THE UNIVERSITY OF
WARWICK

University of Warwick institutional repository: http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of Warwick

http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap/1198

This thesis is made available online and is protected by original copyright.

Please scroll down to view the document itself.

Please refer to the repository record for this item for information to help you to cite it. Our policy information is available from the repository home page.

Shakespeare and The Idea of The Book

One Volume

Charlotte Scott

Ph.D

The University of Warwick

January 2005

Table of Contents

Table of Contents i

Acknowledgements ii

Abstract iii

Abbreviations iv

I. Introduction: 'Give me that glass, and therein will I read' 1

II. 'Sad stories chanced in the times of old': the book in performance in *Titus Andronicus* and *Cymbeline* 25

III. 'The lunatic, the lover, and the poet': *The Taming of The Shrew* and *Love's Labour's Lost* 65

IV. *Richard II*: 'Marked with a blot, damned in the book of heaven' 125

V. 'Minding true things by what their mockeries be': forgetting and remembering in *Hamlet* 163

VI. 'Rather like a dream than an assurance': *The Tempest* and The Book of Illusions 200

VII. Conclusion: 'We turn'd o'er many books together' 235

Bibliography 244

Appendix 270

Acknowledgements

Foremostly I'd like to acknowledge and sincerely thank Jonathan Bate.
I'd also like to gratefully acknowledge the support, interest and patience of Emma Lambe, Alice Hunt, Richard Scholar and David Margolise.

Abstract

Shakespeare and the Idea of the Book is about the book in Shakespeare's plays; the book as an object, wherein the article may disclose narratives, corroborate stories, expose versions of reality and perspectives of presence; and the semiotic of the book, wherein the language of the book, of holding, touching, turning leaves, opening pages, reading, revealing and closing may simulate an idea of the body or mind in motion. This thesis is about how the metaphorical and material book appears on Shakespeare's stage, and how the physical and figurative presence of the book challenges the imaginative and representational conditions of theatre. Having chosen seven plays for their particularly significant relationship to the book, I explore each play and its books for the demands they make of each other and what such demands reveal. The Introduction outlines the argument of the project and, drawing on a broad range of Shakespeare's plays, sets out the prevalence of the 'book' and an awareness of the potential discourses through which the object is beginning to move in the Elizabethan period. The thesis is then split into five chapters, the first two dealing with two plays each, *Titus Andronicus* and *Cymbeline,* and *The Taming of The Shrew* and *Love's Labour's Lost.* The following three chapters deal with individual plays, *Richard II*, *Hamlet*, and *The Tempest.* Although the thesis follows, with the exception of *Cymbeline*, a chronology of the drama, I make no attempt to suggest that Shakespeare forged a linear narrative in his evolving relationship with the book. Rather, my conclusion demonstrates how the book's extraordinary semantic scope resists a continuum or progressive evolution. The ever-changing capacity of the book, its materiality and language, supports the stage in a quest to define and expand the representational relationship between seeing and thinking, moving and being. Shakespeare's books are, I will argue, like Hamlet's players, 'the abstracts and brief chronicles of the time', and, to that end, 'let them be well used'.

Abbreviations

All first references will be cited in full; thereafter the following abbreviations will apply:

SQ Shakespeare Quarterly[*]

OED Oxford English Dictionary

EMDD Early Modern English Dictionary Database

F First Folio

Q Quarto, versions will be specified.

SD stage direction

ed., eds editor, editors

Shakespeare's works

AYL As You Like It

Luc The Rape of Lucrece

2 HVI King Henry Sixth Part 2

2 HIV King Henry Fourth Part 2

LLL Love's Labour's Lost

TC Troilus and Cressida

MW The Merry Wives of Windsor

MND A Midsummer Night's Dream

Venus Venus and Adonis

[*] *Shakespeare Survey* and *Shakespeare Studies* will be distinguished in full

I

‘Give me that glass, and therein will I read’

In Shakespeare’s Sonnet 23 the poet imagines what it is to be silenced by the need to speak. Comparing this feeling to an actor’s stage fright, or ‘some fierce thing replete with too much rage’, he pleads for the written future of his voice. ‘O’er charged with [the] burthen of mine own love’s might’, he declares:

> O let my books be then the eloquence
> And dumb presagers of my speaking breast,
> Who plead for love and look for recompense
> More than that tongue that more hath more expressed.
> Learn to read what silent love hath writ.
> To hear with eyes belongs to love’s fine wit.[1]

The sentiment is love, the image is the stage and the expression is the book. Even within the written form of the sonnet, the idea of the book becomes the place in which not only can the tongue express more, but the inexpressible — the silence — will eventually be translated into pages to be read and heard by the eyes of the beloved. These books reassure the burdened poet and promise not only a definitive place of expression but ‘recompense’.[2] The book both reflects and receives a version of what it represents. Sonnet 23 maps an idea of the book onto the requisites of the stage where the acute relationship between an actor and his part replicates the relationship between the voice and the heart. The sonnet’s synthesis of the book and the stage provides a significant starting point from which to engage with ideas and images of the communicable. Here,

---

[1] Stephen Booth (ed.), *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (New Haven and London: Yale Nota Bene, Yale University Press, 2000), ll. 9-14.

