glossing? In his original text, from 1998, Bloom would seem to agree with Bevington and Greenblatt. Bloom writes—in the chapter "Romeo and Juliet"—the following: "Juliet, like the Nurse's dead child, Susan, is too good for the Nurse" (98). But listen to what happens to Bloom's sentence in the 2004 reproduction of the essay in Raffe's Yale edition of the play: "Juliet, like her late twin sister, Susan, is too good for the Nurse" (208). Bloom must have changed his mind during the intervening years as to who this mysterious Susan might be. So who is correct—the Bloom of 1998, or the

Bloom of 2004? Raffel himself would seem to side with the 1998 Bloom, for in his gloss of the Nurse's line Raffel writes that Susan is "the Nurse's dead daughter" (28, n. 18). But then Raffel includes at the back of his *Romeo and Juliet* text the emended Bloom conjecture that Susan is Juliet's dead twin. Perhaps this shows us that, sometimes, the meanings of Shakespeare's words are like shifting sands. Or at least the glosses are.

Works Cited

Bevington, David, Anne Marie Welsh, and Michael Greenwald, ed. *Shakespeare: Script, Stage,*

Screen. New York: Pearson Education, 2006.

Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead, 1998.

Crystal, David, and Ben Crystal. *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary & Language Companion*.

London: Penguin, 2004.

Fraser, Russell, ed. *The Tragedy of King Lear. The Complete Signet Classic Shakespeare*. Ed.

Sylvan Barnet. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972. 1174-1226.

Greenblatt, Stephen, et al., ed. *The Norton Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Tragedies. New York: Norton,

2008.

Ioppolo, Grace, ed. *King Lear*. William Shakespeare. A Norton Critical Edition. New York:

Norton, 2008.

Raffel, Burton, ed. *King Lear*. The Annotated Shakespeare Series. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007.

---, ed. *Romeo and Juliet*. The Annotated Shakespeare Series. New Haven: Yale UP, 2004.

Surveillance and Fetishism: Desire for the Forbidden

Wesley J. Hellman

University of Mary

Near the conclusion of his essay “Panopticism,” Foucault addresses quite specifically the relationship among discipline, power, and knowledge. He remarks that, at a certain juncture “the formation of knowledge and the increase of power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process” (183). Here he contends that the institution of disciplinary practices brought about a mutually productive knowledge and power calculus. Because of the regulation inherent in disciplined systems, the power/control within the system provided a breeding ground for the creation of knowledge which, in turn, rendered the system or institution even more powerful (183-84). It is at least partly the function of surveillance, therefore, to create and secure knowledge. But, should all knowledge be available to those who may have access to it? Roger Shattuck argues that there are moments when knowledge’s availability is not sufficient justification for the pursuit of that knowledge. Identifying long-held categories of the forbidden as the taboo, the occult, the sacred, and the unspeakable, he contrasts society’s acceptance of limitations on the practical matters of daily life with the Western belief that true freedom places no such limitations on the mind (5).

If, as Shattuck maintains, there is not merely the divergence of areas of limitation (the practical) from those without limit (the symbolic), but also value in acknowledging certain areas of the symbolic as forbidden, there would appear to be a strong tension

between those arenas that have traditionally been off-limits and a human desire to traverse those arenas. In other words, there is a human desire to know the forbidden.

Roy Ellen's work in fetishism traces the development of the concept, beginning with de Brosses' view that the fetish is a material representation of an abstract deity. The ability to manipulate the concrete object led Lubbock to suggest that the fetish permits the user to exercise control over the deity. Ellen concludes his review of that evolution by identifying among anthropologists an "ambivalence as to whether it is the objects themselves which effect material changes in some mysterious way, or whether it is some spiritual force which is either represented by or located in (but separate from) those objects" (213-15). Ellen continues his analysis of the fetish by aligning it not only with anthropology and religion, but also with Marxism and the economy, and with the psychoanalytical and sex. Often the term is applied simultaneously in its religious as well as in its erotic sense (216-18). Because of their associations with religion and/or sex, fetishes may fall within all four of the categories of the forbidden identified by Shattuck. It is in these senses, either applied individually or in tandem, that I will address how the surveillance projects in *Measure for Measure*, and *Brave New World* manifest themselves as expressions of desire for the forbidden. These expressions of desire incorporate surveillance's tendency toward penetration of the panoptic object. In the process, the surveillor creates of that object a human fetish.

Yet one more theoretical task remains, whereby the specific texts may be read. Ellen identifies four "cognitive processes" which the subject will engage in as they generate or create the fetish, irrespective of the type, religious, economic, or sexual.

These are:

1. a concrete existence or the concretisation of abstractions;
2. the attribution of qualities of living organisms, often (though not exclusively) human;
3. a conflation of signifier and signified;
4. an ambiguous relationship between control of object by people and of the people by the object. (219)

In Act One, scene four of *Measure for Measure*, the penetration of space is effected by one whose principle motive is not surveillance. Lucio has come to inform Isabella of her brother's Claudio's arrest and to honor Claudio's request that Isabella intervene on his behalf. He is able to penetrate the convent and gain access to Isabella only because she has yet to take her final vows which would have forbidden her to receive him. Although this is not a penetration of surveillance, the scene does introduce the fetishistic potential that Isabella possesses. Lucio hails her as a "virgin" (1.4.16) and holds her "as a thing enskied and sainted" (1.4.34). He declares that she would have power over Lord Angelo to give her whatever she requests "as freely ... / As they themselves would owe them" (1.4.82-3). Lucio equates Isabella with purity and the heavens and suggests that her dominion supersedes even that of the earthly ruler. In addition, because of Lucio's experience with women (1.4.31-33), his words describing Isabella's power could as well suggest her likely control over Angelo's apparent sexual indifference. Lucio makes of Isabella a concretized abstraction (saintliness), and begins

to decenter the power relationship between Angelo and Isabella. This introduction of the possibility of Isabella's being fetishized in both the religious and the sexual realms will be further developed in Act Two.

Though Isabella's interview with Lord Angelo in Act Two, scene 2 receives its just due in most discussions of the play, it is when the two are not on stage together that the potential for the fetishization of Isabella is established. Isabella departs from Angelo with the ambiguously deferential farewell wish "Save Your Honor" (2.2.168), to which Angelo immediately responds, out of her hearing, "From thee, even from thy virtue" (2.2.169). Recognizing the two meanings of the word "honor," Angelo could not have more quickly admitted his desire and the forbidden nature of it without speaking it directly to Isabella. His scene-ending soliloquy (2.2.169-94) is filled with references to temptation and corruption, as well as to the binaries of virtue and wantonness, of holiness and defilement, of strumpetry and maidenliness. In so doing, Angelo establishes that these binary abstractions may serve as the primary identifiers for Isabella and for himself. He asks himself "Dost thou desire her foully for those things / That make her good?" (2.2.181-82). An analysis of the scene shows numerous ways in which Ellen's processes of fetish-generation are present. Isabella is clearly the object of Angelo's gaze, of his desire, but it is her status as the physical emblem of an abstraction that makes of her a fetish. To Angelo, she is "modesty," "temptation," "virtue," and "saint"—not so much a person, but a bodily representation of these qualities. Within the quotidian world of Vienna, she embodies the opposite of everything that he has been trying to eradicate. Principally, at this juncture, it appears that it is within the realm of religion that Isabella's place as fetish is presented, yet there is a fine distinction here. Is virtue a religious or a

sexual characteristic? What about temptation? Certainly the lines are blurred. Angelo must determine if he is prepared to penetrate the sanctity of the convent walls for the sake of his desire to penetrate the novice those walls contain.

Angelo's opening soliloquy in Act 2 scene 4 shows that the earlier binaries continue. Heaven and evil contend; seriousness and vanity, foolishness and wisdom, and angels and devils do battle (2.4.1-17). Angelo's making a fetish of Isabella is nearing its completion. When Isabella returns to learn of her brother's fate, Angelo asks her to "Give up [her] body" (2.4.54), which he has separated from her soul by his claim that "Our compelled sins / Stand more for number than for account" (2.4.57-8). Here Angelo suggests that the body's compulsions have no real affect on the soul. The binaries that had earlier been outlined may not intersect; the body and the soul are clearly separate in Angelo's philosophy, because he wishes to effect his power through discipline over the object of his surveillance. As surveillor of Isabella, he seeks to penetrate the concretized saint. The fact that she is promised to the convent and possesses her innocence makes her, ironically, the more alluring, much as, perhaps, a school girl fetish operates in modern times. In addition, as Alan Sinfield remarks, Isabella's independent status within the convent would seem to run against the place that the Viennese leaders would prefer for her and for all women, namely marriage, thus making her even more attractive as both autonomous and inaccessible, at least until the Duke appropriates her at the end of the play (33). Angelo owns his desire and, as Ellen outlines, seems willing to admit that the power which Isabella possesses is as great as his own. His attraction to her places her in the position of controlling whether his desires will be met. But further, Angelo conflates the signifier, his desire, with a new signified. When pressed to "speak the former

language” (2.4.141), one which Isabella will find it easier to understand, Angelo claims that he loves her. His fetishized desire has turned to love within this false signifier-signified construct. Ellen cites Pouillon’s conclusion that fetish is “signification rather than what is signified” (226). This would suggest that Angelo has understandably, but erroneously, confused his bodily desire with emotional love. When Isabella initially denies Angelo, it becomes clear that the new signified, love, is merely a false conflation with his fetishized desire as he then resorts to threats of physical torture upon Isabella’s brother and implied emotional torture upon Isabella herself. Angelo bullies her thus:

Redeem thy brother

By yielding up thy body to my will,
Or else he must not only die the death,
But thy unkindness shall his death draw out
To ling’ring sufferance. Answer me tomorrow,
Or, by the affection that now guides me most,
I’ll prove a tyrant to him. As for you,
Say what you can, my false o’erweighs your true. (2.4.164-71)

Not merely does Angelo threaten Isabella and, in so doing, undermine his declarations of love, he gloats that his official power will reverse the binary of truth and falsehood. This is suggested in Jonathan Dollimore’s analysis of the play which claims that the primary purpose of the surveillance project is not so much to satisfy desire, but to legitimate the authority of the State (73). Thus, it is my view that while legitimation of State authority may result from the stated reasons for surveillance, it is the desire to seek out, to suppress, and, in some cases, to participate in transgressionary actions against the State

which make such official surveillance necessary. It is this matrix of desire which leads to the creation of the fetish. Clearly, in fetishizing his desire for Isabella, Angelo has concretized in her an abstract quality of saintliness. In addition, he has fetishized a living embodiment of this abstraction, not simply a personified object that represents the abstract. Angelo has now conflated his desire with an emotion that he proves he does not truly feel, and he has waged a battle of power with the fetishized which introduces uncertainty about whether the fetish (Isabella) or the person who created the fetish (himself) is in control. All of these actions follow the progression of fetishism that Ellen has outlined.

Perhaps it is Isabella's role as fetishized desire which compels Angelo to agree to the bed trick wherein his forsaken lover, Mariana, is substituted for Isabella. The conditions that he agrees to do not speak to anything other than satisfying his sexual and perhaps, on some level, his spiritual desire. Spiritually, Angelo has experienced the challenge to his sense of his own goodness. He had viewed Isabella as a temptation of his character: "Oh, cunning enemy that, to catch a saint, / With saints dost bait thy hook" (2.2.187-88). His own goodness now compromised, he seeks to ameliorate the situation by both compromising Isabella's goodness and by aligning himself with it at the same time. The outcome of the arrangement satisfies Angelo's sexual and spiritual desires without his awareness that Isabella, the object of those desires, has been replaced by Mariana, to whom, ironically, he had likely declared his love once upon a time.

This particular example is quite important both for the completion of the fetish and for the power relations inherent in surveillance operations. With regard to fetishism, Ellen's fourth cognitive process, the ambiguation of control between the fetishized object

and the person(s) responsible for that fetish, the theorist has this to offer: “The desire to control increases with the intrinsic powers attributed to objects, but as these powers increase, so they may counter the power which people have over them. . . . The power relations between supernatural beings or objects and humans is always conditional, never absolute” (229). Therefore, the more power with which Angelo embodies Isabella, the more he will wish to manipulate that power to his own benefit. However, the very act of empowering the fetish means that it, too, may manipulate the subject. If power is a function of the discipline imposed by the mechanisms of surveillance and the penetration of space that surveillance implies, then both the fetish and the fetishizer have accomplished a sort of mutual and circular penetration of space. Angelo wishes to penetrate the convent walls to impose power over Isabella and at the same time, he desires the penetration of Isabella, not simply in the sexual sense, but in his desire to control her actions. He seeks to get her to act as he would desire, but in so doing, he gives her the power to penetrate his subjective space both in terms of his physical longing, and in his spiritual desire to retain his own sense of virtue. Thus, Isabella’s ability to convince Angelo to accept the conditions of the bed trick illustrates this paradox. Isabella’s power resides in the very location that makes any knowledge of her forbidden knowledge. And it is this sense of the forbidden that arouses Angelo’s desire for that knowledge.

Angelo’s desire to penetrate the forbidden knowledge that Isabella represents seems to be the norm in terms of the sexual politics of fetishism. Anne McClintock summarizes the male-dominated theories of the fetishized body from Freud through Lacan and Bhabha and concludes that, “[t]he denial of female fetishism (the fetishistic gesture itself) is less an accurate description than a theoretical necessity that serves to

disavow the existence of female sexual agency except on terms prescribed by men” (182-83). McClintock explains this as a means by which fetishism may coexist with psychological theories of the phallus and castration anxiety. She seems to be suggesting, therefore, that the “gestures” of fetishism in women must relate to similar gestures by men in order that they may be recognized and understood as fetishism according to the prevailing theories. Her ultimate contention is that female fetishism ought to, and, indeed, does “dislodge the centrality of the phallus and parades the presence and legitimacy of a multiplicity of pleasures, needs and contradictions that cannot be reduced to the ‘desire to preserve the phallus’” (183). In the following exploration of the fetishized desire of Lenina Crowne for the “savage” John in *Brave New World*, I hope to illustrate the degree to which McClintock’s subversion of the power relationships implicit in the fetish holds true. In other words, I wish to show that fetishism is not a uniquely male construct.

Of course, in a fashion similar to the fetishizing of Isabella, Lenina is herself fetishized by John. What Lenina’s presence on the Reservation suggests to him, among other things, is the perfection of the world outside of the Reservation, its modernity and its technology coming together to form the antithesis of Malpais, his own “bad country.” The second section of the brief Chapter Nine, in which John enters Lenina’s rest-house, is dominated by such a fetishized veneration of Lenina by John. She is embodied for him in her luggage, her clothing, and her scent and he regards each in a sort of religio-sexual ritual that elevates him to ecstasy. In particular, his desire to penetrate her body and her space is indicated by his fascination with the zippers on her garments. “The zippers on Lenina’s spare pair of viscose velveteen shorts were at first a puzzle, then solved, a delight. Zip, and then zip; zip, and then zip; he was enchanted” (Huxley 143). These

concretizations of the abstract good place, represented by Lenina, which John wishes to penetrate, may be read as a fetish. But what of Lenina's fetishizing of John?

The Reservation is a place that is always being penetrated, yet is always being protected. It is decidedly unclear whether the fences that surround it are intended to prevent "escape" or to help "preserve" the Indian way of life (Huxley 102-03). Therefore, whether she is aware of it or not, Lenina's interest in experiencing the Reservation is a form of surveillance with all of the discipline-control, power, and knowledge implications inherent in this penetrative act. Some of the early language of the section of the novel set on the Reservation illustrates the motifs of surveillance and penetration. The party seeks a "bird's eye view" of the pueblos. Soon they were "crossing the frontier that separated civilization from savagery" (Huxley 104-05). Lenina and the other New Worlders desire to see the place where their world and the world of the unperfected meet. The blood ceremony upon which they gaze becomes the entry point into that world and John's presence there reinforces Lenina's associations of the Reservation's raw and untempered society with John, who insists that he ought to have been the tribe's representative. On the Reservation she has begun the fetishizing process which will continue with John's return with her to London. It is in London where that which John most potently represents will be better contrasted against the other men that Lenina knows. Neither the thoroughly conventional Henry Foster nor the overtly morose Bernard Marx, John is a concrete example of an abstract world that most New Worlders believe is long gone—the world of the sexually exotic.

John has become exoticized for Lenina through her associations of him with the Reservation in general and with the blood ceremony in particular. Edward Said notes that

in the nineteenth century, novelists packed their work with fetishistic and exotic images of the Orient to suggest sexuality, especially sexuality of a licentious nature. Because of the economic nature of marital and sexual relationships in European society, the Orient offered both the novelists and their readers the type of sexual experience that was normally unavailable to them (190). The fetishism that results when the process of Orientalism is imposed on an idea like sexuality may be seen in *Brave New World*. Thus it is for Lenina in her desire for John. Certainly, his status as an Indian from the Reservation makes him both an exotic and an object of desire that would be deemed forbidden. His ways are the ways of the primitive and racialized past and, were the New World species being reproduced sexually, Lenina and John's relationship would certainly be viewed by the Director and others as a case of racial miscegenation. After all, caste mixing among Alphas or any other group with any group other than their own was the subject of New World pornography. But Lenina and John's situation is not pornographic simply because of the caste mixing; the situation in which both Lenina and John find themselves vis-à-vis their attraction to each other depicts "an exclusive and maniacal passion" (Huxley 168). Lenina desires a forbidden exclusive relationship with John (Huxley 187), and John's forbidden desire for exclusivity aligns him also with the exotic.

John plays a role in exoticizing his position within the New World, especially with regards to Lenina, when he tells her that at Malpais "you had to bring her the skin of a mountain lion—I mean, when you want to marry some one ... in Malpais people get married" (Huxley 190-91). The associations of the wild animal skins and marriage—both of them clearly vestigial in the culture of the New World—also are clearly exotic in that world. Lenina responds to John's wishes for an exclusive relationship by engaging in a

reversal of the type of conflation of the signifier and the signified that we had seen in *Measure for Measure*. Lenina's "desire" for John is mistaken for "love" by him. For Lenina, physical lust equates to love. It is likely that, as much as any other action in the New World, what drives John over the edge in his efforts to find a way to live in the liminal space between his world and Lenina's is her ravishment of him after his declaration of love. He does not know it, but he is a fetish for Lenina, in that he represents in a concrete way many of the abstractions that are both forbidden and desirable to her, namely the historical, natural past and the emotion that the New World has sought to neutralize in its inhabitants with hypnopædic methods and soma.

The disciplinary control which surveillance projects seek to impose nearly always results from some manner of penetration of the space of the object by a subject seeking knowledge of that object. While it may be debated that some knowledge is better left unexplored; that in fact it may fall within the category of the forbidden, what seems apparent is the ease with which abstract concepts that may be unknown, or even unknowable, are made concrete by the seeker of knowledge. When the concrete manifestation of the abstract "unknown" is taken for the abstraction itself and the power relationship between the seeker and the unknown is uncertain or mutual, a fetish has been created. I would suggest that this is more prevalent than not in many forms of surveillance.

Works Cited

- Dollimore, Jonathan. "Transgression and Surveillance in *Measure for Measure*." *Political Shakespeare: New Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Eds. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985.
- Ellen, Roy. "Fetishism." *Man* ns 23.2 (1988): 213-35.
- Foucault, Michel. "Panopticism." 1977. Trans. Alan Sheridan. *Everyday Theory: A Contemporary Reader*. Ed. Becky McLaughlin and Bob Coleman. New York: Pearson, 2005. 162-87.
- Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. 1932. New York: Perennial-HarperCollins, 1998.
- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Said, Edward, W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Random House, 1979.
- Shakespeare, William. *Measure for Measure. The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. Ed. David Bevington. 5th ed. New York: Pearson, 2004.
- Shattuck, Roger. *Forbidden Knowledge: From Prometheus to Pornography*. New York: St. Martin's, 1996.
- Sinfield, Alan. *Faultlines: Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992.

Anne Bradstreet Apocalypse Now!

**Carolyn Baker
Mayville State University**

In her poem, *A Dialogue Between Old and New England*, Anne Bradstreet (1612-1672) makes a poetic, allegorical use of Biblical allusions to frame a personal and literal apocalyptic hope for her Old England's national vindication. Her uses of Biblical texts are more than just poetic or allegorical, though. Her creative use of language may very well reflect the approaches and emphases found in the English Protestant hermeneutics of her day.

Bradstreet's poetry, obviously, is valuable for many reasons. It offers today's readers a primary source for understanding the English and American Puritanism of the 17th centuryⁱⁱ. Be it her celebrated role as young America's first female versifier, or perhaps the way her literary work bridges the transference of ideas from Old England to the New Colony; Bradstreet's work is important for historian and literary analyst alike.ⁱⁱ Bradstreet's *Dialogue* is poetry, but oh so much more than poetry! *Dialogue* is also an historical artifact documenting the earliest usages of Early English Protestant hermeneutics in America.

Just what might have been some English protestant hermeneutics that guided her? That is the focus of this investigation--to view these forces separately, in order to ultimately view them centrifugally, as they particularly affect a possible reading of this poem.ⁱⁱ

The Text of Bradstreet's Poem. In 1659 Anne Bradstreet's poetry-- previously absconded by her brother and brother-in-law and stealthily taken by ship to England!--

was published for the first time as “a booke called the Tenth Muse lately sprung up in America, written by Ann Bradstreet”.ⁱⁱ Contained in this collection of poems was the poem *A Dialogue Between Old England and New* (White 368).ⁱⁱ

Bradstreet’s *Dialogue* records the conversation of an aged and troubled mother (Old England) with her younger daughter (New England). The dialog centers on England’s religio-political struggles, both historical and contemporary during Charles I (1600’s) times, as well as the young daughter’s attempts to assuage an apparently ailing Queen Mum who personifies a troubled England on the verge of experiencing a civil war. The poem records three short conversational movements between them, and is followed by one longer, climactic statement by the daughter.

In the first movement, Old England’s daughter inquires

1. Alas, dear Mother, fairest Queen and best,
2. With honour, wealth, and peace happy and blest,
3. What ails thee hang thy head, and cross thine arms,
4. And sit i' the dust to sigh these sad alarms?
5. What deluge of new woes thus over-whelm
6. The glories of thy ever famous Realm?
7. What means this wailing tone, this mournful guise?
8. Ah, tell thy Daughter; she may sympathize.

The Queen with initial reserve responds that the problem is related to something

12. Which Amazed Christendom stands wondering at...

This introduces the second conversational movement where the concerned and probing daughter recounts more than 1200 years of tumultuous English political history. Included in the list are the Jutes and the Celts who opposed the Picts in 449 AD (line 28), and “flowering crown was threatened by “fraud and force”; the onslaughts of Canutus the Danish king of England in 1016-35 (line 31), and that Norman

34 whose victorious hand, With English blood bedews the Land

The daughter recounts the contests for the crown by “Maud and Stephen” in the 1100’s (line 36), and tells the about the time when King Henry II was enthroned. She speaks, furthermore, about the deposing of “Edward” the Second who reigned during 1307-27 (line 39), as well as his eventual murder by his Queen Isabella and her followers. She mentions the murder of King “Richard” the Second (reigned 1377-99) (line 40) by followers of Henry Bolingbroke. She talks of the “red white pricking Roses...” (line 42)-- that War of the Roses (1455 to 1485) between the house of Lancaster (the red rose) and the house of York (the white rose) which was resolved in 1486 when Henry VII married Elizabeth the daughter of Edward IV (1486) and united the two factions (Lancashire).

A listening Queen then responds to her daughter. She affirms the troubles that the daughter mentions, and then adds a few more of her own to this historical list. She mentions the troubles of Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, the future Henry VII (1457-1509) (line 43), and Richard the “Boar” (1452-85) of line 44 (Lancashire).

In response, the daughter reminds her reflective Mum of something her Queen surely knows. England has survived at least 1200 years of political turmoil. By implication, the nation will surely survive this crisis. She then asks,

45 If none of these, dear Mother, what's your woe?

And this is where the second movement of the dialog begins. The daughter begins her side of the conversation, speaking to her Mother about the troubles in the present time with “Spain”, “France”, the “Scots” and “Holland”. The daughter probes a little deeper asking the Queen

50. Whence is this storm, from Earth or Heaven above?

51. Is 't drought, is 't Famine, or is 't Pestilence?

52. Dost feel the smart, or fear the consequence?

53. Your humble Child entreats you shew your grief.

Once again, with distinctive reserve, the Queen guardedly responds to her question. Yet she is still unwilling, even after 56 lines, to offer a total disclosure.

57. I must confess some of those Sores you name

58. My beauteous Body at this present maim,

59. But foreign Foe nor feigned friend I fear,

60. For they have work enough, thou knowest, elsewhere.

Here the Queen acknowledges the past turmoils her daughter references; but to her daughter’s litany of troubles, the Queen adds more of her own stress-causing concerns. In what reads like a conversational circling of the field, the Queen speaks a total of 31 lines (lines

57-86) before she begins to show her vulnerability. Before now she has been very much reticent to freely speak her mind. For whatever reason, the big worries of the past are easier for her to handle at this moment and so she lists: the troubles associated with “Alcie’s son”, “Henry’s Daughter” (line 61), “John” the King of England (1199-1216) (line 63), “Edward” (line 65), “Richard” (line 65), “Lancastrians” (line 66), the French King “Louis” the VIII (1187-1226) (line 64), the “Duke of York” Edmund (line 69), Plantagenet (1341-1402), Earl of March” (line 69), “Spain’s Braving Fleet”(line 73), “France”(line 74), Edward the Third” the King of England (1327-77) (line 75), “Henry the Fifth”, the King of England (1413-22) (line 75). The challenges posed by the countries of Scotland” (line 77), “Holland”(line 79), even “famine and pestilence” (line 83), and “destruction to a land” (line 84). Yet all of these pale in comparison to her very big and present concern.

This time England’s archenemy is not a king, a pestilence, or even a plague. This time the enemy is a Church.ⁱⁱ

In line 87 the Mother hints at a willingness to soon share her preoccupying concern with her daughter, but not yet.

87. But yet I answer not what you demand

88. To shew the grievance of my troubled Land.

She does hint at a future transparency.

89. Before I tell the effect I'll shew the cause,

These causes, says she, are religious. They consist of

90. My sins--the breach of sacred Laws:

91. Idolatry, supplanter of a Nation,

92. With foolish superstitious adoration,

93. Are lik'd and countenanc'd by men of might,

94. The Gospel is trod down and hath no right.

95. Church Offices are sold and bought for gain

With increasing directness, she begins to confide in her daughter that the Roman Catholic Church's Pope is her enemy because

96. That Pope had hope to find *Rome* here again.

In fact, my daughter, he actually speaks the language of Satan!

97. For Oaths and Blasphemies did ever ear

98. From *Beelzebub* himself such language hear?

So this, young daughter, is your Queen's problem.

118. These be the *Hydras* of my stout transgression;

119. These be the bitter fountains, heads, and rootsⁱⁱ

120. Whence flow'd the source, the sprigs, the boughs, and fruits

Tumult is eroding a country that is religiously governed.

125. The Sermons yet upon record do stand

126. That cried destruction to my wicked Land.

127. These Prophets' mouths (all the while) was stopt,

128. Unworthily, some backs whipt, and ears crept;

129. Their reverent cheeks bear the glorious marks

130. Of stinking, stigmatizing Romish Clerks;

It is because of these Romish clerks that

131. Some lost their livings, some in prison pent,

132. Some grossly fined, from friends to exile went:

The Queen states how she saw all of this coming, when she stood as a far off observer as similar tragedies befell “Germany” and “Ireland”. Now,

146. Such cruelty as all reports have past.

147. Mine heart obdurate stood not yet aghast.

148. Now sip I of that cup, and just 't may be

149. The bottom dregs reserved are for me.

The third and final conversational movement then begins with the daughter agreeing that

the Queen could have done more to prevent religious persecutions.

And then it finally happens. After 156 lines in this conversation of indirection, the frustrated daughter finally asks her Mum to speak plainly what is really troubling her.

(Any daughter of any mother living in any age can probably feel the frustrated patience in this daughter's voice.)

156. Pray, in plain terms, what is your present grief?

157. ...let's join heads and hands for your relief.

Now finally, after 157 lines, a once reserved Queen offers a direct answer.

158. Well, to the matter, then. There's grown of late

159. 'Twixt King and Peers a question of state:

160. Which is the chief, the law, or else the King?

The Queen says she wishes to "help the church and stay the commonwealth" (line 165).

She recalls how many "obstacles" have come in her way (line 166). She has been denied uses of

"the militia" to correct the situations (line 178); and Britain's internal wars of cross and crown

caused by "religion and Gospel" (line 194) has shaken her "sacred Zion" (line 195). Now "thousands lay on heaps" (line 187).

187. Here bleeds my woes.

188. I that no wars so many years have known

189. Am now destroy'd and slaughter'd by mine ownⁱⁱ

Seen in Britain's civil war debris are "plundered towns" (line 197) and "house's devastation" (line 197). "Virgins" have been "ravisht" and "young men slain" (line 198).

Those

who are “wealthy” in “trading” have “fallen”, and now there is a “dearth of grain”(line 199).

It is also here after 207 lines of lengthy, prodding patience that the daughter finally speaks directly to her ailing Mum’s present concerns.

208. Dear mother, cease complaints, and wipe your eyes,

209. Shake off your dust, cheer up, and now arise.

The daughter responds to Queen Elizabeth with an offer of an apocalyptic hope (lines 208 ff). She affirms her Mum’s way is the right way, and how that the Queen can surely expect the “blessing” of Divine favor to rest upon her “Nobles” (line 218), “Commons” (line 220), “Counties” (line 222), and “Preachers” (line 224. It is at this point that the daughter uses language in an interesting way.

She makes a poetic use of Biblical texts —texts that originally referenced ancient Jews.ⁱⁱ

Beginning at line 224 New England begins to describe her apocalyptic hope for Old England. She cites a Text from one Biblical historical narrative about Gideon’s leadership of Israel’s tribes against the enemies God (Judges 7:20); and by doing so quickly transforms the

literal use of an historical narrative into a free-standing allegory. This alteration enables her to voice her support and Biblical sanction for those defiant preachers who would rightfully support England's religious cause against Rome.

224. Blest be thy Preachers who cheer thee on

225. Oh, cry: the sword of the Lord and Gideon!

After mentioning that

226. These are the days the Churches foes to crush,

227. To root out Prelates, head, tail, branch, and rush.

She invokes her Queen to

232. ...bring Baal's vestments out, to make a fire.

This Biblical allusion, "Baal's vestments", refers to the religious garb associated with ancient Israel's enemies who were thought by them to be pagan. Under the leadership of Elijah, the worshippers of Ba'al were destroyed by heavenly fire for their audacity to challenge Israel's God of truth (I Kings 18:21ff). Here the Queen's daughter seems to have this scene in mind as she transforms this historical Biblical narrative into allegory. Through this makeover, she implicitly applauds her Queen's divine authority and definite Biblical sanction to rid the

Church of those pagan leaders who so audaciously wear ‘the cloth’ⁱⁱ. These are not the garments

of true Christian ministers. These are “Baal’s vestments”. With a rally cry of ‘apocalypse now!’

she invites her Mum to join her,

232. Let’s make a fire,

235. And let their names consume, but let the flash

236. Light Christendom, and all the world to see.

Why?

237. We hate Rome’s Whore, with all her trumpery.

“Rome’s Whore”? Revelation 17:1-6, a late New Testament text composed by the aged Jewish John the Elder in the late nineties AD, symbolically depicts the persecution of the earliest Believers by those who were not, those best personified not as a True Brideⁱⁱ but as a “Whore”. This “Whore” is Roman. “Rome’s Whore” is the Roman Church. It is here that Bradstreet continues the dubious nature of this allegory by transforming it again into yet another allegory—an allegory, by the way, which has its origins in the Apocalypse. Here her language clearly draws a fluorescent line separating ‘us’ and ‘them’, the Church of England (the Bride) versus the Church of Rome (the “whore”). The apocalyptic destruction of the ‘whore’ must happen. The world must know who is right and who is wrong. It is watching and waiting.

This apocalyptic hope is also possible because, according to the daughter,
England in

some way is the true Israel. England's true "ancestors" are from "ancient Palestine" (Line 269).

They are chosen. They are "Abraham's seed" (line 282)—an allegorical spin on a common

phrase for the historical Jewish nation of Israel (Genesis 26:24; cf. Romans 4:13-18). As

"Abraham's seed" England is divinely favored. She then says,

282. *Abraham's* seed, lift up your heads on high,

283. For sure the day of your redemption's nigh.ⁱⁱ

"...Lift up your heads on high" (line 282) refers to a Psalm celebrating the arrival of the Jewish Messiah at the gates of Jerusalem (Psalm 24); and "the day of your redemption is nigh" (Luke 21:28, refers to what Jewish Christians would have historically regarded as a reference to the return of their Messiah to establish His earthly victorious reign.

This ends up being Bradstreet's political millenarianism in action, and at its best. Through allegory she establishes the favor and vindication of the English church cause is pre-destined. It will happen quite independently of anyone's ability to believe, just like the unbelieving Jewish Saul of long ago (Acts 9:18),

284. The scales shall fall from your long blinded eyes,

In that apocalyptic moment of national triumph, those who question the Queen's way as

the right way will see that the Queen's way is in fact God's way. They are after all one and the

same. Forcibly,

285 And him you shall adore who now despise.

This is, of course, is yet one more allegorized reference to Revelation 19, one more apocalyptic hope based again on one more allegory from the Apocalypse itself. In its original setting, this Biblical text describes the Christian expectation for the eventual and ruling return of the King. Used allegorically, it is transformed into a Biblical sanction for the Queen's right to expect the same for England. In fact, when England triumphs over the Church of Rome, the

286. ...fullness of the Nations in shall flow,ⁱⁱ

At a predetermined time, England the "Jew" (line 287) and Rome, or other religious/political bodies composing the "Gentile" (line 287) shall "to one worship go" (line 287). The religious wars will be over; and,

288. Then follows days of happiness and rest.

289. Whose lot doth fall to live therein is blest.

The Queen and her Church will be vindicated at last.

290. No Canaanite shall then be found 'n th' landⁱⁱ,

291. And holiness on horses' bells shall stand.ⁱⁱ

In light of this pre-destined, Biblically sanctioned political millenarianism, the ailing

daughter's Mum has every reason to be encouraged.

292. If this make way thereto, then sigh no more,

293. But if at all thou didst not see 't before.

294. Farewell, dear mother; Parliament, prevail,

295. And in a while you'll tell another tale.ⁱⁱ

But just how does might one explain the daughter's use of these Bible allegories to build an apocalyptic hope for her Queen? One could say that these are simply poetic uses of Biblical text. Indeed, the dissertation work of Raymond Allen Craig demonstrates how that in American Puritan poetry.

Biblical allusion can occur in the form of extended or limited quotation, paraphrase, and tacit echo; it can be complex literary allusion or simple allusion. The allusion may simply appeal to the authority of the Bible valorizing the text, or it may trigger discursive activity as complex... as those which allude to several scriptural passages in succession and produce inter-textual patterns. (Craig 32)

Yet, there is also another possibility. Bradstreet's use of Biblical texts is more than poetic. These allegories could very well be primary source indicators of hermeneutical practice common to seventeenth century English Protestantism; a way some non-poets and Bible

interpreters established their own literal apocalyptic hope for Old England. To see how Bradstreet allegorizes, and why she does, is to see this poem in a new light.

But apparently, this historical/theological dimension of Biblical allusions is one that has not been emphasized. In fact, little work has been done on the influence of Calvinist dogma upon Bradstreet's poetry.

According to Jane Frances Wolter-Williamson in *Anne Bradstreet's Construction of Predestination Through Poetical Conventions and The Calvinistic Theology*,

Still lacking in the critical work on Bradstreet is the examination of the dogma in her private poems, figurative language in her love poems, and her use of irony to address not just a human audience but to question the predestination in God's order. (Wolter-Williamson 33)

Wolter-Williamson would also say that Bradstreet's poetry illustrates her doctrines. Her doctrines "act as a catalyst for poetic creativity"; and the doctrines themselves "become poetic elements and not merely subject matter." These theological allusions also "appear at pivotal points in the poems to offer a reprieve from the unrest the poet feels" by providing a "a sense

of order to the poet's world" (Wolter-Williamson 52).ⁱⁱ

In addition to things, both theological and hermeneutical, the role of the apocalyptic in

Puritan historiography has also been neglected. According to J.F. Maclear,

In all that has been written about the settlement of New England one curious omission stands out: historians have not yet given adequate weight to the Puritan scheme of Apocalyptic history and its impact on early New England thought and institutions. (Maclear 259)

There seems, then, to be a need for examining Bradstreet's Biblical allusions in light of

some English Protestant hermeneutics which underpin her Calvinistic dogma, and especially

those hermeneutics which sponsor her apocalyptic hope for her Mother Country in

Dialogue.