[2] The full hermeneutic potential of the relationship between Shakespeare and his texts is still in contention, but recent scholarship by Lukas Erne proposes an authoritative distinction between the quartos and the Folio, suggesting that the length and cognitive demands of the plays in the Folio were intended not for the stage but for the page. If we accept Erne’s thesis, Shakespeare’s idea of the book acquires an even deeper significance in the light of a conscious awareness of the ‘literary’ text. See also Patrick Cheney, *Shakespeare, National Poet-Playwright* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), who argues that Shakespeare’s sonnets and poetry were not ancillary to his drama but part of the very processes which made his plays possible.

the book conjures a form through which the actor and the poet move in the hope of compensation for the inadequacies of their response to the present.[3] As the sonnet shifts through some of the inexorable frailties of our relationship to expression — the stunned inarticulacy of fear, the suffocating weight of emotion, or the absolute desire for lucidity — his books, as ambiguous and elliptical as they are, alleviate the pressure of the moment. The books of sonnet 23 celebrate the luxury of a second chance, and promise, in all their shapelessness, an eloquent narrative of the soul. It is books like these, which speak, signify, shape and presage that Shakespeare places on the stage of his dramatic imagination.

The purpose of this thesis is to explore the idea of the book within Shakespeare's plays.[4] Specifically focusing on seven of his plays I examine the book, both materially and metaphorically, within the broader implications of Elizabethan discourse. The chapters are devised chronologically to expose the various definitions and significations through which the book moves during Shakespeare's dramatic career. The vagaries, subtleties and paradoxes of interpretation and mimesis begin to emerge as we trace the interrelationships between two complex media of expression and reflection. As the recent work on the history of the book has shown, the book is central to the development

[3] 'Presagers' is often considered an awkward description of the books' activity and has led to various re-readings of 'books' for 'looks'; however, as Stephen Booth explains, given the extended theatrical analogy through which the sonnet moves, it seems that books here operate in a similar way to prologues or choruses. See Booth (ed.), *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, p. 172. In other words, the books anticipate the narrative, establish the context or expose the art. All these functions centralise both the dramatic and narrative role of the books, which signify their ability to both transcend and accommodate the limitations of the stage and the 'speaking breast'.

[4] The texts of the seven plays, which this thesis focuses on, will be based on the first folio. I am deeply conscious of the ongoing debate that surrounds the relationship between a Shakespearean text, quarto, folio, fair-copy or foul paper, and ideas of authenticity, authorship and value, be it the single blotless genius, collaborative artist, or flawed memorial constructions of audience members and actors. I have chosen to use the folio as my 'control text' not in the belief that those versions of the plays necessarily reflect a stable authorial or dramatic decision, but rather because the first folio is a book in which the culmination of Shakespeare's work first became available as a material object, and as this thesis is about his theatrical books it seemed best to start with the one in which all the others came to rest. I have, however, for ease of reference and style, chosen to use modern editions, rather than a facsimile of the folio itself. All deviations from the folio will be noted.

and dissemination of the human consciousness and context, affecting almost every social and personal movement that we make. In order to limit the scope of this subject I examine the performance and permutations of the book as they emerge on Shakespeare's stage. Although the word 'book' appears, in some form, say as either a referent or passing reference, in almost every play (with the notable exception of two) I have chosen specific plays for the significant role that the book plays, and I have set these plays together in order to explore the various and complex forms the book takes within Shakespeare's theatre. The seven plays that I focus on are foregrounded because of their particular and performative relationship to the book. This selection has been made through exposing and assimilating all of Shakespeare's references to the book. From this point I have identified the more profound resonance and dramatic impacts, and highlighted those plays in which they are most thoroughly imagined and explored. Each of the plays I investigate manipulates and interrogates the semiotic of the book in a different way, which we may find shadows of throughout 'The Complete Works'. Through a close analysis of the denotative and connotative performance of the book, and the hermeneutic potential such analysis affords, I aim to show how the idea of the book informs Shakespeare's plays and responds to Elizabethan discourse. In looking at Shakespeare's books, my purpose is not to offer narrative sources, inter- or paratextual insights, or even an indication of Shakespeare's reading as a schoolboy or adult; rather my concern, given the developing and still ambiguous status of the book in this period, is to examine the ways in which two media – the book and the stage – interact in performance.

The *OED* defines a book as originally meaning 'a writing'; only in its third definition does it cite the now generally accepted meaning of 'a collection of sheets

of paper ... written or printed, fasted together so as to form a material whole'; and the definition, 'that which we may read, and find instruction or lessons', precedes that of 'The Bible'.[5] The word 'book' occurs in thirty-six of Shakespeare's thirty-eight plays.[6] Shakespeare refers to approximately twenty-six different types of book, which span both the metaphorical and the material. Within these references the book ranges from the specific — the Bible, instruction manuals, behaviour books, law books, almanacs, books of heraldry, hawking or arithmetic, and the Book of Common Prayer — to generic signs of learning, pedantry, education, art and experience. Similarly, the book surfaces on a figurative level in reference to faces, hearts, beauty, conscience, inner-consciousness, 'trespasses', 'nature', 'misfortune', 'virtue', memory, 'the secret soul' and character.[7] Often, in Elizabethan discourse, the prevailing metaphoric function of the book, as of the stage, is that of the world and what Montaigne called 'la condition humaine'. Yet, where Montaigne's experience became a synecdoche for his book, Thomas Heywood's was the stage:

> If then the world a theatre present,
> As by the roundness it appears most fit,
> . . . .
> And chief determiner to applaud the best,
> And their endeavours crown with more than merit
> But by their evil, actions dooms the rest
> To end disgrac't, while others praise inherit
> He that denies then Theatres should be,

[5] Although the word 'book' is used by Shakespeare to cover a number of written articles, including a page, a tablet, manuscript, lettering and the printed volume, I follow his use of the word book under the general definition of something that is written, and therefore do not distinguish between the possible material variations.