The Apocalypticism of Ann Bradstreet. Bradstreet makes some startling apocalyptic and

inflammatory statements; and she does so by invoking the authority of the Holy Scriptures in

some way. With Biblical verity and sanction, Bradstreet affirms the Church of England as the

pre-determined winner in the civil/theological strife (line 226). This is because God's

favor rests

on England, and THEY are the chosen people. They are actually “Abrahams Seed” (line 282).

Consequently, she heralds her personal hatred for “Rome’s Whore” (Line 237).
Once
again, those who are not with the Queen are obviously against her. These enemies have
only
their own total destruction to anticipate; for there is coming a time when “No Canaanite
will be
found in the land” (line 290); and the Pope and Roman Catholic Church shall burn:
“Bring
Baal’s Vestments and make a fire” (Line 232). On that one pre-ordained day everyone’s
eyes
will be open to the truth: “The scales will fall off your long blinded eyes” (line 284); and
with
force they will recognize the true church and “adore him whom you now despise” (line
285).

But how could Bradstreet-- a respected poet, a loving mother, wife, and Christian
woman
of her times—voice such searing sentiments? This is after all a woman who writes letters
to
“My Dear Children”, loving poetry to her husband, and epitaphs of endearment for her
mother

and father. How could she say such things? Perhaps her words are not just her own but reflect the thought processes of her day.

Interestingly, Bradstreet crafts her venom-filled verse by using certain thought processes. She selects specific canonized Christian texts from Jewish historical and mostly apocalyptic contexts. She then transforms their often dubious interpretations into allegories which clearly communicate her nationalistic and apocalyptic hopes for Mother England. She fills these linguistic containers with her own meanings. Israel, the “Seed of Abraham” gets transformed into the Church of England; and “Rome’s Whore” becomes the archenemy, the Roman Catholic Church. This is the way Bradstreet builds her poetic allegories.

This transformative phenomenon is incredibly fascinating to me, and raises these questions particularly.

What if these descriptions are more than just allegories in a poem? What if they reflect a common thinking process of some in 17th century England? In what ways might the English Church be considered a new Israel? Is Bradstreet’s description of the Roman Catholic Church as

“Rome’s Whore” a common description for her day; and if so what is the historical background

for these identifications? Who are some of the thinkers that might shed light on Bradstreet’s

religious war and warriors: Israel/England, “Rome’s Whore”/English Church?

So just how could Bradstreet voice such vitriol?

Suggested Contexts for Bradstreet’s Poem. Generally speaking, according to Ahiu

Zakai after the 16th century, “Protestants turned increasingly to history, to the study of past

events and the interpretation of their significance, in order to find meaning for the Reformation

in sacred providential history” (Zakai 300) The historical, apocalyptic tradition “became important” especially from “the time of Queen Elizabeth’s accession to the throne in 1558

through Puritan Revolution of the seventeenth century” (Zakai 301)

Some scientists like Thomas Burke, author of *Sacred Theory of the Earth* (1684; 1689),

and other Bible commentators “believed that the struggles against domination and power of

Rome were foretold in Scripture” (Jacob and Lockwood 266). During the 17th century English

Protestants felt “increasingly threatened” by “the possibility of Catholic domination”.

These

fears were further heightened by “the Popish plot, the prospect of James’ kingship, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the militancy of the French King Louis XIV.”

There were

many in the English church who “abhorred any opposition to legally constituted authority, but

who on the other hand saw the position and power of the established church seriously threatened” (Jacob and Lockwood, 266).ⁱⁱ

It is against this general historical background that Bradstreet calls the English Church a

divinely chosen race, “the seed of Abraham”ⁱⁱ. These words are uttered in an age when a thinker

like John Foxe (1516-1587), invented the five periods of sacred historyⁱⁱ; and in writing *Acts and*

Monuments, he demonstrated

to the English readers that theirs was a *chosen nation* (italics mine)

that received the pure faith during the time of the apostles, that had struggled to

preserve it undefiled against Rome and the papacy, and that finally

initiated the

Protestant Reformation (Zakai 310)

John Bale and Thomas Brightman also see the English Church, then, as a distinct people.

These men were “leading exponents of Protestant apocalyptic tradition in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.” They applied a Protestant concept of human history to

the English church. Claiming “that pure apostolic Christianity had been transferred intact to

England well before the intrusion of the Church of Rome” (Zakai 306).

They believed that their sophisticated interpretation of English history,... implied that it was the Church of England that was founded upon apostolic origins, and that Rome was

the harmful usurper. (Zakai 306)ⁱⁱ

It is easy to understand, then, how the daughter in her *Dialogue* could affirm the Church of England as the “seed of Abraham”; and how the Mum here could describe her kingdom as a “sacred Zion.”ⁱⁱⁱ Hyper-dispensationalism and historiography would have both

allowed and endorsed these sentiments.ⁱⁱ

But what about the daughter’s reference in *Dialogue* to “Rome’s Whore”? This phrase is actually used by John Bale (1495-1563) in his *Image of Both Churches*. He describes the “true Christian Church” as “...the meek spouse of the Lamb without spot.” He calls “...the proud

church of hypocrites, the *rose colored whore* (italics mine), the paramour of antichrist, and the sinful synagogue of Satan” (Bale 251).

Again, this kind of deprecatory allusion also appears in print in a frontispiece engraving to a work that was published in the year of Oliver Cromwell’s death (1658). The picture portrays Cromwell as a worthy, heroic successor to kings.

Clad in military armor representing his great victories in the civil wars at home and against foreign powers. Under his feet he treads the Whore of Babylon (a figure for the Roman Church) and the dragon of Error.

...Above all is a symbol for God with ribbon banners promising his continuing protection to Cromwell. It is a fitting substitute for the *Eikon Basilike* image of Charles as sacred king (Norton Online)

These very few examples potently showcase Bradstreet as a poet and thinker of her times. This initial, though not final investigation, demonstrates how Bradstreet’s poetic uses of Biblical allusions—once understood quite literally though dubiously by ancient conservative Jews—were transformed into allegorical allusions which ultimately endorsed her distinct British

nationalism. This paper generally explains how these allegories framed her literal, nationalistic, and apocalyptic expectations for Bradstreet's Old England.

Implications of Bradstreet's Poem. There are also some implications. If Bradstreet's *Dialogue Between Old and New England* serves as some of the earliest evidences for the use of English Protestant hermeneutics to establish a literal, political millenarian, apocalyptic hope for the church of her Old England; and if this poem is one of the earliest bridges connecting the old world to the new world in ideological ways, then there are some questions which might be asked.ⁱⁱ The answers to these questions have important implications for our day.

Questions for Further Research:

- 1.) In what ways might Bradstreet's *Dialogue* serve as a bridge that bore English Protestantism's ideas and brands of apocalypticism, or notions of America's Divine election and *Manifest Destiny* to the early American Colonies? Before America ever became the United States, she was first an English Colony.

2.) In what ways and places do these inherited ideologies and epistemologies appear today? How might Old England hermeneutics still affect the way Stateside churches and the Nation think about themselves? Others?

Marginal Discourse and Spatial Boundaries in Margaret Cavendish's *The Convent of Pleasure*

“The infinitely rapid oscillation between the performative and the constative,ⁱⁱ between language and metalanguage, fiction and nonfiction, autoreference and heteroreference, and so on, does not just produce an essential instability. This instability constitutes that very event—let us say, the work [*l'oeuvre*]ⁱ—whose invention normally disturbs, as it were, the norms, the statutes, and the rules”ⁱⁱ

**Karen Foster
Dickinson State University**

In Margaret Cavendish's *The Convent of Pleasure*, Lady Happy in an attempt to protect herself from the onslaught of male suitors utilizes her father's inheritance to transform her home into a convent for herself and twenty other females. This self-contained sealed enclosure, one that no man can enter but one in which all matter of pleasures are allowed, however not pleasures of the heterosexual nature, is seemingly one that cannot be breached except by a Trojan horse—a Prince who disguises himself as a Princess. However, this stoned, walled structure is little more than a linguistically enclosed paper construct created by Cavendish's fancy, an idealistic manifestation of feminine solitude created in her brain, where Cavendish lived. But in *The Convent of Pleasure*, there is that moment of a kiss between the Princess/Prince and Lady Happy, a homoerotic act made plausible, basically because at that point in the play who or what (character) is male or female lacks significance, for both the reader and the spectator of this production, for only the fortune-hungry characters of Lord TakePleasure, Courtly, Advisor, and Facil circling the convent are to be considered male.ⁱⁱ But when the kiss occurs, the spectator or reader might suspect that something is up, some slippage, some trace,ⁱⁱ the spectator especially when viewing in the feminized male the Adam's apple shaded precariously on the porcelain skin of the Princess—or is it a female pretending to

be a male and then assuming on stage a woman's appearance, but when disrobing she who became a he and then a she for a time only dis-layers down to the male? Some diametrically opposed other has inserted itself on the stage, has slipped through the psychic cracks so to speak: the other of the self, of the dramatist Cavendish, exists fragmentally on the stage, peeking through the shades of characters.ⁱⁱ

However, if we take the play's characters and their actions at face value, we must assume as Erin Lang Bonin, quoting Irigaray, states in "Margaret Cavendish's Dramatic Utopias and the Politics of Gender," in this utopian drama, the women have ""refused to go to 'market'""ⁱⁱ. But then I question whether we should be discussing solely markets of the flesh as were marriageable women of substance then and now or Cavendish's idealization of her gendered other, for as in some of her other plays, such as *The Presence*,ⁱⁱ Cavendish often dramatizes, albeit satirically, her "fanciful" rendition of her reality. *Fancy* is being defined as that discursive process of the mind that begins with desire and develops without impediments—spontaneously—and in that connection of imagination with reason, or wit, new forms occur with the resultant imaginative constructs taking precedence. But do not we do no other but that, at least in part, when examining an author's creative works? Do we not at times, as I am doing now, re-dramatize almost to the point of absurdity those glimpses of an author's reality, and thus possibly our own limited psychic connections? Cavendish is writing in her own language, as Jacques Derrida would say in *Psyche: Inventions of the Other*, Volume I, but introducing a condition in our language.ⁱⁱ In the construction of artificial, imaginary beings, Cavendish projects a version of her self, according to Derrida, the shell of a somewhat inaccessible kernel: "by way of its semantic structure, the concept of the

messenger is a symbol insofar as it makes allusion to the unknowable by means of an unknown, while only the relation of the terms is given”.ⁱⁱ If we can assume that the Princess/Prince and Lady Happy and their actions are messengers from the brain of Cavendish, then perhaps we can view the interiority of her mind. Only later, after this act, does the action reveal that this kiss becomes what was considered then normalized or known, an act of heteronormativity placed into the established social constructs of the time; however, that titillation, that awe, of that lesbian sexual tease continues to reverberate.

That kiss between the Princess and Lady Happy predicates sexual fusion, for in the dialogue prior to the kiss, word uses play upon meanings and thus act as linguistic hinges into the psyche. Prior to the kiss, in response to Lady Happy’s statement regarding her reluctance to please herself, “How can harmless Lovers please themselves?”ⁱⁱ the Princess/Prince urges, “Why very well, as, to discourse, imbrace [sic] and kiss, so mingle souls together.”ⁱⁱ Perhaps more than just idling away the time exchanging dialogue, as in *to discourse*, *dis-*meaning split in two while *discourse* also means coming to conclusion,ⁱⁱ Lady Happy uses the infinitive phrase “to please oneself” in a passive sense—as a reactor to self-stimuli—to obtain pleasure within the fortified enclosure of the self-imposed grateless convent.ⁱⁱ However, that verb phrase moves from autoerotic passivity to a willful act between two, perhaps split individuals, the merging of the *dis-* when modified in the next line by the Princess/Prince. For Cavendish and thus for Lady Happy, that mingling of souls’ imagery of the Princess/Prince is one of the components of the triad of Cavendish’s successful marriage to her Lord William Cavendish: “my Lords [sic] the Masculine, mine the Feminine Wit, which is no small

glory to me, that we are Married, Souls, Bodies, and Brains, which is a treble marriage, united in one Love, which I hope is not in the power of Death to dissolve; for Souls may love, and Wit may live though Bodies dye.”ⁱⁱ

The Prince, feminized through dress into a Princess—exteriority—is an interloper and at the same time a psychic manifestation of Cavendish’s interiority. Of course, when Lady Happy states, “But innocent Lovers do not use to kiss,”ⁱⁱ the Princess/Prince’s next line plays upon the word *innocent* and mocks Lady Happy’s nativity: “Not any act more frequent amongst us Women-kind; nay, it were a sin in friendship, should not we kiss: then let us not prove our selves Reprobates”.ⁱⁱ Innocent women kiss in friendship; if they do not, the Princess/Prince argues that omitted act is a sin; therefore, the Princess/Prince urges that they not act as ones lost in sin. In addition to the fact that Cavendish using her wit sets up that linguistic transfer in order to move the action forward, that transfer also reveals Cavendish’s desire.

When the fox is revealed to be in the hen house, when the Princess is revealed as a Prince, Lady Happy becomes silent or silenced, as has been noted by Erin Lang Bonin, supposedly acceptable behavior of a female either preliminarily or legally bound to a male. Bonin also states that silence is “directly related to her [Cavendish’s] views of nature,”ⁱⁱ an argument espoused by Lady Happy before the kiss: “No, no, Nature is Nature, and still will be / The same she was from all Eternity.”ⁱⁱⁱ That idea of nature’s primacy in male/female and female/female relationships Cavendish publically, verbally obeyed, even though her dress and actions at times belied the verbal face. She demurred in public writing to her husband’s physical presence and his intellectual influence in an attempt to clarify which writing can be said to be hers and which his, for her earlier

writing—her poems and philosophical tracks—were often subjected to questions of authorship: “My Lord was pleased to illustrate my Playes with some Scenes of his own Wit, to which I have set his name, that my Readers may know which are his, as not to couzen them, in thinking they are mine.”ⁱⁱ

Cavendish’s dress often displayed sexual dimorphism, splitting her in two horizontally. Publically Cavendish wore at times costumes that suggested masculinity submerging femininity: the top half, a knee-length *juste-au-corps*, that a contemporary of Cavendish, John Evelyn, who along with Samuel Pepys became noted for detailed memoirs, recorded that he “took her for ‘a cavalier, but that she had no beard’”;ⁱⁱ however, her gown under the cavalier hat and knee-length *juste-au-corps* that she commonly wore had eight feet of train born by “six waiting-women who attended on her.”ⁱⁱⁱ Not only did Cavendish’s dress display that gender ambivalence, her behavior/*gestus* (Brechtian) helped to construct this woman: “In place of a lady’s curtsies, she honored the company by making formal ‘legs and bows to the ground with her hand and head.’”ⁱⁱⁱ Note also during the times that women of substance often designed their own clothes, then ordered them assembled.

But as James Fitzmaurice might agree, her dress could be a mask, a means by which Cavendish sought to deflect criticism. In “Fancy and the Family: Self-Characterizations of Margaret Cavendish,” James Fitzmaurice undermines Cavendish’s public assertions of her behavior and states that Cavendish constructed herself in such a way as to depose and divert criticism of her self: “she intended to be understood as a harmless eccentric so that she could protect herself from criticism. If she appeared to suffer from mental disturbances, then she could scarcely be attached for the publication

of what she wrote: and it was the printing of her work rather than the writing of it that was at issue [to Cavendish].ⁱⁱ In order to protect her fanciful creations, thus her mind, her choice was to appear ludicrous in dress and in speech.

Fitzmaurice uses as one of his examples Cavendish's statements regarding her predisposition towards solitude.ⁱⁱ Fitzmaurice points out that Cavendish actually was more sociable than she publically posits: "However, she pictured herself as more reclusive than she actually was in order to reinforce the characterization she was forming for herself as melancholic,"ⁱⁱ melancholy being a depressive disorder characteristic of those in a certain social class. In fact, Cavendish courted melancholy in order to justify her periodic solitude.ⁱⁱ In actually as Fitzmaurice points out, she spent a great deal of time in the company of woman—dinner parties, churches—as she stated in *Sociable Letters*.ⁱⁱ However, I question how much was Cavendish in public and how much was Cavendish displaying a self in public. One interesting note Fitzmaurice inserts is that Lord Denny, a contemporary of Cavendish, calls her a "a hermaphrodite in show, in deed a monster"ⁱⁱ; that designation almost corresponds to the negative characteristics of melancholy that Kate Whitaker states in *Mad Madge*: "Greedy, miserly, selfish, proud, jealous, hostile, misanthropic, rude—her enemies would late accuse Margaret of all these melancholic attributes."ⁱⁱⁱ Denny's "in deed" suggests in action, in show, not an emphasis on factuality. But do the desires of this self-constructed woman, this woman of contradictions, emerge through her writings? However, Whitaker also points out that Queen Christina of Sweden, whose dress and behavior in 1655 influenced Cavendish, for Christina adopted male styles of dress and behavior. Christina went as far as to wear "men's shoes and stockings, a soldier's periwig and neck-scarf . . . [and] a black velvet

cap, which she doffed in courtesy like a man.”ⁱⁱ Further, at approximately the same time as Christina of Sweden’s influence on Cavendish, to hearken back to the Princess title, as in Princess/Prince character in *The Convent of Pleasure*, William Cavendish published his book on horsemanship. Sir Edward Walker told William that William could take the title of prince and thus present a more aristocratic appearance: William Cavendish did insert the title of prince on his 1658 publication; more significantly, however, for the purposes of this discussion, prior to William Cavendish’s publication, Margaret Cavendish titled herself “the thrice noble, illustrious and excellent Princess, the Lady Marchioness of Newcastle.”ⁱⁱ

Roberta C. Martin in “‘Beauteous Wonder of a Different Kind’: Aphra Behn’s Destabilization of Sexual Categories” applies Randolph Trumbach’s understanding of sexes during the early eighteenth century in discussing the Behn’s libertine associations: “there were two genders—male and female—but three biological sexes—man, woman, and hermaphrodite.”ⁱⁱ Martin asserts that in the seventeenth century, that there were those who experimented with gender, especially those such as Behn who advocated libertine thinking: “In fiction, poetry, plays—and perhaps in real life—these individuals created subject positions that were neither male nor female, but instead were based on ‘sliding’ or transitional experiences of gender and sexuality.”ⁱⁱ According to Martin, hermaphrodites, as Trumbach points out, sex with the same sex could occur up until the point of penetration. The point of penetration was then an illegal act, except for women: “Any sexual relations between women in England were, if not exactly legal, then not illegal; such women may have been stigmatized and marginalized, but not until the eighteenth century were they assigned to a third, illegitimate, gender.”ⁱⁱ During Behn’s

time and thus Cavendish's time, as Martin points out, "desiring both genders"ⁱⁱⁱ was considered possible for both genders, and no one lost masculinity or femininity designation.ⁱⁱ Only male to male penetration and female to female penetration resulted in the public designation of hermaphrodite.ⁱⁱ

But back to Lady Happy's silence after the sexual fusion with the Princess/Prince, either imposed or deposed, there is the problem of the emendations, noted in Anne Shaver's edition of *The Convent of Pleasure and Other Plays*, even though there is still debate regarding what was composed by William Cavendish and what was not. After the Maypole scene that follows the kiss and the dance, the rest of the play appears to have been written by William Cavendish, so thus Lady Happy's demise into silence could be, and more than likely is, the imposed psychic dominance of Cavendish's utopian world: her fancy put on the page/stage has been breached; her imposed constructed solitude, exposed. According to Shaver's note, "since no terminus is given, it seems that he [William Cavendish] is the author of the final two scenes and the epilogue."ⁱⁱ As if to emphasize the breach, that repositioning of Margaret into her imposed gendered position that of subordinate writer, William Cavendish, husband, writes the last scenes in the play; in those scenes, he eliminates the progression of action towards gender fusion and brings the ending into heteronormativity. Prior to William Cavendish's insertion of material that reveals the Princess is a Prince, we do have solely the description of the Princess as "a Princely brave Woman truly, of a Masculine Presence"ⁱⁱⁱ and the comedic scene of the Lord Take-Pleasure, Courtly, Adviser, and Facil discussing donning female garb in order to breach the convent. Up until William Cavendish's material insertions, there is a

possibility that Margaret Cavendish did not design the play to end with the Princess being discovered as a Prince.