[6] This includes *The Two Noble Kinsman* and *Henry VIII* (*All Is True*), however in recognising Shakespeare as the 'author' I do not occlude the probability of collaboration on a number of plays including *Titus Andronicus*. However, as far as *Cymbeline* is concerned, I agree with J. M. Nosworthy that the play is the work of Shakespeare only (see his Arden edition, pp. xxviii-xxxvii). A full list of all Shakespeare's references to the book is be included in an appendix at the end of this thesis.

[7] The word 'character' is predominately used by Shakespeare to mean the written symbol or letter, which in turn feeds back into the metaphorical book, ambivalently playing upon the notion of both reading and writing the visible, graphic face or 'type'.

He may as well deny a whole world to me.[8]

The metaphoric function that both the book and the stage were able to provide for the world was supported by their dual ability to harness and represent the self. The role of the commonplace book in humanist education often suggests a linear development between the book and the self, drawing in quotations and observations as the mind and body grow up with their material companion. The commonplace book provides an image of the way in which the book and the mind interact. Thinking about the commonplace book may provide us with an image of the way the book develops in both subjective and social conditions. The introduction to Thomas Cooper's *Thesaurus* of 1578 states: 'A studious yong man ... may gather himselfe good furniture both of words and approved phrases ... and make to his use as it were a common place booke'. John Marston in his collection of satires, *The Scourge of Villanie* (1598), writes, 'Now I have him, that .... Hath made a commonplace booke out of playes, and speakes in print'.[9] Where for Cooper the commonplace book suggests a sensible and close companion of 'approved' quality, for Marston it signifies a superficial stockpile betraying ignorance and cursory experience. Yet Cooper's analogy to furniture is important since, for good or bad, the book houses a portable mind and social imagination that may move independently of the body. For Ann Moss the history of the commonplace book is

> an integral part of the history of Renaissance culture in general, because it is the history of its technical support system, and consequently of one of the most important factors contributing to its intellectual paradigms.[10]

Probably the most significant Renaissance writers on the commonplace were Erasmus, Agricola, Melanchthon, and (in English) Henry Peacham. Where Erasmus offered a

---

[8] Thomas Heywood, *An Apology for Actors* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1612), A4v. I have modernised both spelling and typography

[9] Both examples are cited by the *OED*. Cf. John Marston, *The Scourge of Villainie*, ed. G. B. Harrison (Edinburgh: At the University Press, 1966), 'Satyre. X. Humours', p. 107.

[10] Ann Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and The Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 134.

complex and philological structure, Melanchthon proffered a sustainable inventory specifically designed to accommodate and augment both real experience and esoteric endeavour. Johann Sturm's treatment of the commonplace is linked to the art of memory appropriated by Renaissance humanists, in which he devises 'places' for 'things' as a route-map to discovery and definition, plotting the co-ordinates of both nature and knowledge onto a book of life; and 'as Cassiodorus declared, "wherever the human mind turns, whatever thoughts it considers, it refers of necessity to one of the commonplaces."' [11]

Generically, we may consider the idea of the book to belong, at this point, to the metaphorical landscape of the world, signifying the knowing mind and sensible presence as well as the individual body testing its subjective wit against consensual impressions. Shakespeare draws his books from this grand arena and sets them, often as 'furniture', upon his stage. Yet outside the figurative realm, books have a powerful place within religious, political, legal and didactic discourse, but as we move through Shakespeare's books, we become aware that they do not always retain their shape, sanction their conditions or stabilise the semiotic. Whilst the book may suggest a grandiose commitment to certain ideologies or a peculiar friendship with the self, it emerges on Shakespeare's stage as a dynamic challenge to both thinking and seeing. The book both betrays and belongs to the theatre.

The word 'book' appears in all of Shakespeare's plays except *All's Well That Ends Well* and *The Comedy of Errors*. Even in *Errors*, however, we find traces of the semiotic

[11] See above, p. 195; and Sister Joan Marie Lechner, O.S.U., *Renaissance Concepts of the Commonplaces* (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1962), pp. 48-9.

affecting and emblazoning the book upon the action. Dromio of Ephesus, confronting his master, compares his beaten body to a marked page:

> If the skin were parchment, and the blows you gave were ink,
> Your own handwriting would tell you what I think (3.1.13-14).