Notice also that in the final act, even the stage directions reposition the imaginary characters into their respective gendered positions: In what has been suggested to be written by William, when Madam Mediator rushes in “*wringing her hands, and spreading her arms; and full of Passion, cries out*”ⁱⁱ the women in the Convent “*all skip from each other, as afraid of each other.*”ⁱⁱⁱ Both the Prince and William are foxes in this hen house. After the phallic May Pole celebration written by Margaret Cavendish, this idea of male presence at the end, at the climax, presumably created by William Cavendish, exhibits the fear of a male, fear of masculine behaviors, unwanted intrusion of a seemingly pre-structured logical order, Jeffrey Masten asserts in “Material Cavendish: Paper, Performance, ‘Sociable Virginitie’” that these emendations, instead of correcting an error as in other manuscripts during this time, supplement the manuscript.ⁱⁱ Masten further asserts that Cavendish may be anticipating her husband’s desire or denote “William’s desires in denoting his textual property.”ⁱⁱⁱ However, that designation of what language was William’s and what was hers does more than point to what language was William’s. Those emendations delineates exactly what was hers, although it should be noted that wifely or female suggestions regarding the creation of a manuscript or the altering of language would not during that time be emended in manuscripts produced by husbands of those same women.

Immediately after the kiss and the embrace, the Princess/Prince states, “These my Imbraces though of Femal kind, / May be as fervent as a Masculine mind.”ⁱⁱ Then follows these stage directions that lead to a courtly scene, another layering device of Margaret

Cavendish's, the shepherdess Lady Happy being courted by shepherds: "*The Scene is open'd and the PRINCESS and L. HAPPY go in. A Pastoral within the Scene. The Scene is changed into a Green, or Plain, where Sheep are feeding, and a MAY-POLE in the middle.*"ⁱⁱ I cannot help but imagine that opening of a scene within a scene into a pastoral, the folding back of the curtain to reveal a Maypole, such as phallic symbol, as the ideal sexual flowering, that preliminary sexual contact that leads to sexual fulfillment, a pre-release of societal constraints that leads to acceptance of one's gendered other: a psychic penetration of the literary kind.

In the May-Pole scene, courting Lady Happy is not one shepherd but three; each of the first two shepherds request that Lady Happy be his wife: to both requests Lady Happy refuses. Of course this mock scene could be said to be only there only to mimic courting scenes and may in fact refer back to both Queen Elizabeth's and Sweden's Queen Christina's refusals to marry, for as Madam Mediator states, "My Daughter vows a single life, / And swears, she n're will be a Wife."ⁱⁱ When the Princess/ Prince dressed as a shepherd enters, instead of requesting her hand, she/he praises Lady Happy's intellectuality. According to the Princess/Prince—a speech in which Margaret Cavendish the writer praises Cavendish's representation of herself as Lady Happy and Cavendish's other, the Princess—Lady Happy understands all that occurs in heaven, on earth, and below, "there [in the center of the Earth you] observe to know, / What makes the Minerals grow; How Vegetables sprout"ⁱⁱ to the extent that the Princess/Prince that Lady Happy is in a contest with nature to "reveal /w What Nature would conceal."ⁱⁱ So the lady doth protest too much: Lady Happy acknowledges Nature's primacy before the kiss; but she is observed after the kiss as someone whose wit challenges Nature's presumed order.

Instead of becoming a “votress” [sic] to nature as stated by Lord TakePleasure to nature, she challenges nature. Lady Happy, at the end of her response to the Princess/Prince’s monologue about Lady Happy’s wit, states that souls dwell in bodies and the mind dwells in the brain and there in the mind/brain is the soul that will not die but live in the memory: that dwelling in memory reverberates Cavendish’s desire for fame and her statement regarding marriage to William: “for Souls may love, and Wit may live though Bodies dye.”ⁱⁱ

There is a suggestion in *The Convent of Pleasure* that male discourse disrupts any form of pleasure: “Words [from men],” according to Lady Happy, “vanish as soon as spoken,”ⁱⁱ that their vows/prayers “rather flow out of their mouth, then spring from their heart, like rain-water that runs thorow [sic] Gutters, or like Water that’s forced up a Hill by Artificial Pipes and Cisterns.”ⁱⁱ In response to Madam Mediator’s question regarding Men’s conversation as pleasurable, Lady Happy states that “Men are the only troublers of Women; for they only cross and oppose their sweet delights, and peaceable life.”ⁱⁱ Whether or not Lady Happy’s utterances reflect Margaret and William’s relationship can not truly be deduced for she often praised his verbal and written ability, although it should be noted such praise often tends to keep those overbearing at bay. Whitaker states in *Mad Madge to The World’s Olio*, “debates on the relative merits of men and women”ⁱⁱ were “fashionable, courtly conversation.”ⁱⁱ Margaret Cavendish published her debates with William, saying that women talked too much because of “their sense of inferiority”ⁱⁱ to which William responded that “women talk because they cannot hold their tongues.”ⁱⁱ

ii

Margaret Cavendish's brain is the place where she lives: "My brain the Stage, my thoughts were acted there."ⁱⁱ However, Cavendish's physical reality mirrored her retreat into her mind with its gray walls, similar to Lady Happy's retreat into the convent. Often a recluse in her room, where she would only take "'two or three turns'" around in a day for exercise, Margaret purposely isolated herself from public scrutiny and censure. According to Whitaker, Margaret knew that "her constant, sedentary occupation in writing, 'living too much . . . retired' with little exercise or fresh air, was bad for her health"ⁱⁱⁱ; however, Cavendish desired that life more than she feared death.ⁱⁱ

The construction of the mind depends not only upon acquisition of language, physical restraints, and images imprinted but also upon the construction of the spaces within which one operates; however, for Cavendish, and perhaps for most of us, these spatial constructs depend upon perception. Margaret Cavendish roamed her mind's corridors and niches observing, documenting, dissecting, delighting in the images she created. Along with some of her other plays, the characters in the *The Convent of Pleasure* serves as an external manifestation of Cavendish's bi-or tri-furcated self, if one takes into consideration that in addition to the Princess and Lady Happy Madam Mediator's behavior may also reflect Cavendish's multiple selves that she developed in her mind, that safe place for many woman; but for Cavendish in the age in which her words in print were continuously being assaulted or subjected to ridicule, that safe place in which she worked out her thoughts without impediments.

“ ‘Huge Porches to Small Hovels’: Proportion in National Histories and Women’s History”

**Judith Dorn
St. Cloud State University**

The Dedication to Lord Clarendon’s *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England* metaphorically places Queen Anne, its addressee, in a lofty position from whence she may survey the previous era’s turbulent events, which the narrative lays out before her: “By degrees your majesty is brought, in the course of this History, as it were to the top of some exalted height, from whence you may behold all the errors and misfortunes of the time past with advantage to yourself; ...” (1st edition, vol. III). In reflecting the early modern tradition that the historian serves as a “faithful counsellor” (vol. II) to the monarch by supplying past scenarios as moral-philosophical examples and explanatory precedents casting light on present situations (Jardine and Grafton), this Dedication implicitly extends the History’s benefits to a wider audience of readers. Hence neoclassical emphasis on the proportionateness of historical narration. Since contemporaries understood texts as shaping the perception of readers through their senses, the method and order of narratives would be important in shaping readers’ reception of historical significance.

I have taken the expression “Huge porches to small hovels” from John Oldmixon’s *Critical History of England* (1724) to illustrate the application of neoclassical decorum to national histories. Oldmixon used this architectural image of disproportion to judge the writers who accidentally dwarf the story of a nation by prefacing it with the general history of the world: “Several Authors have begun the

particular Histories of their own Countries with the General History of the World; and this, when it is clear as well as concise, is of good Use, and connects the Particular History with the General; otherwise 'tis like a huge Porch to a small Hovel” (I:10).

Neoclassical philosophy of history idealized the achievement of written narrative that materially signified the events of the past with such transparency and judgment that it conveyed moral significance and truth at one and the same time. Narrative proportions ought to convey the “real” significance of their contents, including on the level of the sentence-by-sentence movement of the representation.

Oldmixon’s title, “The Critical History,” announces the challenge he is issuing to the authority claimed by the wave of national histories that appeared after William Temple’s lament that England’s honor suffered by lacking a general history like those written for France, Spain, and the Empire (Levine 293). Most of the national histories that appeared from just before 1700 through the next three decades, among those written by James Tyrrell, Lord Clarendon, White Kennett, Laurence Echard, John Oldmixon himself, and Rapin de Thoyras, appeared in monumental folio volumes designed to impress the significance of their material on readers and to open the vast survey of the past to their gaze.

To those with an interest in the works of women writers, the monumental national histories raise the question of how women positioned themselves in relation to neoclassical standards. A narrative’s architecture would be expected to reflect women’s proportionate significance—or rather, insignificance--through allocation of space. If, moreover, a narrative celebrating the nation should deal out justice and not reward breaches in the way things ought to be, then women’s actual interventions in history

might even be justifiably left out. Joan de Jean has reviewed in *Tender Geographies* the extent to which seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French writers sought to erase from recollection the leadership roles taken by noblewomen in the Fronde, the rebellion against Louis XIV's regents, as an unacceptable and never to be emulated turn of events in the king's reign (41, 69). What tactics, then, did women writers adopt in publishing their own accounts of the national past?

My approach to answering that question includes attending to the contemporary understanding of narrative as guiding perception materially, and therefore to the understanding of narratives as models of the mind. That is, in the reading process, readers would see playing out in the pages before them the contending forces of faculty psychology as provided by the writers. I will focus on narratives by Aphra Behn and Delarivier Manley in order to look at one writer—Behn—predating the march of impressive neoclassical histories into the English book trade, and one who clearly engaged contemporary culture during the period when the national histories made their appearance: Manley. Both writers showed awareness of neoclassical culture in providing examples of imaginative domains created by women's narratives. What becomes evident is that Behn and Manley reflect pervasive contemporary assumptions about faculty psychology, and in doing so suggest that women should no longer be asymmetrically associated with the passions rather than the reason and the will. In order to sum up their approaches, we could call Ovidian and Machiavellian the strategies with which, like French women writers before them, they inculcated skepticism regarding the very representational principle of narrative on which neoclassical historiography was based. "Ovidian" refers to the argument that the power of love intervenes in the course of

history, while the recognition of the pervasiveness of dissimulation and stratagem in shaping events would be “Machiavellian.”

To understand the agency of this period’s contentious writings more precisely, let us consider the extent to which these perceptual spaces marked out by narratives would have been understood as modeled on the faculties of the mind. Post Aristotle, the human mind could be understood via the contending forces of reason and the passions, with the will mediating between them (James, chapter 2). Hobbes famously considered the will merely whichever appetite or passion had arrived last. Sir Francis Bacon had divided knowledge according to the faculties—with memory carried out as history, the imagination yielding the many dimensions of poetry, and great many sciences and forms of philosophy extending the reach of reason. In his view, the imagination stood between the will and reason (Zagorin). But it is worth noting that Bacon, as a major seventeenth-century contributor to philosophy of history, understood each of these faculties as to some extent blending the reason, passions, and will: “The human understanding is no dry light, but receives an infusion from the will and affections; whence proceed sciences which may be called ‘sciences as one would wish’ for what a man had rather were true he readily believes” (*New Organon*, quoted as epigraph in Zagorin). Despite Bacon’s and Hobbes’s depiction of the bias of appetite in human perception, habits of associating women disproportionately with the passions were widespread in the world of letters, with men seen as exerting reason and will to govern their own passions, and so suited for governing impassioned women as well (James 8).

The vast prospect provided to the gaze of readers by historical narratives allowed the interplay of the faculties, embodied in human agents in history, to act on the nation’s

stage. So it was that history became a university subject useful for acquiring moral understanding and political acumen, since young humanists would learn from history to understand the motives that activated men and the scenarios likely to play out in political situations as they became diplomats and statesmen (Sharpe).

Neoclassical principles guided the effectiveness of history's representational language (Hicks). The English translation of Rene Rapin's *Discours sur l'histoire* (1680), a work cited as an authority by even the francophobe John Oldmixon, calls for a style of history writing that achieves "a constant Contexture of sound Sence"(7), which renders the phrase "Ecrire sensement" (234). The expression conveys the principle that historical writing ought to employ words to achieve a transparent view of the material things represented in a linear narration that does not digress and that conveys the causes of events. Form and style ought to embody material content in proportion to its significance.ⁱⁱ Rapin denounces "rhetoric", called in English "Elegance void of things"(13). The narration furthermore maintains its elevated character, and the virtues it inculcates in readers, by excluding from its style "any thing that is improper, far-fetch'd, harsh, mean, over-daring, or obscure" (12). Events have a character; therefore, the ignoble detail cannot be granted historical significance in a narrative. To err in structuring and styling a historical narrative would reflect the problematic mental faculties of the historian, and would presumably distort the perception of a reader whose knowledge and reason were not fully kept in hand. The disproportion would homologously injure the nation's self-representation.

Focusing attention on the faculties of the mind changes the reading of historical narratives. First, it becomes evident that writers of history around the year 1700 assumed

Aristotle's standards for analyzing moral philosophy and employed the model in representing and evaluating historical characters. Secondly, when we consider how readers were supposed to take in the lessons of history through their perceptual encounter with the display of actions upon the scene, which struck the senses for hours at a time through narration, we recognize another way of looking at the national narrative. Not only did the metaphor of the nation as one whole psychology, and so reacting that way, come naturally to readers attuned to analogy (compare *Leviathan's* key image of the nation as one body), but a historical narration would then be occupying the space of a mind—certainly at least the memory, but with implications for the reason and will.

One monumental history that illustrates this modeling of mental faculties is the neoclassical, Thucydidean history of England's great rebellion by Lord Clarendon, "begun in the year 1641" and published posthumously beginning in 1702. What is remarkable, from the point of view of surveying a narrative as a sort of panoply of the nation's psychology, is that Clarendon frequently slips into treating the English nation as a single mind even though his explicit purpose at the outset of the narration is to argue precisely that the outbreak of civil war arose from the wickedness of a few individuals. His opening sentence insists that the rebellion did not come from "universal apostasy", and his chapters describe the actions of individuals with at times novelistic vividness. Here is Clarendon's weighty explanation of his purpose, at the beginning:

That posterity may not be deceived, by the prosperous wickedness of these times, into an opinion, that less than a general combination, and universal apostasy in the whole nation from their religion and allegiance, could, in so short a time, have produced such a total and prodigious alteration and

confusion over the whole kingdom; and so the memory of those few, who, out of duty and conscience, have opposed and resisted that torrent, which hath overwhelmed them, may lose the recompense due to their virtue; ...

He proceeds to provide a vision of events rich in complexity that examines the influence of specific persons on events through how they interacted with others. But Clarendon often slips into treating the nation as one sinful self:

And the venom of that season increased and got vigour, until, from one license to another, it proceeded till the nation was corrupted to that monstrous degree, that it grew satiated, and weary of the government itself; under which it had enjoyed a greater measure of felicity, than any nation was ever possessed of; and which could never be continued to them, but under the same. (Clarendon I: 57)

Once we recognize that the domain constructed by the narrative metaphorically functions as like the mind of the nation, we notice that this theatrical space is occupied by forces that contend with one another in the roles of will, reason, and passion. The narrator's governing voice functions as a will, but Clarendon can only observe the passions disrupting the state in the person of the Duke of Buckingham, George Villiers:

And yet all these provocations, and many other, almost of as large an extent, produced no other resentment, than the petition of right, (of no prejudice to the crown,) which was likewise purchased at the price of five more subsidies, and, in a very short time after that supply granted, that parliament was likewise, with strange circumstances of passion on all sides, dissolved.