Here the body and the page become inscribed by experience, recording and exposing a relationship with the world. What is written is translated in the very act of writing, representing not the author (Antipholus) but the book itself (Dromio). The page turns its subject outward against the pressure of the writing hand. Like the idea of the play, the idea of the book simulates its own metaphorical discourse, and discusses the image and the body of the actor through which it moves. The relationship between the book and the body is made up of many and various strands — recently, Douglas Bruster has examined the increasingly personal nature of print in the 1590s, locating satire, eroticism, and an developing awareness of 'authorship' in the relationship between the death of a writer and the popularity of their works.[12] Equally, the transmission of books as love-tokens suggests a tangible relationship between lover and beloved played out in the physical donation and acceptance of the object. Here, however, I am concerned with the metaphorical capacity of Shakespeare's books, and to that end the journey a metaphor makes from 'cause to effect, effect to cause'.[13] According to Henry Peacham's *The Garden of Eloquence* (1577):

> Metaphor is [the] artificial translation of one word, from the proper signification, to another not proper, but yet nigh and like.[14]

But why and in what way did the book become a suitable metaphor for the body and the soul, particularly as metaphor is predicated upon a 'nigh and like' relationship?[15] In

---

[12] Douglas Bruster, *Shakespeare and the Question of Culture: early Modern Literature and the Cultural Turn* (Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 66-93

[13] Sister Joan Marie Lechner, *Renaissance Concepts of Commonplaces*, pp. 128-9.

[14] Henry Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence* (1577), p. 4.

Romeo and Juliet the book supports the rhetorical emblazoning of Paris; Lady Capulet instructs her daughter to 'Read o'er the volume of young Paris' face'

> And find delight writ there with beauty's pen:
> Examine every several lineament,
> And see how one another lends content:
> And what obscur'd in this fair volume lies,
> Find written in the margent of his eyes.
> This precious book of love, this unbound lover,
> To beautify him, only lacks a cover (1.3.84-90).[16]

Lady Capulet's extended conceit plays upon the various conditions of the reader who becomes — by virtue of her observation, her interpretation, her engagement with the text, (the lineament, the margin, the pen) — the fulfilling element of the process of production. The book is made up of two entities, the leaves and the cover, which are reflected by two bodies that 'beautify' and bind through their union and consummation. Juliet is both the reader and the binding who, in reading Paris, completes the process of perfection, the 'precious book of love'.[17] Here, the book specifically supports the conditions and consummation of love because it provides a dynamic process of physical and cognitive engagement that is both sensual and sensible.

As Lady Capulet suggests, the semiotic of the book releases a figurative fabric of possession and consummation in which reading and reception simulate the harnessing of one body to another, augmented by the sense in which the woman's mind will reflect

---

[15] In tracing the tropological origins and emergence of the book of the heart, Eric Jager locates a general transition of textual exegesis from scholarship to desire in the rise of vernacular love literature of the twelfth century. More particularly, however, he explains that 'from the early thirteenth century ... lyric and romance began to portray the lover's heart also in expressly textual terms', Eric Jager, *The Book of The Heart* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000), p. 71. In support of this Jager cites *Roman de la Rose*, an 'allegorical dream-vision begun around 1230-35 by Guillaume de Lorris and complete some forty years later by Jean de Meun'. Jean's part of the poem, he explains, 'draws heavily on scholastic ideas and metaphors, and the book of the heart that it cites several times is clearly adapted from an academic model – often with deliberately comic effect', p. 72.

[16] Because of the substantive variations in text, including both the Oxford and Norton editions working from Q1 and Q2, I have referred to the Folio text and modernised both spelling and typography.

[17] Technically it is possible to read this description as pertaining to a manuscript rather than a printed book; however, this distinction is not relevant to Lady Capulet's conceit.

and accommodate the man's imperative. According to Edmund Tilney's *The Flower of Friendship*, for the wife, the face of a husband

> must be her daily looking glass, wherein she ought to be always prying, to see when he is merry, when sad, when content, and when discontent, whereto she always frame her countenance.[18]

The idea of the book offers an image of two bodies bound by the same conditions, in which the beloved may read 'the margent of his eyes', and, perhaps, 'frame her countenance' to that end. However, as well as the romantic or social bond, the book also supported an explicitly sexual metaphor. Whilst John Taylor, 'publishing a prostitute's character in 1622, justifies giving his "Booke the Title of a *Whore*" since a book, "like a *Whore* by day-light, or by Candle, ... is euer free for euery knaue to handle"', James Shirley, in *The Cardinal* (1641) has Antonio describe his companion's object of desire as:

> A pretty book of flesh and blood, and well
> Bound up, in fair letter too. Would I
> Had her with all the errata![19]

Towards the end of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the body and the book became further intertwined, sexually and secularly, through the iconic space of the female reading. Sasha Roberts explains:

> If men are shown to seduce *with* books, women are frequently represented as being seduced *by* books. Textual and sexual experience are assumed to be intimately linked in the body of the woman reader.[20]

[18] As quoted in Frances E. Dolan (ed.), *William Shakespeare, 'The Taming of The Shrew': Texts and Contexts* (Boston and New York: Bedford Books of St Martin's Press, 1996), pp. 30-1.
[19] As cited by Gordon Williams, *Shakespeare, Sex, and The Print Revolution* (London and Atlantic Highlands, NJ, 1996), p. 49.
[20] Sasha Roberts, 'Shakespeare "creepes into womens closets about bedtime": women reading in a room of their own', in *Renaissance Configurations: Voices, Bodies, Spaces, 1580-1690*, ed. Gordon McMullen (Hampshire and New York: Palgrave, 2001), p. 42.

The reception and popularity of *Venus and Adonis* (1594) saw Shakespeare become a synecdoche for the sexual female reading, so that, in 1641, John Johnson could claim:

> There as also *Shakespeere*, who (as *Cupid* informed me) creepes into the womens closets about bedtime, and if it were not for some of the old out-of-date Grandames (who are set over the rest as their tutoresses) the young sparkish Girles would read *Shakespeere* day and night, so that they would open the booke or Tome, and the men with a Fescue in their hands should point to the Verse.[21]

The male, here, is imagined in terms of his dominant and privileged role as the phallic explicator of Verse. Shakespeare, however, translates the book into the body through the vagaries of knowledge and desire, narrative and love, Lysander's 'love's stories written in love's richest book' (*MND*, 2.2.128), or as Berowne says: 'From women's eyes this doctrine I derive ... /They are the books, the arts, the academes' (*LLL*, 4.3.326). When the book enables this journey it appears to map and re-map the relationship between the corporeal and the cognitive. When King John wonders if, on looking at his daughter, the Dauphin 'Can in this book of beauty read I love?'(2.1.486), or when Lady Macbeth warns her husband: 'Your face, my thane, is a book where men/May read strange matters' (1.5.61-2), or when Hector berates Achilles, 'O, like a book of sport thou'lt read me o'er' (*TC*, 4.7.123), the book is explored, like the body, for traces of the artless heart and the honest soul. According to its representational potential the semiotic of the book revolves on stage with an image of its reader, as Mistress Page complains, 'writ with blank space for different names' (*MW*, 2.1.66). Thomas Dekker, in *The Honest Whore*, capitalises on such potential:

> I read
> Strange Comments in the margin of your lookes:
> Your cheeks of late are (like bad printed Bookes)
> So dimly charactered, I scarce can spell,

[21] John Johnson, *The Academy of Love describing ye folly of young men, & ye fallacy of young women* (London: For H. Blundon, 1641), p. 99. Cf. Gordon Williams, *Shakespeare, Sex, and The Print Revolution* (London and Atlantic Highlands, NJ, 1996), p. 9, and Sasha Roberts, 'Shakespeare "creepes into women's closets about bedtime"', p. 45.

One line of love in them.[22]

According to Julie Stone Peters, 'Actors could be "volumes" appearing larger than life in "larger print"', and 'the theatrical face (legible or other wise) could be a page for the imprint of character'.[23] The relationship, here, between the actor and the book is predicated upon the ability of the book to perform; to image one thing and disclose another, to offer words or signs beyond the visible requisites of its presence, to be read or rejected, accepted or mistrusted. The relationship between the actor and the book is dependent, like that of Juliet and Paris, upon the dialectic between reader and read, where the reader/audience may 'spell', 'print', 'read' and 'comment' on the text that interprets as it moves between character and performance.

One of the first things that we notice about Shakespeare's books, both literal and figurative, is that they frequently fulfil a linguistic function. Whether as rhetorical, demonstrative or implied, the book scores graphic marks within the drama which often confront the limits and ideas of the communicable. These semiotic functions lead us to question how the book creates effects, and to what extent its potential and performance imposes upon the drama. Alongside such questions of presentation are questions of evolution, and in what ways Shakespeare imagines and experiences the idea of the book. We notice, for example, that Ovid's *Metamorphoses* appears in the hands of Shakespeare's heroines at only the beginning and end of his career in *Titus Andronicus* and *Cymbeline*. Drafting the heroine's consciousness at acute moments of violence or fear, *Metamorphoses* seems to emerge at or expose the point at which theatre is unable to represent the space between body and meaning. However, despite the physical and

[22] Fredson Bowers (ed.), *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker* Volume II (Cambridge: at The University Press, 1955), part 2, III.i.127-131.
[23] Julie Stone Peters, *Theatre of the Book 1480-1880, Print, Text and Performance in Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 109/111.

imaginative potential of the book, we begin to notice its entrance at acute moments of representational impasse. On one hand, Shakespeare's prolific use of the word 'book', its figurative scope and theatrical presence, suggest a lucidity and performative potential on the other, as a representational rubric, the book offers theatre 'an image of itself', which also transcends the structural and synthetic boundaries of the stage in its ability to shift between the icon and the metaphor, to conflate meaning and extend allusion. In terms of the material book, I have chosen plays that not only acutely draw upon the presence and 'dumb eloquence' of a text but also dramatically trace the lineaments of truth through the margins of history or book in performance. At the beginning of Shakespeare's career, in *Titus Andronicus*, we are confronted with the book as an object and an imaginative musical score; as we 'learn to read' and 'to hear with eyes' we become aware of the bookish hinterland through which many of the plays move. In the following chapter I focus on *Cymbeline* and *Titus Andronicus*, which I have chosen not only for their chronological significance but, more importantly, for the material authority and imaginative eloquence of their books. The dramatic role of the book on stage, when its presence is affected and interpreted by the performance and the place, leads us to a developing awareness of the hermeneutic potential of the image and the idea in motion. Unlike the play-within-the-play, the book is attached to, and yet constantly eliding, an articulate image of itself. Even in its presence, the book questions and transfers the limits of its own authority. Even as a language, the configurations of the book are subject to interpretation, and even as an object the book is an actor. Given the enormous hermeneutic potential of ideas of representation within drama, the book signifies an extraordinary synthesis of the subjective and objective in action.