The abrupt and ungracious breaking of the first two parliaments was wholly imputed to the duke of Buckingham. (I:7)

Clarendon's narrative explains the dissolution of parliament as caused by the workings of passion, specifically the passions of the duke of Buckingham, whose exploits in trying to force prince Charles's marriage to the Spanish Infanta, and in his rivalry with Bristol, had rocked parliament. In his magisterial tone, Clarendon goes on to wish that some voice of reason had curbed the duke's passions, given free rein as they had been by the overindulgence of King James I, who had bestowed a series of honors on Villiers on the basis of his own affection rather than its object's merit:

His single misfortune was, (which indeed was productive of many greater,) that he never made a noble and a worthy friendship with a man so near his equal, that he would frankly advise him for his honour and true interest, against the current, or rather the torrent, of his impetuous passions; ... (I:47)

Clarendon's own narrative functions as an act of will and judgment overseeing these forces of human motive interacting in events. His history became a national monument. It was followed by a series of neoclassical histories that attempted surveys not just of one major episode of the nation's past but of its whole history, back to the earliest times.

The national histories established their authority by professing neoclassical principles that embodied practices of maintaining rational control over the passions according to common understanding of faculty psychology. A host of pamphlets, most announcing their adherence to the value of impartiality, rose up to contest this air of authority, usually critiquing the histories' political bias in favor of either the Whig or the Tory party as a sign of their subservience to the passions. In the context of this debate in print, it becomes evident that the representations of national history by the women writers

Aphra Behn and Delarivier Manley likewise showed that they could turn common faculty psychology to their own purposes.

Both women engaged neoclassical culture in their work, Behn having been recruited by Dryden to translate one of Ovid's heroic epistles—that is, poems of lament in the voices of famous women from the past—and taking “Astraea,” goddess of justice, as her pen name in *The New Atalantis*. Manley adopted Astraea as her own pseudonym in *Memoirs of Europe* (1710) to associate herself with Behn's legacy. Ovid remained an influential precursor for women writers in large part because the *Heroides* enabled poetry to express women's voices (Beer), as well on account of his *Art of Love*, but also because his own career showed the marks of women's power to divert it. Traditional explanations for Ovid's exile from the court of Augustus Caesar have supplied the lack of reliable records of what took place towards the end of his life, and the tradition tells the story that Ovid endangered himself through a love affair with Augustus's daughter Julia, who betrayed him and turned Caesar against him. Madame Villedieu held up Ovid as a classical exemplar of the power of love and female influence to interfere with the course that events were expected by men to take, as her account *Les Exiles*, translated into English as *The Unfortunate Heroes* by 1680, related. A 1729 revival of Villedieu's work, *The Secret History of the Court of Augustus Caesar*, imagines Ovid's exile in vivid, novelistic representations of conversations and his own ability to enjoy seduction even in exile.

The figure of Ovid suggests the expectation that women writers might work in the romance mode in order to connect to this image of influence over the course of events. But referring to the influence of Machiavelli served as a tactic useful to women as well.

Noting a Machiavellian cast to women's writing also points out an important corrective to the tendency to see women writers as idealizing. Then, as now, associations with Machiavelli emphasized the truth claim to be looking into the ruthless heart of human motivations. The Machiavel, as illustrated by *Matchiavel Junior, Or, The Secret Arts of the Jesuites* (1683) or the ideas associated with *Matchiavel Redivivus, or, the Modern Politician*, by "Caleb d'Anvers" (1731), stood for the schemer working in secret toward the sole end of political power over others. Making political power the primary consideration in evaluating human affairs, this view focused on self-interest and the keeping of power as overriding considerations, and so jettisoned truth and ethics as major values. Machiavelli described the art of dissimulation as crucial to achieving strategic superiority over others; heads of state must preserve their "mysteries of state," in addition to the willingness to govern by means of fear and violence, for the ultimate purpose of maintaining control. The invocation of Machiavelli to attack the Whigs and especially Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, as wielding undue influence on Queen Anne appears in the preface to the *Secret History of Queen Zarah and the Zarazians* (1705). Although this work is no longer attributed to Manley, it would have been a likely read for the author of the *New Atalantis* (1709), a work that makes similar attacks on the Duchess of Marlborough.

Ovid and Machiavelli therefore represent specific strategic redirections of faculty psychology that carry out effective critiques of neoclassical principles of historical narration. For one thing, the Ovidian model suggests that histories too often do not acknowledge the influence of women in the course of events, and also that amorous motives tinge the professedly transparent accounts of events. Machiavelli's legacy trains

readers to expect that the seemingly straightforward presentation of historical facts must be inflected with political motivations and dissimulating prose that allows for the play of bias. In effect, skeptical views of human deployment of the faculties supported critique of historical authority on the levels of language and of the very motives guiding perception.

Aphra Behn wrote prior to the appearance of the neoclassical national histories while Delarivier Manley wrote her best-known narratives while the partisan contest over England's history remained at a high pitch (Levine). Neither could have had access to the resources necessary for compiling national history, as Nathalie Zemon Davis has pointed out. Nor do their volumes set themselves apart from ordinary narratives as monumental by appearing in folio. But by approaching these narratives as expressions of faculty psychology writ large on the national mind, we can notice how similarly they function to histories in allowing readers to inculcate their examples of moral and political conduct. Behn's main representation of events on the national scene, the several volumes of the *Love Letters Between a Nobleman and his Sister* (1684-87), refers to France as code for England, while Manley wrote both *Secret Memoirs and Manners of the New Atalantis* (meaning England) and *Memoirs of Europe*, with Constantinople as the court of England. While Catherine Gallagher has traced the ways in which women writers published with strategic doubleness for the book trade, positioning their writings so as to both embody and disembody their authorship (xix), the reading public would have had little difficulty in recognizing the imaginative spaces of their works as representations of the nation. As narratively created spaces, the works by these women writers compete with the national narratives for authority in truth-telling and as instruction for readers. Their projects provided compelling descriptions of actions to be seen as of national significance, and

knowing readers would have easily understood these as creating accounts that competed with and overturned the authority of narratives professing to sum up what the public could know.

To begin with Aphra Behn, the scandal chronicle *Love Letters Between a Nobleman and his Sister* is particularly interesting because Behn wrote the piece in three parts issued as the adventures of its characters were unfolding. Behn followed the news and accounts of court hearings to track a current scandal in which Ford, Lord Grey, eloped with his sister in law even as he was betraying King Charles II by allying himself with the Protestant malcontents championing the Duke of Monmouth at the time of the Exclusion Crisis. Monmouth's popularity came especially from his Protestantism, since as the eldest bastard son of Charles he seemed preferable to Charles's very Catholic brother James. Behn's first part concerning events of 1682 primarily focused on the idealized love conveyed in amorous letters between the two lovers. But in parts II and III, Behn increasingly moved to third-person accounts of the current dramatic events on the national stage as Monmouth's Rebellion of 1685 became the context for the unfolding complications of the lives of Philander and Sylvia. Behn gave these romance names to Lord Grey and Henrietta Berkeley, but readers would have found irony in their names and romance language as the lovers eventually broke faith with one another and successfully pursued their own interests. As events took their course in actuality, it became clear that no satisfying narrative arc would come to a close. While the Duke of Monmouth met his end with execution, Grey managed to escape long imprisonment and moved to the continent, effectively going unpunished for treason.

In order to understand how Aphra Behn's *Love Letters* could occupy the imaginative space of English national history, we need to recognize that she wrote the several installments of the work during the age when writers were assembling first-person accounts and compilations of documents in order to grasp the turbulent events of England's national life in the seventeenth century. Clarendon's basing of his history on his own memoirs and on accounts supplied by his colleagues is only the consummate example of this contemporary ambition to move from primary documents to complete narratives.

Notably, English neoclassical histories in the eighteenth century incorporated into their narratives considerable stretches accounting for person-to-person exchanges in intimate spaces and turns of events amounting to the accounts of passions and character weaknesses. They justified such unclassical narration by maintaining a historian's posture of reasoning evaluation. The English did this in part in order to avoid the commercial failures of histories written strictly according to French standards, which in France had resulted in histories so committed to decorum that they were rendered unreadably tedious, and judged so in their own times (Ranum 69).

When Clarendon takes the time to describe, say, King James's embarrassing tantrums in his bedchamber (evidently reported by eyewitnesses), he defends his neoclassical decorum by calling his enlarging on the nature and character of the Duke of Buckingham's character a "digression" (I:62) although it reveals the temper and spirit of the age. By acknowledging that he has departed from the all-surveying narrative line he asserts the predominance of that linear narration.

Reading these seventeenth-century narratives with the benefit of a hindsight that includes histories of England written during the later eighteenth century, however, it is tempting to observe that the social spaces of the narratives and the public political and military spaces were soon to be integrated into national histories allocating space formally, and increasingly, to the social, even intimate, dimensions of events as well as to the all-surveying view (Phillips). But during the careers of Behn and Manley, the experiential spaces of their “histories” with their accounts of scandalous love and social maneuvering, told vividly through accounts of conversations in private exchanges, lay outside the authoritative scope of national history.

An obvious obstacle to considering the works of either Behn or Manley as engaging national history is genre: their works resemble allegorical romances, with pastoral names assigned to their characters. Weighing in to the matter is contemporary political context; in writing about contemporary events and the characters of powerful persons, neither Behn nor Manley could risk naming names. As is well known, Delarivier Manley was sued for libel in court over her representations of the Duchess of Marlborough in the *New Atalantis* and had to argue that she was an innocent writer of fiction. Catherine Gallagher takes this episode as a significant establishing moment for “fiction” as a domain distinct from actuality even as Manley’s storytelling capitalized on its dual connection to current politics (104). “History” remained a term applicable to any story whether based in fact or pure invention.

By writing *romans à clef*, Behn and Manley appear not to confront the genres of history. But it is worth noting that Behn wrote in a relative vacuum of historical authority and at a time of ferocious contest over the representations of the national past. The many

writers issuing documents at this time would have been keenly aware of competing for recognition as tellers of true accounts and as informing people of what was going on, as Clarendon continued to do year after year in compiling a publication ultimately to appear posthumously and therefore to risk less danger. Furthermore, taking an ambiguous position looks like a strategy on Behn's part for exercising the perceptual skills of readers. Her narrative also complicates the psychological clarity of narrative models that would celebrate the reasoning with which the will governs the passions. It is evident that her protagonists have aristocratic language for reasoning and that they bend their wills toward the consummation of their appetites, as their articulate, rationalizing language stokes their mutual passion.

Allusions to Machiavellian principles are telling. When Sylvia urges a series of compelling reasons that Philander ought to support his king rather than the Duke's rebellion, Philander teases her for interesting her female head in "mysteries of state," a phrase with Machiavellian associations. Sylvia would have been giving voice to Behn's own reasoning at this point, and her caving to Philander's diverting of the conversation to love shows the weakness of both their characters. The example of Sylvia shows a woman making a political analysis (and one in harmony with Behn's partisan allegiances), but therefore functions as an anti-romance illustration when she is swayed by love to yield her critique and accept Philander's treasonable plans. Philander will not let her persuade him to quit the conspiracy against the king, but also expresses the motives of self-aggrandizement that propel him into this scheming. Behn indicates the need for skepticism regarding the underlying motives for actors' apparently idealistic aims. This is a writer who argues that women's best weapon is dissimulation: "All Things in Nature

Cheat, or else are Cheated... You never knew a Woman thrive so well by real Love, as by Dissimulation” (*Works*, vol. 7, 382). Sylvia, like others of Behn’s female characters elsewhere, demonstrates that her success at surviving each in a series of unexpected changes depends on her strategies for manipulating others. Reading with a Machiavellian eye therefore enhances the argument of “the power of love” theme. Skepticism regarding the rhetorical constructs through which people present their views is perfectly compatible with suspecting that the power of eros underlies the apparent causes of events and likely expresses the secret self-interest of those striving to manipulate others for their own ends. It is an account that encourages suspicious reading of published versions of past events.

Aphra Behn had rejected neoclassical formulas when she wrote her plays, although she presented the value of classical knowledge for both sexes (Todd 151, 293). She did show herself willing to engage representations of history. She engaged directly in political controversy over the representation of recent history in 1688. L’Estrange had produced a *Brief History* of the times in the Tory *Observer*, to respond to versions of recent history put out by the Whig Gilbert Burnet in Holland. “Her response in Poem [to Sir Roger L’Estrange] was to add to his ‘truth’ with her own vision of recent history banished by fraud and flattery. The result was a present of corrupt laws, false religion and a misled ‘restless People’” (Todd 407). What turned her attention from writing plays to other genres, such as the prose *Love Letters*, was the difficulty of making money in the theater by the early 1680s (Todd 297).

Aphra Behn’s choice of the intimate letter form creates a very different narrative structure from the surveying spectatorship of the historian, but also associates the work with another classical inheritance, namely the famous romance of the Portuguese letters

and Ovid's *Heroides*, the epistles of lament by famous women of history. Behn had been commissioned by Dryden to write a translation of one of Ovid's heroic epistles, the one by Paris's jilted wife. If the *Heroides* lament tradition assumes the voices of women as undergoing events, that is, as reactive to the actions of others, it is showing the lack of governing power to assert the speaker's will, whatever her passion. Still, there is not a crisp boundary between the experiential voices of the letters and the practice of memoir writing that provided the substantive material for the writing of national history.

From the *Love Letters'* very opening epistle dedicatory, it becomes clear that Behn's tone is always arch and knowing. We have to read the entire collection of letters with a double recognition that they both represent and dissemble actual events, but further with recognition that they mock and undermine the ambitions of those acting in national, political affairs to be taken seriously. The high flown amorous language of the main characters is shown to be out of proportion to their shallowness and infidelity.

Behn's 400 pages expressing the adventures and misfortunes of an eloped pair caught up in the course of national events demonstrates the sheer complexity and experiential plenitude of events, so making the conventional narration of history seem to be bare and reductive. But even moreso, with her knowing, sophisticated narrative position, Behn shows us the phrase by phrase bad-faith negotiations of these letter writers, and makes us recognize them as politicians. The era of the Exclusion Crisis, followed by the nobility's breaking of its oaths of loyalty and mass desertion of James II in favor of the usurping William of Orange, provided Behn with a theme of betrayal and the stark examples of Machiavellian promotion of stratagems of self-interest that carried her through all of her prose works, including for example her tale of *Oroonoko*. At the

same time, this knowing recognition of the negotiability of events makes her account a critical argument supporting the metaphysical principle of the significance of the insignificant. Her vision of the transformative but also transitory power of love to influence the course of historical events would inculcate in readers a fundamental skepticism towards a facile confidence in the transparency of overarching accounts of events contemporary and past.

If the writers of national history came to present their narrations as exerting the will and reason over their often unruly and passionate subjects, Aphra Behn's narratives undermine confidence in the claims of will and reason; the Machiavellian and Ovidian strains preside over men and women alike.

Delariver Manley's narratives show a nearly obsessive retelling of a particular sort of story on a similar theme of men betraying women. In the *New Atalantis, Memoirs of Europe*, and also her autobiographical *Adventures of Rivella*, the same scenario repeats. A powerful man finds himself passionately susceptible to a woman who is in his power, and uses his reason and will to control her in the service of his passions. Manley's repetition of this particular plot comes from its being a story from her own life, since she had been tricked into a bigamous marriage to her cousin-guardian (Koster vi).

The examples of Aphra Behn and Delarivier Manley show that the philosophe David Hume, who was to write a monumental *History of England* published in the mid-eighteenth century, never checked to see whether women writers had already taught the lessons of history that he thought important for their sex:

Among other important truths which they [female readers] may learn from history, they may be informed two particulars, the knowledge of which may

contribute very much to their quiet and repose; That our sex, as well as theirs, are far from being such perfect creatures as they are apt to imagine, and That Love is not the only passion, which governs the male-world, but is often overcome by avarice, ambition, vanity, and a thousand other passions.[3]

Hume's revelation of male imperfection is meant to disabuse women of the illusion that idealized love is as significant a force in the lives of men as they believe it is in their own lives. That illusion would not have been perpetuated by either Behn or Manley, in whose accounts of men's motives "love" would be a euphemistic term for the pleasure derived from Machiavellian enjoyment of having power over a member of the opposite sex. Hume's instructive survey of the diverse motivations and activities in human affairs makes Behn's and Manley's outright warnings look unlike dispassionate history, but both women also share a vision of imparting a recognition of some of the dangerous forces that young women are likely to deal with.

Manley bows to the hierarchy of public decorum by calling her work in the *New Atalantis* a "trifle", a conventional gesture indicating the insignificance of female subjects, but this work also opens with the goddess Astraea returning to earth to survey its corruptions in hopes of restoring virtue, a vast prospect for the reading eye. Manley's narrative scope in both the *New Atalantis* and the *Memoirs of Europe* situates the reader in the lofty position of being able to survey the actions of enormous numbers of persons in courts throughout Europe and Britain—at least under code names. Readers who allow their imaginations to incorporate the narrative spaces of these works are also likely to encounter Ovidian and Machiavellian views similar to Behn's in Manley's depictions of the nation.

Manley's style, as her editor Patricia Koster has noted, is typified by heavy use of exclamation points (xi), a feature that shows little concern to ally her work more closely with reason rather than passion. Koster also remarks, however, that her efforts to research the particular episodes of these works found that Manley's accounts had been accurate as representations of what could have been known about events at the time (xxi, xvii).

Moreover, Manley evidently made the most of opportunities to glean and evaluate information from informants, probably also picking up details from conversations while occupied at the gambling house of her patron, the Duchess of Cleveland (Gallagher 96).

Manley describes high praise bestowed on a young woman for knowing history; the princess Ethelinda in *Memoirs of Europe*, being able to lecture on history and draw lessons to guide national virtue from the decline of Rome, provokes "Admiration, that a Lady so Young, so Beautiful, so Delicate, shou'd know our History, and that of the World, so much better than many of our Senators..." (II:9). The *New Atalantis* is called "satyr", but the *Memoirs of Europe* show more deliberate association with history writing. She presents her narrative as a rival to the Whig *History of His Own Times* by Bishop Burnet in the first page of her Preface, and later also to Laurence Echard's ecclesiastical histories, and explains that her narrative does much more than do the list of "Historians relating Matter of Fact"; Eginardus (the pretended writer of these pages) "takes in whatever occur'd of particular Importance and Design, in the Age wherein he flourish'd." It is a claim to expansion of scope. She also places the actions of her characters frequently in relation to national events such as the revolution of 1688 or the Civil Wars, and the *Memoirs of Europe*'s opening lines provide conventional language

affirming the narrative's own impartiality after a manner similar to the pronouncements of "histories" at this time.

In sum, then, what Manley's work demonstrates its engagement with a range of available language and forms, such that her work cannot be easily ranked with romance nor can it be dissociated from the domain of national events. She makes clear in the preface to *Memoirs of Europe* that she will deal with the subjects of both war and love: "Our Design is to treat of rough Bellona's formidable Charms," she writes, but her narrative will also take into account the domain of women:

But to take in and compleat our Circle with the lovely Sex, to attempt their Heart, Eyes, and Attention by something less dreadful, tho' not less fatal than the native Horrors of the Warriour God; we shall not forbear to introduce the Queen of Love, her bitter Sweets, her Hours of Pain and Joy: With the fantastick Sway of the still changing Goddess, who in her various Dispensations, unequal Movements, Prodigality and Penury of Favours, fatal Frowns, and her more fatal Smiles, is Fortune-all, yet unto whom there are more Knees and Vows addressed, than to the whole Coelestial Hierarchy besides. (I:2-3)

This insistence that love is the more powerful force would appear to align the work with romance conventions, but *The New Atalantis* also explains that Love involves all the passions and elements of virtue and vice, and so must be understood as a significant force in events. She has the figure of Sincerity lecture on the natural philosophy of the passions. Treating love as a material process reinforces her explanation of the power of love, arguing that makes a lasting, even indelible impression on the mind:

For Passion being a Motion! when that Motion ceases, the Passion is at an End; and we may say there is no more Love! But the Habit forbears not to be there still, which is nothing but the Impression the lovely beloved Object has made on the Mind, and which causes that at all times, when the Thought proposes it to the Appetite, it moves and forms the Passion of Love, and because we cannot possess without (in some manner) uniting our self to it, it necessarily follows, that Love is a Motion of the Appetite, by which the Mind unites itself to that which appears to it amiable and Good. (I:31).

Populated with personified abstractions, and spilling ink in accounts of amorous relationships, surveyed in quick succession in order to illustrate points of morality and social and political conduct, *The New Atalantis* presents itself as romance. Manley builds a case for her credibility by making a case against romance as well.

Neoclassical principles had frequently been deployed as anti-romance standards, targeting especially the heroic French romances by Scudery and others (de Jean) and claiming to establish criteria for evaluating the authority and probability of narratives. Manley sides with this critique of romance by blaming the idealized unreality of romances for bringing about her own personal ruin. When her guardian proposed marriage, she could only interpret his motives by the light of her romance reading. She does not fail to have Virtue recommend that any young maid of amorous tendency “shoul’d be deny’d all heightnings of the Passions: Opera’s, Romances, Books of Love, we will have excluded from their Closet” (*New Atalantis* 568), a stricture that could well rule out Manley’s own work, if she didn’t succeed in her bid for self-conscious transcendence of romance.

Considering the ideal neoclassical principles of historiography – the transparency, the proportionality of narrative and significance, the practice of history as philosophy teaching by examples – does put into perspective Manley’s accomplishments. She represents the succession of her accounts of contemporary scandals, though using coded names, as truth-telling that provides a comprehensive and relevant survey of the actions of the great. Moreover, this survey, through the allegorical figures of emblems participating in the action—virtue, sincerity, and so on—presents itself as an account of the nation: whether in Atalantis or “Constantinople,” she depicts the sweep of events as a summation of the nation. The actors in this setting embody aspects of the human faculties, but chiefly the vices given rise to by the passions and the appetites. Looking for these references helps orient readers of these accounts of historically distant, since it becomes evident that the hundreds of pages of a succession of amours serve to illustrate specific elements of passion. What that means is that Manley presents this work as not so very different from the claims that history teaches moral philosophy. Her accounts of highly placed persons in difficulties illustrate the consequences unfolding from specific motivations and character types. Readers would internalize these scenarios as examples of moral philosophy and so recognize how to respond to them in their own affairs, a benefit much like the value promised by history.

She further supports the significance of her project by explicit defense of the Ovidian theme that Love needs to be recognized as a force in events, reinforcing the implicit instruction of many of the individual stories in her narrative. Her version of the Duchess of Marlborough shows that a cognizant woman can outdo even the Machiavellianism of a politician:

So true it is with a little Address, a Lady belov'd, may succeed in the management of the most refin'd Politician; because nature alone being to be gratify'd in what relates to the heart, their Statesman-Notions (which in Business so successfully distinguishes them) has nothing at all to do with Nature or the Heart. (656)

Evidently love is more visceral than stratagem.

At the same time, electronic searches show that Manley has frequent cause to use the word “dissimulation”. The earliest villain encountered in *New Atalantis* takes inspiration from reading Machiavelli (I:61). Her constant alertness to the Machiavellian motives and strategies of dissimulation exhibited by contemporary personalities sharpens readers’ awareness of the gap between public appearances and professed truths and the actual maneuverings at work that no one is willing to acknowledge. Here is a typical rendering of one nobleman who exploits an occasion when his political and amorous drives fall into harmony: “Thus having found the delicacy and admirable Secret of uniting his *Love* and *Interest*; he consider'd only the Methods to advance them” (*New Atalantis*, 656). The hidden motives revealed in her work may also describe the secrets behind the achievements of persuasive and authoritative writers.

If we look at histories as shaping readers’ perceptions materially and so constructing their own authority, we might also look for similarities in the ways in which Behn and Manley strategically occupy the imaginative spaces of readers’ minds. The malleability of self-representation person to person suggests the unreliability of representations of motives and actions of historical personages, as does her narratives’ theme of disclosing closely guarded secrets. Where historians present their narrative

control over their passionate subjects, Manley and Behn make a case for critique. Manley in particular redresses unjust representations of women, but both challenge lack of public recognition of the corruptions among the nation's major actors and suggest the instability of what can be known about the events proposed to be of greatest public significance, which they demonstrate to be under constant renegotiation in the press.

Works Cited

- Beer, Gillian. "Our Unnatural No-Voice': The Heroic Epistle, Pope, and Women's Gothic." *Yearbook of English Studies* 12 (1982): 125-151.
- Behn, Aphra. *Love Letters Between a Nobleman and His Sister*. Ed. Janet Todd. London et al.: Penguin Books, 1993, 1996.
- Behn, Aphra. *Works*, vol. 7. Ed. Montague Summers. New York: B. Blom, 1967.
- Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of. *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*. 7 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1899.
- Davis, Natalie Zemon. "Gender and Genre: Women as Historical Writers, 1400-1820." *Beyond Their Sex: Learned Women of the European Past*. Ed. Patricia H. Labaline. New York and London: 1980.
- DeJean, Joan. *Tender Geographies: Women and the Origins of the Novel in France*. New York: Columbia UP, 1991.
- Gallagher, Catherine. *Nobody's Story: The Vanishing Acts of Women Writers in the Marketplace, 1670-1820*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994.
- Hicks, Philip. *Neoclassical History and English Culture: From Clarendon to Hume*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.
- James, Susan. *Passion and Action : The Emotions in Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*. Oxford : Clarendon Press ; New York : Oxford UP, 1997.
- Jardine, Lisa and Anthony Grafton. "'Studied for Action'": How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy." *Past & Present* 129 (1990): 30-78.
- Levine, Joseph M. *The Battle of the Books*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1991.
- Manley, Mary de la Rivière. *The Novels of Mary Delarivière Manley. Facsim. reproductions*. Ed. Patricia Köster. Gainesville, Fla., Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1971.
- Phillips, Mark Salber. *Society and Sentiment: Genres of Historical Writing in Britain, 1740-1820*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Ranum, Orest. *Artisans of Glory: Writers and Historical Thought in Seventeenth-Century France*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- [Rapin, René] *Instructions for history: with a character of the most considerable historians, ancient and modern. Out of the French*. London: A.G. and J.P., 1680.
- Sharpe, Kevin. *Politics and ideas in early Stuart England: essays and studies*. London, New York: Pinter, 1989.
- Todd, Janet M. *Secret Life of Aphra Behn*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1997, 1996.

Zagorin, Perez. *Francis Bacon*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Exploring the Relations of Science and Virtue

Douglas A. Northrop

Ripon College

Last fall a request for proposals came out from The University of Chicago for research projects that would investigate the connection of science and virtue. I was intrigued by the topic and believed I knew what their interest was. Indeed, one suggested topic crystallized the venture for me. They asked:

What do the insights into humans, that are emerging from the best scientific research, tell us about the nature of virtue? What contribution does science make to our appreciation and understanding of virtue? For example, what might neuroscience and psychology tell us about the difference between reckless risk-taking and, by contrast, moral courage?

(<http://scienceofvirtues.org/Arete/Topics.aspx>)

Having worked mostly on texts of the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, I was most familiar with systems of thought in which conceptions of virtue and of science were treated as parts of a continuous whole, but the RFP seemed to assume a conflict or at least a discontinuity between science and virtue which they were hoping to diminish. Thus, I thought there was an interesting historical question to pursue: Was there a natural connection between virtue and science and has it changed?

Several years ago I argued for the coherence of Eliza Haywood's positions on religion, politics, virtue, and of course education as revealed in *The Female Spectator*

(Northrop, “ Reading *The Female Spectator*”). I think similar cases can be made for other writers of the eighteenth century. Indeed my assumption is that such integration of thought was ordinary and to be expected. In more modern times it seems an investigation is needed into their connection.

Let me take a step backwards before a step forward and look at the world of science before the Eighteenth Century. There was a general consensus in the early modern period that the world had been created perfect and then had fallen into corruption; thus we could expect certain corollaries for both science and virtue. The Christianized Ptolemaic universe posited that the universe wobbled when Adam and Eve fell. Human action was at the very center of things, and the world responded to our fate and fortune. The assumption of progressive deterioration, for instance, would explain how the planets are drifting from their regular, originally established patterns. Similarly, human behavior and virtue would be seen as increasingly corrupt and needing harsh correction and restraint.

Edmund Spenser in the Proem to Book Five, the Legend of Justice, of *The Faerie Queene*, provides an example of these relationships when he asserts that he will not base his presentation of justice on present practices but on the “antique vse,” and connects the wandering planets to the corrupt behavior of humans:

For that which all men then did vertue call,
Is now cald vice; and that which vice was hight,
Is now hight vertue, and so us'd of all:
Right now is wrong, and wrong that was is right,

As all things else in time are changed quight.

Ne wonder; for the heauens reuolution

Is wandered farre from, where it first was pight,

And so doe make contrarie constitution

Of all this lower world, toward his dissolution.

(*FQ.5.Proem.4*)

For harshness of correction in the Legend of Justice we have the iron man Talus.

And Spenser's conception of mercy is that one sheds a tear as the offender's head is lopped off.

By the eighteenth century a shift in scientific thought that established that the laws of motion are indeed regular and the patterns of the heavenly bodies are fixed would provide a different conception of the universe and our position in it. In a Copernican/Keplerian/Newtonian universe the center has shifted, human action has gone off center, and our role is to accept our diminished state. We must accept with Pope that "WHATEVER IS, IS RIGHT" (*Essay on Man* 1.294) We must beware with Swift, the hubris that leads the scientists on Laputa to enquire into and speculate about new rules for building, agriculture, or human relationships. Practical wisdom is much praised by Swift; speculative and abstract thought is satirized.

Samuel Johnson in *The History of Rasselas* explores the limits of human happiness and again concludes that the core of virtue is knowing our limitations and the limited possibilities of human achievement. While we may not all be locked into Happy Valley, we are equally locked into the conditions that control our ability to even imagine an improvement in the human situation. Virtue becomes, for Swift, Pope, and Johnson,

largely defined by acceptance. The nature of and more importantly the limits of reason are central to scientific and religious thought. And are crucial to the definitions of virtue.

Eliza Haywood's linkage of science, virtue, and religion is much more specific and explicit. She argues that our knowledge of nature is controlled by our understanding of divinity. As I argued in 2006:

The connection of flying machines and God's providence indicates once again how the various concerns of Haywood are integrated in her awareness. Whether man could fly is connected to religious beliefs, as is the question of whether there are other worlds and other creatures on them. The structure of snails and the wonder of butterflies all proclaim the providence of the Creator. Religion is as important to natural philosophy as it is to moral philosophy.

(209)

Haywood insists that the fact of our immortal soul is central to our conduct, including honesty in our relations with others. She urges education in the sciences for women so that they will better understand the providence of God; she urges education in philosophy so that women will better understand the principles of behavior. She claims, for instance, that understanding the principles of emotions clarifies that jealousy proceeds from anger not from love.

The Eighteenth Century seems fairly clear (as do earlier centuries) that virtue and science are tightly interconnected in that the concepts and beliefs that underlay science were also used to establish the foundations of virtue. But, the reverse is also true in that virtue constrains science both in terms of what is proper to investigate and what uses can

and should be made of the results. Thus, in the Eighteenth Century the understanding of virtue controlled the use if not the nature of science. At some point science effectively freed itself from those restraints. It is true that religious protests are still made about stem cell research, animal and human testing, and other areas of scientific research. Some efforts are made to control uses as well, in listing certain banned substances, developing nonproliferation treaties, outlawing some weapons such as poison gas, and controlling the use of land-mines.

Science, however, came to have a moral authority of its own. The pragmatic method, the experimental method, the measurable method, all came to have an authority which challenged deductive principles and gave science an independence from external constraints. Science has meant simply knowledge at one point, then differentiated into natural philosophy as distinct from moral philosophy at a later point, then became that species of knowledge based on experiment, then became wholly dependent on models and mathematical formulae at another point. Thus science is now defined by a particular methodology, not a body of information or an area of investigation. Plato finally would not differentiate among the good, the true, and the beautiful. Aristotle would use the same methodology to analyze physics, metaphysics, poetics, ethics, and politics. But the process of philosophy establishing principles for science has become reversed by the time that Hume claims in the 18th century that he will do for philosophy what Newton did for science, that is apply the same methodology of observation and experience to morals as Newton did to the analysis of motion.

If I can conclude that at least into the Eighteenth Century many thinkers and writers expressed a close connection between the principles on which they base their scientific understandings and their sense of virtue, why doesn't that connection continue? The great barrier would seem to be in the question of progress. The progress of science is established not only by our increased understanding of ourselves and the world around us, but upon clearly measurable improvements in life such as longevity, birth mortality rates, comfort of living, disease control, food supplies, speed of travel, range of exploration, control of elements, levels of education, nutritional understanding, and success, size, and strength. Even the consistent improvement in Olympic records is a testimony to the advance of science if in no other way than in performance enhancing drugs.

Science seems to have a history of cumulative growth and development, while most of us would think that virtue has remained pretty constant over the centuries. Are we more virtuous now than before chemical bonding or quantum mechanics? Is the German effort to dominate Europe under Hitler more virtuous than the French effort under Napoleon? Yet both were based on supposedly scientific studies of virtue. If science is cumulative or at least progressive and virtue is not so, why bother about the earlier connections? The science on which the earlier connections seem to be based may have been bad science and thus the connection is at best irrelevant and perhaps misleading.

Thomas Kuhn in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* argues that there is much to learn about how we got from Galileo to Newton which can help us get from Einstein to our next plateau (or paradigm). Thus, he does not deny the progressive nature of science,

but insists that we understand the nature and process of that progression in order to continue and facilitate it.

There was a recent article in *Newsweek* by Sharon Begley entitled “Of Voodoo and the Brain.” Her point was that neuroimaging of brain activity turns out to be less able than previously thought to “predict and explain differences among people in feelings of prejudice, moral judgments, fear of pain, how much social rejection hurts and other fascinating questions” (Feb 9, 2009:52).

One of the central uses of brain scans is in tests for honesty; Begley mentions two companies that are producing lie detectors based on neuroimaging. Compared to the rack and the thumbscrew we might claim an increase in virtue, perhaps even over water boarding. But what is the relationship between science and virtue that is being explored in such experiments?

Part of our modern investigation of the relation of science and virtue is to discover, by scientific means and measures whether virtue is possible. Hume has insisted that free will is necessary or virtue cannot exist. Virtue consists of choosing the good. If science can determine that the choice wasn't really a choice at all but a nerve twitch, an excitement in the cortex, an evolutionary imperative, then the question of virtue is solved. We have only the appearance of virtue as we have had only the appearance of choice.

I took a course as an undergraduate based on the hypothesis that the more we know the less we respect. The particular issue was the history of behavioral science, for the instructor argued that the more we understood human behavior the more diminished

we found human capacity. It paralleled the argument about religion, that the scope and value of religion diminished as science advanced explaining what was before mysterious.

In our age we use science to explore whether virtue, choosing the good, can exist. If there is a fat gene and one can't help being overweight, then there is no virtue in being thin; it is an essential quality not a chosen one. The connection of science to virtue at present, then, is primarily the investigation of the extent or limitations of human choice. Can the extent of human choice be established by other than scientific means? For instance can the Bible, religious lore and lessons, philosophical inquiry and reasoning, or aesthetic insight and response help us to determine when or whether a response or action is chosen or determined? Or perhaps whether it is virtuous or not? Have we simply begged the question if we say that these areas have validity only in so far as the results can be verified by rigorous scientific analysis? We are fascinated by the results of brain scans that show those with religious beliefs light up different areas than those of a more skeptical nature when presented with religious images. But, what are we proving or even investigating by such experiments?

My conclusion, tentative though it is, is that the relationship between science and virtue continues to change. The continuity that had Aristotle looking for humans to fulfill their potential by being virtuous just as he looked to a tree to fulfill its nature by full growth, or the planets to fulfill their nature by proper motion, was displaced by a view that proposed uniform laws of action and reaction, but believed the same uniformity, stability, and regularity should apply to human actions and be therefore central to the definition of virtue. I have skipped the nineteenth century where I expect views of evolution and progressive change may characterize the arenas of biological growth and

development as well as the proper nature of human relationships. Thus, in these general terms, science and the definitions of virtue have been mutually interdependent but historically various. With the confidence we have in science there is little doubt that The University of Chicago grants will generate new and intriguing information about how limited our possibilities for virtuous action can be. But, I still think there is room for an historical investigation into these evolving relationships. Perhaps there are additional sources for an understanding of virtue that exist apart from the different definitions given to it by the progressions of science.

Works Cited

“A New Science of Virtues.” The Arete Institute at The University of Chicago.

<http://scienceofvirtues.org/Arete/ResearchGrants.aspx>.

Northrop, Douglas. “Reading *The Female Spectator*.” *Proceedings of the 14th Northern Plains Conference on Earlier British Literature, April 7-8, 2006*. Eds. Bruce E. Brandt and Michael S. Nagy. Brookings, SD: English Department SDSU, 2007

Pope, Alexander. *An Essay on Man*.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. Second edition. Ed. A. C. Hamilton. New York: Pearson, 2007.