Henry VIII, in a letter of 1533, commented: 'And rather than men would note a lye when they know what is meant, they will sooner by allegory or metaphor draw the word to truth.' Metaphor, for Henry, functions as the shadowy space between fact and fiction: it neither lies nor communicates absolutely, but rather 'draw[s] the word', as both an image and a journey, into something resembling reaction. An equally equivocal relationship to truth begins to emerge from Shakespeare's semiotic of the book, and Henry's comment provides a conceptual basis from which we may start to observe and interpret the icon and the metaphor in motion. We notice from plays like *Love's Labour's Lost* or *The Taming of The Shrew*, where the book becomes enmeshed in practices of teaching and transformation, that the representational function of the metaphor is constantly fluctuating. I discuss *Love's Labour's* and *The Shrew* together in chapter three because both plays engage the book, although very differently, in the pursuit of desire and the pretence of learning. Although relying on different traditions, both comedies make a specific relationship between the body and the book, through which I explore how the semiotic has come to permit a sexual and textual tension to develop under the auspice of learning, and in what ways Shakespeare uses the body of the actor/character to expose this dynamic. Yet in *Hamlet* or *Richard II,* plays that negotiate the effects and authority of performance, the book appears to defy the representational rites of theatre. Through *Richard II* the relationship between the book and ceremony is examined in chapter four. Through the figure of the King, the play's attention to story and history, and the tension between iconoclasm and ritual, the book challenges the requisites of theatre and confronts ideas of truth. Although we begin to notice the entrances of the book at moments of theatrical crisis, we are denied our metaphysical induction to processes of meaning. In chapter five I explore Hamlet's relationship with memory, which begins in the Ghost's command from the cellarage,

through the rejection of Wittenberg, to 'The Mousetrap', navigating the dialectic between words and image in the radical soul. Finally, through *The Tempest*, I will expose the ways in which the book has become complicit in the very processes it appeared to defy. The plays I have chosen to focus on engage the material and semiotic of the book in performance. The theatrical presence of the book begins to harness the drama to processes of signification, processes, I shall argue, that challenge the very foundations upon which they are built. In *The Tempest* we may immediately notice the ubiquitous power of Prospero's books, yet upon what basis, through what indications and contraindications, contingents, prisms and performances does the book achieve such a status? And how does such status enable us to explore and identify the potential of text in play, and how does such potential, text and performance contribute to the hermeneutic scope of Elizabethan media in motion? These are some of the question that Shakespeare's books propose.

'The book in many's eyes doth share the glory'

There are four areas of critical enquiry central to the background and justification of this thesis: the history of the book; the role and rise of the public theatre, including meta-theatre; Shakespeare's use of Ovid; and Shakespeare's wider reading, including his use of sources and intertextual material. Separately, these lines of enquiry have been well-documented, and all have an important role, to a greater or lesser extent, in supporting the fabric of this argument. However, the particular premise of this project is to examine the performance of the book upon Shakespeare's stage. The institutional and cultural value of the theatre has long been established as informing and exposing the dissemination of early modern practices. More recently, the iconic, material, literal and

metaphoric vagaries of the book have been recognised as seminal within the development of early modern culture.[24] The purpose of this thesis is to locate and examine the interaction of these media upon Shakespeare's stage. Julie Stone Peters's recent book, *The Theatre of the Book* (Oxford, 2000), is perhaps the most significant contribution to the study of the book and the stage, in which she establishes that 'The study of the relationship between theatre and printing is ... not a sideline in the history of communication but the paradigmatic instance of the interaction between text and performance'. However, her particular focus is on the book as playbook or script and the impact of publishing in enabling and establishing theatre. It is the book, she argues, that gave theatre 'an image of itself'. Equally, David Scott Kastan's *Shakespeare and The Book* (Cambridge, 2001) examines the status and role of publication, text and authorship within the trajectory of Shakespeare's dramatic career. Though considerable in the formation of both the history and evolution of the book and the stage, neither of these works harnesses the particular iconic and metaphoric book of Shakespeare's theatre.[25]

---

[24] Since the seminal work of W.W. Greg, D.F. McKenzie, R. McKerrow and A.W. Pollard, Roger Chartier and H.S. Bennett, the history of the book has acquired an ever-increasing importance within both comparative and cultural studies. The body of work dedicated to the study and exposition of the impact and implications of the book is continually evolving, however, currently the most significant contributions to this discipline, ranging from the material production to the cultural and cognitive evolutions, include Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, *The Coming of The Book* (London and New York: Verso, 1997), Anthony Grafton, *New Worlds, Ancient Texts: The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University press, 2000), Anthony Grafton, *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers*: Jerome Lectures, 20 (U.S.A: University of Michigan Press, 1997), David R. Olson, *The World on Paper: the Conceptual and Cognitive implications of Writing and Reading* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), D.R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) and for a broader anthology of the history of the book see David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery (eds.), *The Book History Reader* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002),which includes post-modernist essays on the sociological implications of literacy, authority and authorship; and John Barnard, D.F.McKenzie, and Maureen Bell (eds.), *The Cambridge History Of The Book in Britain, Volume IV, 1557-1695* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[25] Perhaps the three other most significant contributions to the specific area of this thesis are Robert S. Knapp, *Shakespeare: The Theatre and The Book* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), Jeffrey Knapp, *Shakespeare's Tribe: Church, Nation and Theatre in Renaissance England* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002), and Ann Righter, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1962).