The Phoenix in the Fire:
Stirring the Ashes to Reveal Hidden Connections between *Frankenstein* and *Pride*
and *Prejudice*

Jennifer Christoffersen
St. Cloud State University

What does a fire do but bring light, heat, and ultimately its own end? When it burns it shines a flickering light on those objects and people closest to it and snuffs out encroaching darkness. Reading a book is a lot like watching a fire; it brings imaginative warmth and light to a cast of people and places but only temporarily until the book is finished or set aside. Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* and Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* each burn brightly in their own regard. Indeed, Austen describes her own tale as nearly *too* "light and bright and sparkling," and we find it occupied with numerous women and rich men bound together in a society where nearly all roads lead to marriage ("Letter to Cassandra" 273). In contrast, Shelley's story is a fierce, icy, nightmarish tale filled with characters that die or circle around the abyss of death wrought by an obsessed man and his monstrous creation. Certainly on the surface, the two stories are vastly different, yet since both authors were young Englishwomen writing in the early 19th century, one wonders: Do these stories simply burn independently of one another, or are there any similarities that can be found in their ashes? After all, the "sparkling" *Pride and Prejudice* was published in 1813 and was followed only five years later by the more gruesome *Frankenstein* published in 1818.

The purpose of this work, however, is not to revel in the biographies of the two female authors in order to see what likenesses can be found, nor to speculate about how they generated these novels. What interests me here is the possibility that there may be a hidden story or palimpsest beneath the wildly different surface plots that have each become the best-known work of its young, female author. This idea of hidden meanings buried in women's authorial work is not new. Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, two prominent feminist theorists, describe this phenomenon in their work, *The Madwoman in the Attic*. In Chapter 2, "Infection in the Sentence: The Woman Writer and the Anxiety of Authorship." Here they suggest:

Women [like Austen, Shelley, Bronte, Dickinson] produced literary works that are in some sense palimpsestic, works whose surface designs conceal or obscure deeper, less accessible (and less socially acceptable) levels of meaning. Thus these authors managed the difficult task of achieving true female literary authority by simultaneously conforming to and subverting patriarchal literary standards.

(1533)

Clearly, the fact that these novels by Austen and Shelley have remained in print proves their social palatability and shows that they were able to write openly as women, yet also conform to the literary standards set forth by the predominantly male establishment. Still, because of the gruesomeness of Shelley's narrative, she admits that the first thing she must do in her *Introduction* to the Third Edition of *Frankenstein* in 1831 is: "...give a general answer to the question, so very frequently asked of me—'How I, then a young girl, came to think of, and dilate upon, so very hideous an idea?'"(169). This explanation shows that even some fifteen years later, Shelley feels the need to defend her own work

to an incredulous audience. Even to this day, her explanation that *Frankenstein* was written as a result of her participation in a ghost story contest with some of the most celebrated male romantic writers of the time is nearly as famous as the story itself. In some ways, one might argue, this back-story of the contest makes Shelley's authorship of this hideous tale all the more socially acceptable.

Consequently, if we can assume that the novels of these two young women were socially accepted by society while they were alive, then we can begin to dig into those parts of their stories that one might consider palimpsestic or hidden. How did these female writers both conform and simultaneously subvert societal standards at once to achieve true female authorship? What similar designs did they conceal beneath the surface plots of their work and why might these be considered potentially less socially acceptable? With these research questions in mind, I propose to use Gilbert and Gubar's feminist framework to argue that there are three main palimpsests that link the otherwise dissimilar plots of *Frankenstein* and *Pride and Prejudice*. These three palimpsests are:

- 1) The author writes about space, entrapment, and enclosure which reflect anxieties related to the woman writer's own fears of being trapped in patriarchal institutions (1540).
- 2) The female writer appears to disassociate themselves from revolutionary impulses, while passionately acting on those impulses through characters in the novel (1539).
- 3) The author attempts to make herself whole through healing. In order to free herself of despair, she must shatter the mirror that has reflected what every woman must be and recover her Eve (1536).

The use of these three main ideas as literary excavating tools make the job of digging through the language of the two novels significantly more focused and will enable the reader to see clear connections between the subtexts of both works. Ultimately, what these connections reveal is the fluid ability of both Austen and Shelley to show the limited spaces in which women could move, to critique the patriarchal system while appearing to conform to it, and to convey their deepest hopes and wishes to their readers.

I. Anxieties about Space, Entrapment, and Enclosure

From the beginning of both novels, both Austen and Shelley fan the flames of their plots by revealing that the main characters we will begin to care about are both in dangerous situations. In *Pride and Prejudice*, we discover that the Bennet girls will be cast out of their home because it is “entailed in default of male heirs,” and in *Frankenstein*, Walton, a sea captain undertaking a perilous trip to the Arctic, writes to assure his sister that he is safe despite the “floating sheets of ice” that continually pass his ship and “dismay” his men (19, 12). Thus, it is fair to say that both authors set their novels in motion by making readers feel uncomfortable on behalf of the characters as well as feel “unsettled” themselves. Both of these troubling situations are also related to spaces; the Bennet girls will lose their *home*, and Walton is sailing precariously in a *ship*. Additionally, the characters seem to be pinned in spaces that are beyond their control. After all, the Bennet girls cannot spontaneously become boys to save their home, and Walton’s ship is at the mercy of the weather. The main difference in regard to these problematic situations is one of polarity since the danger for the girls is that they will have to leave their space, while the peril for Walton is that he might become trapped in it. It is worth noting that Walton’s enterprise define male activity. He is venturing out into

the unknown and writing his sister who is back home, whereas the Bennet girls' situation defines the constraints under which women operate since married is offered as their only way out. Yet, in both novels, the authors establish right away that the spaces their main characters inhabit are deeply troubling; they evoke a dire sense of loss as well as a sense of futility at being unable to avoid that loss.

By extension, Austen and Shelley may have experienced a similar lack of control regarding their own female space in a patriarchal society, and as a result here, use their authorial stance to establish a sympathetic space with the reader through which they can critique the system. The spacial conflicts in both novels are predicaments which the reader must contend with if he/she is to understand what stimulates the windings of the plot for either story. Most likely, the reader wants to know: how and why did the characters get into this terrible situation, and how will they get out of it? The answer that both authors provide is remarkably similar: The men (Mr. Bennet and Walton) are the only ones with significant power that could remedy these spacial situations and, ultimately, they end up in a mess because of a lack of preparation combined with a blind eye to the possibility of failure. The Bennet girls rely on Mr. Bennet in much the same way that the ship's crew relies on Walton. Men in power, these female authors seem to suggest, overstep their bounds when they believe themselves so powerful as to be able to predict a secure future for themselves (and others) when the future security *cannot never be predicted*. The promethean leap these men make, then, does bring knowledge about the space they inhabit, but it is a knowledge that comes too late. The Bennet house will be lost...the ship will get stuck in the ice. The real promethean transgression lies in the fact that because of their individual failings, these two men have placed the souls that rely

on their power in severe jeopardy without much recourse. The Bennet girls might be able to marry well, but the pickings are slim, and the ship's crew can always mutiny, but how much will that help when they may not be able to move the ship? The way that both authors address the underlying question of who is to blame for the problems of space described at the beginning of the novels suggests an inherent criticism of the status quo. Mr. Bennet is the father of the house and Walton is the captain of a ship. These are male characters who represent patriarchy and are given power of their respective spaces, yet these spaces become endangered, and consequently, so do the lives of the people over whom these men have charge. If this balance of power were not so skewed, Austen and Shelley suggest, then men would not be the only ones who had to shoulder social responsibility or who could influence the future, which seems to become perilous under their command. Therefore, any emblematic Bennet girl or shipmate would have the power and resources to save themselves. Or better yet, they might not need saving at all.

This unsettling attention given to space in the beginning of the novels continues as the plot of each progresses, but the manner of their trajectories differs. For example, Austen focuses mainly on external spaces. We hear all about houses and gardens throughout the story, from Lucas Lodge to Pemberley, and in order to get her girls out of their dire situation, Austen situates them most often in these public spaces. Consequently, she eases them out of the nest like baby birds by most often employing the squawking voice of Mrs. Bennet whose "business of her life was to get her daughters married" (4). It is this voice that nags Mr. Bennet to call on Mr. Bingley when he first arrives at Netherfield, prompts Jane to go to Bingley's in the rain, threatens Lizzy to consider marrying Mr. Collins, and praises Lydia and Kitty for chasing after redcoats. Though

these scenes reveal that this mother bird is silly and given to hyperbole, what Austen also shows is that this woman/mother is right in her assessment of the female situation.

Indeed, the only way it seems for the Bennet girls to solve their problem is for them to acquire a new space, and the main way for a young woman living at the time to do that is through marriage.

Unfortunately, even this solution is problematized in the novel as Austen reveals a severe dearth of successful marriages. Why does she do this? One answer may be that she wished to critique the way marriage was constructed as *the* safe, viable space for women in the 18th century. As shown by the following comments by Sir William Blackstone, even the marriage laws at the time were “instrumental in effacing women,” because once a woman married, their identity was absorbed into that of her husband:

By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in the law: that is, the very being or legal existence of the woman is suspended during the marriage, or at least is incorporated and consolidated into that of the husband: under whose wing, protection, and cover, she performs everything. (Wilputte 325)

Hence, this language suggests that when a woman marries, she is “metaphorically buried and denied any tangible social significance” (325). Given this, is it any wonder that 19th century female authors, such as Austen and Shelley, would find it difficult to offer their readers examples of successful marriages or companionship? If society gives women only one option to save themselves and that option effectively negates their identity, then it’s clearly understandable why the work of these authors would include a palimpsestic anxiety about space, and especially marriage space, in their work. As Gilbert and Gubar suggest, women at this time were conditioned to believe that they were like houses

because of their wombs and nesting duties. Moreover, a woman was, “conditioned to believe that as a house, she herself is owned (and ought to be inhabited) by a man. Thus, she may once again see herself inescapably as an object” (1542).

Consequently, Austen shows that for her female characters to save themselves, they must leave the enclosed space of their home and reject the traditions that would bury them alive. Her characters partly solve the problem of entrapment by attending balls, visiting friends, wandering about in gardens, and in the case of Lizzy, rejecting marriage proposals. Yet where Austen’s answer for women regarding space lies in a trajectory and sense of moving “outside,” Shelley’s occupation with space becomes very womb-like. Once Victor Frankenstein comes on board Walton’s ship, the two men (as well as the reader) become rhetorically enveloped within a layering of stories told inside a cabin which is inside a ship that is sailing about as far from civilization as one can get—the North Pole. As Marc Rubenstein suggests:

Throughout the novel, the act of observation, passive in one sense, becomes covertly and symbolically alive in another: the observed scene becomes an enclosing, even womb-like container in which a story is variously developed, preserved, and passed on. Storytelling becomes a vicarious pregnancy. (173)

The physical spaces in this book mimic the close rhetorical spaces described above by Rubenstein and are almost claustrophobic, which make the psychological spaces seem that way as well. For instance, Walton speaks of the physically “imminent danger of being crushed” in the ice, the monster of living in a coffin-like hovel, and Victor of being often confined to a “wretched” bed (149). Psychologically, a kind of embryonic loneliness also echoes through the voices of these three characters, and it is through this

echoing of language that we can see that they each utter the same deep desire. Consider the following quotes as an example of how the psychological space each character inhabits repeats the other:

Walton to his sister: *I have one want which I have never yet been able to satisfy...I bitterly feel*

the want of a friend (10).

The Monster to Victor: *The more I saw of them [the DeLacys], the greater became my desire to*

claim their protection and kindness; my heart yearned to be known and loved by these amiable creatures: to see their sweet looks turned towards me with affection, was the utmost limit of my ambition (89).

Victor to Walton: *My life, as it passed, was indeed hateful to me, and it was during sleep alone*

that I could taste joy...for in sleep I saw my friends, my wife, and my

beloved

country (142).

These repeated echoes within the rhetorical space of the story all have one thing in common. All three characters, whether man or monster, call out for true companionship and love, but all three are unable to fully achieve it. Consider that Walton wants a friend, but the one that shows up at his door, dies. Additionally, the monster is continually rejected by others because of his appearance, and Victor indirectly causes the deaths of all those he loves. Without a truly loving companion, each character is virtually locked in a hellish space that becomes more and more isolating as they continue on their life's path.

Shelley may have chosen to give the setting of her novel this kind of icy womb-like environment because it best reflects the inner remoteness her main characters feel throughout the story. Perhaps, like Austen who critiques the idea of a perfect marriage space for women, Shelley, too, speaks through her characters to suggest that there is no one way to guarantee a loving companionship and that to demand it only results in failure. Thus, this may be why she has Frankenstein deny the monster a custom-made companion. What Frankenstein has learned is that while one might be able to somewhat control the design of another being just as he did in creating the monster, one will never be able to control the mind and will of that being completely. The fear of losing even more control than he already has over his creation is what regulates his decision and locks him into the vengeful battle with his creature. In the end, this anxiety about losing control is a fear that both men show in the novel, but it is intimately related to the anxiety of space. Until men and women are able to share the burden of each, Shelley seems to suggest, that they will always be locked in battle until death do them part, just like Frankenstein and the monster.

Ultimately, in the fiery conflicts wrought by problematic spaces in these novels, both authors seem to reiterate concerns that would have been felt keenly by women during the time in which they lived. Primarily they suggest that when one has little control over the space they occupy, as the case is for women, those lives endure a terrible stress, like feeling lost all the time on the icy edge of society or fearing that one is continually on the brink of being cast out. Whether or not the authors themselves were able to find a truly loving companion that fulfilled their lives is unknowable, but certainly one may guess that part of the way they could alleviate their situational isolation was

through writing, with “pages and words standing in for flesh and blood (Gilbert and Gubar 228). As Shelley’s story shows, the echoing of desires we hear from Walton, the monster, and Victor could only be known in the presence of a companion who listens to one’s story. Likewise, these palimpsestic echoes we hear from Shelley and Austen could only be known in the presence of their faithful companions—or readers—who have enabled these authors to rise from the ashes year after year ever since 1818.

II. Revolutionary Impulses: Dissociation and Passionate Enactment

*“Can I speak plainer? Do not consider me now as an elegant female intending to plague you, but as a rational creature speaking the truth from her heart.” * Lizzy Bennet*

Like the palimpsest of anxieties related to space that both Austen and Shelley invoke in their novels, they also play the game of appearing to adhere to patriarchal themes or traditions while simultaneously subverting them. Gilbert and Gubar suggest that historically:

...Women in patriarchy have traditionally cultivated accents of acquiescence in order to gain freedom to live their lives on their own terms, if only in the privacy of their own thoughts...By publicly presenting acceptable facades for private and dangerous visions, women writers have long used a wide range of tactics to obscure but not obliterate their most subversive impulses. (1534)

Indeed, if we look back at some of the conflicts that emerged with regard to the anxieties of space, we may see how these authors present one acceptable façade to their readers, but use at least one main character’s voice or actions to offer an alternative view that more truly seems to match their own. It might be helpful here to acknowledge what some of the patriarchal views were at the time regarding women that these female authors were

revolting against. For example, Wilputte notes in her essay about feminine absence that “modesty and silence were the most necessary virtues in a woman, according to the conduct books throughout the period” (324). Hence, to be a good woman, one had to be essentially invisible. Another conduct lesson from the time references the space that women are to fill in marriage: “Though not entirely absent, the ideal wife is definitely angelic, other-worldly; she is neither as human nor as emotional as her husband...her duty is to serve her husband and not to express herself” (326). So, given these conduct lessons which reflect the main ideas of how women should behave during the early 19th century, how did Austen and Shelley appear to agree with these traditions, but also reject them?

If we begin by looking at the female characters in *Pride and Prejudice*, it is difficult to see many that fit the bill of being “good” women who remain modest, angelic and silent. Certainly the matriarchs of the novel, Mrs. Bennet and lady Catherine, evoke anything but silence or saintliness, so it is left to the younger generation to provide the model, and next to Georgiana Darcy or Ms. de Bourgh, Jane Bennet seems to be the only character robust enough to endure the task. She is the only one that Austen rhetorically holds up as the conduct-book-role-model-perfect-woman of whom even the revolutionary Lizzy seems to admire: “My dear Jane!...You are too good. Your sweetness and disinterestedness is really angelic; I do not know what to say to you. I feel as if I have never done you justice, or loved you as you deserve” (90). Of the Bennet girls, Jane is also the only one that the Bingley sisters admire: “...they admired and like her, and pronounced her to be a sweet girl, and one they should not object to know more of” (12). As a result, their brother was able to, “think of Jane as he liked, and he could not

conceive an angel more beautiful” (12). As we can see, the description of Jane that Austen provides by these varied characters suggests that she is indeed the emblem of the ideal 19th century woman. Yet even though Austen pays lip service to Jane on the rhetorical surface and features her as the recipient of the utmost respect and admiration of all of the characters, she simultaneously subverts this model of womanhood by denying Jane the greatest prize at the conclusion of the story and also the privilege of sharing narration with the author. Both of these rewards she reserves for Lizzy, the revolutionary character of the novel.

When I say that Lizzy is the revolutionary, what I mean is that she is the one character whose purpose seems to be to go against every set of societal expectations put on her by either men or women throughout the story. We could accuse her of “disinterestedness” just as she accuses Jane, for although Austen describes her as the brightest flower in the bunch, she seems to be blissfully unaware or uncaring of how other social V.I.Ps like Mr. Darcy and Lady Catherine think of her. To spotlight her rebellious spirit, it is as if Austen places situational dominoes in front of Lizzy just so she can knock them down. For instance:

- She walks two miles in the mud to see Jane at Netherfield, much to the chagrin of Bingley’s sisters.
- She does not marry Mr. Collins even though it is an action that would save her family home.
- She refuses Mr. Darcy’s first proposal despite it being the “best offer” she could get.
- She refuses to promise Lady Catherine that she will not marry Darcy.