Incremental work on the history of the book has only recently found its place as an essential interdisciplinary space for both the intellectual and anthropological discourse of early and modern culture. The early modern period is of course central within this discourse since it sees the inception of both the printing press and the public theatre; institutions which Stone Peters describes as having 'grown up together'. The tremendous body of work that has contributed to this subject charts the chronological, anthropological, and topographical dissemination of the press: the humanist, religious and political appropriation of printing, and the flow of technology, literacy and polyphonic voices that began to flood through northern Europe from the latter half of the sixteenth century. Jakob Ayer's *Opus Thaeatricum* (1618) sums up the impact of the press: 'For any that disappear or are destroyed in one country or place are easily found again in countless other places, so that in human experience there is nothing more enduring and immortal than books'.[26] Elizabeth Eisenstein, crucially, brought the history of the book into its rightful context with her seminal volume *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (Cambridge, 1979).[27] Eisenstein centralised the role of the printing-press in the development of all aspects of late medieval and early modern culture. However, whilst foregrounding the press as the vantage point at which art, science, theology, politics, self and state met, she also recognises that, within such a melting-pot, no one aspect was exclusive to the other. Since her publication, scholars have variously re-deployed her arguments or struggled to retrieve a more balanced view of the press within the early modern period. Adrian Johns, for example, strongly argues that science, and most particularly Tycho Brahe, enabled the transmission of crafts and cultures which

[26] As quoted by Stone Peters, *Theatre of The Book*, p. 109.
[27] See also her more condensed work, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

then became epitomised in the exchange and ideology of the book.[28] Others have argued that the distinctions engendered by the manifestation of the book, both inherently and explicitly, between an oral and literate culture wrongly distinguish two media that continued to not only operate concomitantly but actually remained synthesised and active (Fox (Oxford, 2000), Ong (Routledge, 2000), Stone Peters (Oxford, 2000), Dillon (Cambridge, 1998)). The contention seems to be whether the press and the book were instruments or effects of the profound social and epistemological transitions that took place in the Renaissance.[29]

The relationship between the Reformation and the printing-press notoriously privileges the printed vernacular word and, in his *Book of Martyrs*, John Foxe famously sets the Pope against the press:

> The Lord began to work for His Church not with sword and target to subdue His exalted adversary, but with printing, writing and reading. How many presses there be in the world, so many block-houses there be against the high castle of St. Angelo, so that either the pope must abolish knowledge and printing or printing must at length must root him out.[30]

Equally, within a more secular context Francis Bacon in *Novum Organum* celebrated 'printing, gunpowder, and the mariner's needle' as the 'three things [that] have changed the whole face and state of things throughout the world'. In *2 Henry VI*, however, Shakespeare has Cade offer a more demotic view on the divisive nature of print and sovereign censorship:

[28] Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1998), Johns explains that 'Tycho has come to personify the role of print in transcending place and rendering natural knowledge universal. He has thus become emblematic of the transformation of local craft into global science', p. 10.
[29] The debate between the book as an agent and an effect of change is equally central to the religious upheavals that were both charted and constructed by the book. The literal and emotional proximity of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* to the vernacular Bible under Elizabeth testifies to a singular and profoundly important instance of the book in practice as both instrument and affect.
[30] As quoted by Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*, p. 151.

> Thou hast most traitorously corrupted the youth of the realm, in erecting a grammar school: and, whereas before, our fathers had no other books but the score and the tally, thou hast caused printing to be used, and contrary to the king, his crown, and dignity, thou hast built a paper-mill (4.7.27-31).[31]

Cade's comment gestures at the profound impact of the press on the peasant or illiterate class, and it is interesting to note that Shakespeare anachronistically articulates Cade's rebellion through an attack on printing.[32] The demographics of literacy become fundamental to any examination of the role and impact of book production in any culture, which in turn creates a wealth of post-modernist discourse on the social distribution and stratification of power and authority.[33] The early modern period had not yet standardised language, and yet had accumulated both signs and words within a value system of inherent representational potential. As the word and the representation of signs came under increasing pressure from both iconoclasm and scepticism, Shakespeare's theatre begins to interrogate the semiotic of the book.

Between the construction of the first public theatre in 1576 and the end of the sixteenth century six theatres were opened in London.[34] It is almost impossible to overestimate the impact and importance of the theatre during this period. Partly as a product of socio-

[31] This line reference is to the Norton edition, which uses the Folio as the control text; based on the Oxford edition, however, it also includes Q material. For ease of reference I have maintained the Norton's type but followed the text and punctuation of the Folio.

[32] There is an awkward contention between the historically despotic Cade and the anti-hero of Shakespeare's play. The characterisation of Cade is ambivalent, so that whilst we recognise the figure as self-aggrandizing and oppressive, the commonwealth of Shakespeare's Cade articulates many social and economic concerns of the latter sixteenth century, which would have found many sympathetic ears in the audience.

[33] Levels of literacy are notoriously difficult to calculate in this period in not only the absence of any information relating to the measurements or proportions of the reading public but also in determining what criteria to use. David Cressy claims that 'Only one type of literacy is directly measurable, the ability or inability to write a signature.... People who formed signatures are counted as literate; those who made marks in default are counted as illiterate', *Society and Culture in Early Modern England* (Hampshire and Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2003), II, p. 2.