Hence, Lizzy Bennet is a character whose very nature is inclined to make things more difficult for those who want to impose their will on her, unlike the sweet, angelic Jane who “never thinks ill of anyone”(90). One also notices that two of four dominoes that Lizzy knocks down are related to very prodigious marriage proposals. In a society where the goal of women was to be married well and as a wife to be “angelic and other-wordly,” Austen certainly presents Lizzy as a voice of female reason that revolts against this intolerable state of affairs. As the author, Austen controls the rhetorical situation and because we see the bumbling Mr. Collins and arrogant Mr. Darcy through Lizzy’s eyes and not through the eyes of society or other men, we can understand and forgive Lizzy for her nearly unbelievable rejections of their marriage proposals. By sharing narration with Lizzy, Austen effectively marries her readers to this revolutionary character, and we find ourselves unable to reject her “proposal” to go against tradition and conventional wisdom. As John Dickinson said, “The first duty of a revolutionary is to get away with it,” and not only does Lizzy get away with doing the unthinkable throughout the novel, she gets the richest reward for it by her master revolutionary author in the end.

In a novel such as *Pride and Prejudice* where the dance of courtship and societal manners is so frequently on display, it is easier to see how Austen is able to observe patriarchal traditions and values while also subverting them. *Frankenstein* is not so easy to dissect. Obviously, Mary Shelley’s choice to write about science, body parts, monsters, death and a trip to the Arctic was inherently rebellious since good girls were probably not supposed to think about these things, let alone write about them the way that she did. But everybody knows this fiery story she tells because she wants it to be seen in all its gruesome glory. Consequently, at first I doubted the existence of a revolutionary

palimpsest in this novel because I was so taken in by the obvious one. Yet, if Austen used narrative techniques to get us on her revolutionary side through Lizzy, then does Mary Shelley also make the same kind of rhetorical moves in her work? If so, just as Austen tells us that Jane Bennet should be held up as an emblematic figure, but allows her to come in second-place, then what does Shelley keep telling us verbally that she does not want us to entirely believe? Whose revolutionary voice does she rely on to speak for her?

Part of the answer to these questions lies in the audience's reaction to the story. Just as was discussed in our class, readers have a hard time deciding who is more monstrous—Frankenstein or his creation. This occurs despite the fact that Mary Shelley keeps telling us repeatedly that this creature is a “fiend,” “monster,” “daemon,” and “enemy.” This creature is so physically awful that even his creator describes him as a “filthy mass that moves and talks” and doesn't want to look at him (112). This creature is so morally terrible that he kills innocent people. Just as Austen sets up the unusual foil between Jane and Lizzy, there should be *no question* between Victor and the monster as to who is most fit to wear the laurels of society. Obviously, Victor should be the victor, yet he does not win the physical battle at the end of the story, and doubt is cast as to whether or not he wins the moral battle as well. Is it possible that Shelley's narrative here works in the same way as Austen's? For instance, does Shelley rhetorically stand by the socially accepted Victor (just as Austen did for Jane), but then simultaneously subvert this narrative by eliciting audience sympathy for the monster? How does she do it?

She must do it in the same way that Austen did—by sharing her voice with the underdog character she wants us to believe in, even though nearly every other “trusted” character is telling us that this one, lone voice belongs to someone who behaves

wrongly and does not deserve belief. For instance, consider the advice that Frankenstein gives to Walton on his death-bed regarding the creature:

Yet when I am dead, if he should appear...swear that he shall not live...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 fiend-like malice. Hear him not...thrust your sword into his heart. I will hover near, and direct the steel aright. (145)

This quote is a good example of how Shelley allows Frankenstein one last chance to convince Walton (and the reader) that the monster must be destroyed, but even though Frankenstein pleads with Walton three times to swear he will “undertake his unfinished work,” Walton never concedes or even responds to these requests (151). He has not made up his mind to condemn/kill the monster any more than the reader can entirely be determined to do so, for even when he sees the monster by Victor’s death-bed, he says, “I shut my eyes involuntarily, and endeavored to recollect what were my duties with regard to this destroyer. I called on him to stay”(152).

Why does Walton allow the monster to stay? What is compelling about his story? Why doesn’t Walton just kill him? These questions related to plot could also be asked of the reader. I believe the answer is related to a recommendation that Percy Bysshe Shelley gives to the reader in his note, “On *Frankenstein*:"

The scene in the cabin of Walton’s ship—the more than mortal enthusiasm and grandeur of the Being’s speech over the dead body of his victim—is an exhibition of intellectual and imaginative power, which we think the reader will acknowledge has seldom been surpassed. (186)

Perhaps, Walton cannot kill the creature because his story is compelling, yet the story must be compelling because Walton can identify or in some way sympathize with him. The monster tells him at the end, "I am quite alone...I did not satisfy my own desires. They were for ever ardent and craving, still I desired love and fellowship, and I was still spurned" (154). Is this not an echo of Walton's own feelings at the same narrative point in time? After all, Walton does not satisfy his desires to reach the North Pole; he loses his one friend to death, and he may feel spurned by his fellow men on the ship. He writes his sister, asking: "What can I say, that will enable you to understand the depth of my sorrow?" and is then nearly asked the same question by the monster who concedes, "Yet I seek not a fellow-feeling in my misery. No sympathy may I ever find" (154). Ironically, however, through his "intellectual and imaginative" speech, the monster does find sympathetic listeners (Walton and Shelley's readers) who allow him to live long enough to tell his side of the story right before he ascends his "funeral pyre triumphantly" (156).

Additionally, just as Shelley continually tells us how horrible the monster is, yet undercuts this narrative by having the monster win our sympathy, she also continually tells us how badly we ought to feel for Victor, even though something holds us back. For instance, through Walton, we learn how we are supposed to regard Victor from the beginning: "For my own part, I began to love him as a brother; and his constant and deep grief fills me with sympathy and compassion" (15). Yet once we learn the story of Victor's grief along with Walton, Shelley has managed to imbue us with doubt about Victor's character because we have also heard the monster's story. At the end when Victor implores the sailors, "Oh be men, be more than men. Be steady to your purposes, and firm as a rock," and tries to persuade them in a rousing speech "to return as heroes

who have fought and conquered,” they are not convinced, and neither are we, the readers. Ultimately, Victor wants Walton and his crew to follow his path which he believes is heroic. Yet for all the glorified rhetoric emanating from and surrounding him, what Shelley has us see is his lonely defeat in an unrepentant death-bed far from civilization. He, too, comes in second, and it happens in much the same rhetorical manner as Austen has portrayed the emblematic Jane coming in a close second to Lizzy.

In fact, the conclusions of both novels seem to echo a biblical saying from Matthew 20:16: “In this way the last will be first, and the first will be last.” The significant evidence detailed here suggests that Austen and Shelley do appear to disassociate themselves from revolutionary impulses by verbally telling us to believe that Jane is the angel and Victor the hero who deserve our allegiance. However, it is significant that they also passionately enact a rebellion by leading their revolutionary characters—Lizzy and the Monster—to more glorious ends (Gilbert and Gubar 1539). If the voices of these characters are the mouthpieces through which the authors speak, then this revolutionary palimpsest must reflect very closely their feminine concerns of being women and writers living in the 18th century. Indeed, can they speak plainer? The echo that we hear in this palimpsest is: “Do not consider me now as an elegant female/monster/author intending to plague you, but as a rational creature speaking the truth from her heart” (Austen 75).

III. Shattering the Mirror of Woman, Recovering Eve, and Healing the Self

To name oneself is the first act of both the poet and the revolutionary. When we take away the right to an individual name, we symbolically take away the right to be an individual. Immigration officials did this to refugees; husbands routinely do it wives. *
Erica Jong

Beyond the similar palimpsests of space and revolution, what is the secret message written in the literature of these two female authors, Jane Austen and Mary Shelley? Gilbert and Gubar suggest:

...The one plot that seems to be concealed in most of the nine-teenth century literature by women is in some sense the woman writer's quest for her own story; it is the story of the woman's quest for self-definition...it is the story of her attempt to make herself whole by healing her own infections and diseases."

(1535)

We have observed how Austen and Shelley use language to refocus the reader's "eye" and make us side/believe in the rebellious characters of Lizzy and the monster who should, by all conventional accounts, not be trusted. It's entirely possible that by doing this, these female authors are asking their readers to trust *them* as authors, which means believing in the "other" side. By extension, this belief is what can help them break free of the diseased binaries of angel/witch and good woman/fallen woman. This belief is what can allow them to heal, to be reborn out of the ashes.

In her *Introduction to Frankenstein*, Mary Shelley said, "Everything must have a beginning...and that beginning must be linked to something that went before. Invention does not consist in creating out of a void, but out of chaos, the materials must, in the first place, be afforded" (171). Initially, my interest as a reader searching for hidden connections between these two material novels was driven by the recognition: *Where have I heard this before?* There is a key point in both stories where one soliloquy directly reflects the other, and it is this narrative moment that captured my attention and made me believe that the stories might not be as chaotically dissimilar as they appear:

How despicably I have acted! I who have prided myself on my discernment! How humiliating is this discovery!—Yet how just is this humiliation!—Had I been in love, I could not have been more wretchedly blind. But vanity not love has been my folly...I have courted prepossession and ignorance, and driven reason away, where either were concerned. Until this moment, I never knew myself. (Lizzy in *Pride and Prejudice* 236-37)

...I saw and heard none like me. Was I then a monster, a blot upon the earth, from which all men fled, and whom all men disowned? I cannot describe to you the agony that these reflections inflicted upon me; I tried to dispel them, but sorrow only increased with knowledge. Oh, that I had for ever remained in my native wood... (The Monster in *Frankenstein* 81)

Although the context and diction of these exhortations from the main characters here is vastly different, the underlying sentiment of sudden self-awareness which results in sorrow and “wretchedness” is the same. Also, both characters have come to this awareness as a result of some kind of new “outside” knowledge. The monster’s knowledge comes from the outer senses: “When I looked around, I saw and heard none like me;” whereas, Lizzy’s comes from Darcy’s letter. Though the newly gleaned information is inherently different for each character, the impact is the same—each one experiences a life-transforming, epiphanic moment central to the plot of the novel.

This moment rings doubly in the ears for two main reasons; first, because the self-awareness of Lizzy and the Monster is so strikingly similar, and second, because this is the first moment when the revolutionary characters speak “alone” to the reader. Lizzy’s

internal speech is extraordinary because she admits to the reader how she forces herself to reread the letter from Darcy, overcomes her own pride and prejudice to believe what he has to tell her, and see herself anew in a sincerely unflattering light. The monster's speech is also quite amazing in that he has taught himself to learn the language without much help in a short period of time and can think philosophically about his place in the world, "Who was I? What was I? Whence did I come?"(81). He, too, then comes to the realization that the answer he sees in the reflection of his questions is just as unflattering as it is for Lizzy. He is a monster in appearance, while Lizzy has behaved monstrously, and no one wants to look into a mirror and see a monster staring back at them.

The exclamations and questions that both characters emit in these transformational scenes evoke, what Gilber and Gubar claim, is an understanding of their presence in a fallen world:

...but unlike Adam, these characters seem to have fallen not merely from Eden, but from the earth, fallen directly into hell, like Sin, Satan, and –by implication— Eve. Thus their questionings are in some sense female, for they belong in that line of literary women's questionings of the fall into gender. (229)

Consequently, if we can begin to think of this Edenic moment that occurs in the middle of the both novels as the instant when each "Eve" character gains a new, terrible knowledge about themselves (a la the "apple"), then we can also begin to look for the ways that Austen and Shelley attempt to recover their fallen Eves out of the ashes.

Of the two recoveries, I would say that I delighted most in the way that Austen resuscitated Lizzy because what we learn from Lizzy Bennet's recovery is that she could not have saved herself, just as human beings, the social animal, cannot live alone and just

as authors cannot survive without their readers. After the climax of the novel, we are constantly reminded of the acts performed by Darcy that help to revive Lizzy. For instance, he tells her the truth about the snaky Wickham, rejoins Bingley and Jane, and forces Wickham to marry Lydia to save the Bennet family from total embarrassment. Yet the only reason that he is able to do these kind acts without garnering Lizzy's resentment is because her rejection of his first proposal made him realize his own failings, which he admits to her at the end:

What did you say of me, that I did not deserve? For, though your accusations were ill-founded, formed on mistaken premises, my behavior to you at the time, had merited severest reproof. It was unpardonable. I cannot think of it without abhorrence. (239)

Thus, it is Darcy's admission of imperfection and his own "fallen" nature that ultimately joins these two characters together in a blissful marriage union at the end of the novel and solves the problem of the marriage space as being a place of entrapment. Initially, I was opposed to the way Darcy seemed to be portrayed as the white knight on the horse sweeping in to rescue the damsel in distress, until I realized that his admission to her in the garden reveals that she was just as instrumental in saving him from pride and prejudice as he was to her. Because he spent time considering her thoughts of him as potentially true, just as she did with his letter, the words took root and gave way to belief and a change of heart. Thus, Austen sets up her final marriage union on equal footing as this Adam and Eve get to "start over" together in the most Edenic place possible, a place where they will never have to work again—the house and grounds of Pemberley.

Consequently, believing another's story is an important theme in both novels because it is this belief of can potentially lead to a transformational change of mind and heart necessary for healing. By extension, these newly-minted female authors ask their readers to believe their stories too, despite how unbelievable they seem. Like Austen, Mary Shelley leads her "monstrous Eve" to self-recognition in the middle of her novel and also uses the rest of her novel as a thoughtful pursuit to save the creature, even though she rhetorically describes Victor's pursuit of the monster as a destructive one (Gilbert and Gubar 237). Yet, Shelley's tale of recovery is a darker one that is definitely not "light and bright and sparkling." If we consider that the monster "whose face was concealed by long locks of ragged hair" is Shelley's fallen Eve, then we can consider the ways that the monster (Eve) tries to get Adam (Victor/Walton) to believe his story. While the ending to Austen's novel is unimaginably happy as such a return to Eden might be, Shelley does not reserve the same fate for her creature. Despite the monster's kind acts toward the DeLacy's and his intelligent and imaginative speech to Victor and Walton, his pleas for a life of companionship and love go unanswered, so he resolves to kill himself by ascending, "the funeral pyre triumphantly," and exulting in the "agony of the torturing flames" (156). While this is certainly a terrible fate the creature has reserved for himself, it is all the more awful if it reflects Shelley's own attempts to be heard in a patriarchal society where she knows her mother was attacked as a "philosophical wanton" and her ideas considered, "a scripture fram'd for propogating w[hore]s" (Gilbert and Gubar 227).

However, it is strange that Shelley ends her story with a promise of the death of the creature instead of dramatically showing it. After all, this story has been terribly gruesome and filled with death, so why not have the monster and Victor perish together

in dramatic fashion at the end? Perhaps one reason is because Shelley wants to suggest that our death, like our birth, is a singular journey, but that in between those journeys we should seek out true friends and companionship. Perhaps she has the creature jump out the window of the ship without giving Walton the chance to kill him because she wants us to know that it is not the right of human beings to destroy that which has been created, just as the monster's hideous physical presence reveals that it is also not their right to create from that which has been destroyed. Both seem to be promethean transgressions which are not easily forgiven.

While Mary Shelley does not offer her readers the blissful ending that Austen does, she is able to offer us a similar hope in the healing reunion of one couple spoken of subtly in the story—that of Walton and his sister. Hence, the ending of Shelley's story is essentially a return to the beginning for him, and he says in his last letter to his sister, "But I journey towards England, and I may there find consolation" (152). Thus, Shelley has hope reside in the character of Walton, the listener of stories and the writer of letters. He refuses to carry Victor's torch of destruction; he gives up his individual pursuits in order to save his men; he does not choose death for all.

Ultimately, the hope that Walton carries for the reader is the hope that these female writers seek to define and the command they issue—choose life—but give everyone a fair chance, not just a few. These stories may be vastly different on the surface, but underneath they are very much the same. They both suggest that life will be messy and burn brightly for only a short time, so we have to turn away from pride and prejudice and relinquish our personal vain pursuits in order to do what we were born to do, which is be loving companions and listeners for others. Austen and Shelley were

brave women who wrote novels despite the social consequences that they might incur in a male-dominated writing hierarchy. They took this risk in order to speak and potentially heal themselves and other women. Helene Cixous explains the importance of this perilous act:

In the masculine economy of writing, the repression of women has been perpetuated over and over again, more or less consciously [like in conduct books] and in a manner that frightening since it's often hidden or adorned with the mystifying charms of fiction...where woman has never her turn to *speak*—this being all the more serious and unpardonable in that writing is precisely the *very possibility of change*, the space that can serve as a springboard for subversive thought, the precursory movement of a transformation of social and cultural structures. (350)

Thus, while it's true that Austen and Shelley were probably anxious about the patriarchal spaces they inhabited and wanted to revolt against those spaces as the palimpsests in their novels suggest, what they also wanted, most importantly, was to be able to speak and name their own pathway to hope instead of being told where to go and what to do.

Writing was and continues to be their passage to new life, for they are reborn out of their ashes whenever these stories burn in the minds of their readers, who listen from beginning to end, generation after generation.

Works Cited

Austen, Jane. Pride and Prejudice. Ed. Donald Gray. New York: Norton, 2001.

Cixous, Helene. "The Laugh of the Medusa." In Feminisms. Eds. Herndl and Warhol. 1975. 347-361.

Dickinson, John. "The Liberty Bell." World of Quotes. 3 December 2008.
<http://www.worldofquotes.com/topic/Revolution/1/index.html>.

Gilbert, Sandra and Susan Gubar. "From *Infection in the Sentence: The Woman Writer and the*

Anxiety of Authorship." The Critical Tradition. Ed. David Richter. Boston: Bedford/St.

Martin's, 2007. 1532-1544.

-----"Mary Shelley's Monstrous Eve." In Frankenstein by Mary

Shelley. Ed. J. Paul Hunter. New York: Norton, 1996. 225-240.

Jong, Erica. "Revolutionary." World of Quotes. 8 December 2008.

<http://www.worldofquotes.com/topic/Revolution/1/index.html>.

"Matthew 20:16." Biblos.com Parallel Bible. 6 December 2008.

<http://bible.cc/matthew/20->

16.htm.

Rubenstein, Marc. "'My Accursed Origin': The Search for the Mother in Frankenstein."

Studies

in Romanticism. 15.2 (Spring 1976): 170-184.

Shelley, Mary. Frankenstein. Ed. J. Paul Hunter. New York: Norton, 1996.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe. "On *Frankenstein*." Qtd. In Frankenstein. Ed. J. Paul Hunter.

New York:

Norton, 1996.

Wilputte, Earla. "'Women Buried': Henry Fielding and Feminine Absence." The Modern

Language Review. 95.2 (April 2000), 324-336.