[34] James Burbage's 'Theatre', built in 1576, is usually recognised as the first purpose-built public theatre. However, scholars often count the Red Lion (1567), an inn renowned for its public performances, as the first theatre. The six theatres built between 1576-1600, include the Theatre (1576), Curtain (1577), Rose (1587), Swan (1595), Globe (1599), and the Fortune (1600). Two children's companies were built around 1600 at indoor theatres in St Paul's and the Blackfriars, see Janette Dillon, *Theatre, Court and City, 1595-1610: drama and social space in London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 32-3.

political ceremony, partly as an evolution of medieval moralities and classical drama, partly as a transitional arena for the amalgamation of rhetoric and ribaldry, and partly as a response to and reflection of the aspirational and changing imperatives of humanism, the theatre became a powerful place of metamorphoses and potential. The stage was a nexus of the brilliant and the grotesque, of desires and delusions. The playhouse was a place to meet prostitutes, to bait bears, to see the revolutions of the times and the baseless fabric of this vision; it was both a 'conjuring glass' and 'a mirror up to nature'. John Pitcher best describes this hybrid stage as signalling the 'emergence of two histories, one of material objects and the market place ... and the other of an eruption and opening in human consciousness'.[35] Pitcher's description itself exposes the theatre's fusion of the menial and the mesmeric, and, significantly, the commodification of representational pleasure. The phenomena of theatre has been substantially and variously documented through its spatial and architectural nuances (Orgel, (London, 2002), Mullaney (Chicago, 1988)), its iconoclastic and political evolution (O'Connell (Oxford, 2000), Knapp (Chicago, 2002)), its subjective and social resonance (Maus (Chicago, 1995)), its esoteric scope (Yates, (London, 1966; 2001)), and the mechanics of the collaborative space (de Grazia, Stallybrass (*SQ*, 44, 1993)).

Within Elizabethan culture, the power and presence of the theatre suffuses both public and private discourse. Pageants, festivals, and public and religious ceremonies consistently reflect and reinforce the dynamic between art and authority. The dialectic between the written and the performed or iconic word often provided the basis for spectacular public occasions. The procession of Elizabeth through the streets of London the day before her coronation is perhaps the most famous and theatrical synthesis of icon

[35] John Pitcher, 'Literature, the Playhouse and the Public', in *The Cambridge History of the Book, Volume IV, 1557-1695*, eds. John Barnard, D. F. McKenzie, and Maureen Bell (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 2002), 351.

and inscription. Children, dressed as various Virtues, visually supported the scene as did Latin inscriptions which were pinned to parts of the scaffold and verbally translated into the vernacular,[36] and the apotheosis of the ceremony was marked by the offering of the Bible in English:

> But as soon as she had received the book, kissed it, and with both her hands held up the same, and so laid it upon her breast, with great thanks to the city therefore.[37]

The relationship between print and theatre found another expression in the Puritan anti-theatrical tracts of declaimers like Stephen Gosson and Philip Stubbes. Through distribution of pamphlets, and the dialogic debates made possible through print, the moral role of theatre came into contention.[38] For proponents like Thomas Heywood, however, the book became a medium for the defence of theatre, and by virtue of the page return its readers to the stage.[39] Equally, the book was often modelled upon the

---

[36] The text was pinned to a tree: 'And upon the same withered tree were fixed certain tables, wherein were written proper sentences, expressing the causes of the decay of the commonweale .... And upon the same tree also, were fixed certain tables containing sentences which expressed the causes of the flourishing commonweale', *The Quenes Maisties passage through the Citie of London to Westminster the day before her coronacion* (facsimile of the publication on January 23rd, 1559), James M. Osborn (ed.), (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960) p. 47.

[37] Ibid., p. 48. It is also interesting to note the reciprocal relationship between pageant and print, since Bishop John Bale anticipates much of Elizabeth's procession in his play *King John*, as Janette Dillon notes: 'There is a structural affinity, too, between Bale's *King John*, and Elizabeth's coronation pageant: both present the monarch interacting with the figure of *Veritas*/Truth, and this interaction in turn seems to confirm the sincerity and authenticity of the monarch-performer', *Language and Stage in Medieval and Renaissance England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 106. It is also no coincidence that Elizabeth's coronation 'script' is now known to be the work of Richard Mulcaster, one of the most significant contributors to Elizabethan humanism. The relationship between ceremony, stage and the word is developed through *Richard II* in chapter IV.

[38] Almost everything and anything dialogic became facilitated by print: poems were responded to with poems, treatises with treatises, tracts with tracts, and retorts, responses and quibbles were debated and augmented in printed form. In *As You Like It*, Touchstone parodies both the dialogic forum of print and the popular conduct books of the period, exclaiming to Jaques, 'O sir, we quarrel in print, by the book, as you have books for good manners.' (5.4.81-2). Equally, the 'War of The Theatres' exposes the way in which the text and the stage became reciprocal sites for lively, public expression, and as the satiric exchanges took place on stage, the Bishop's Ban of 1598 aimed to cauterise them from the page (see Bruster, *Shakespeare and the Question of Culture*, pp. 67-8).

[39] Heywood capitalised on the metaphorical potential of the stage as world, wherein the spectator could recognise that 'All men have parts, and each man acts his own'; Heywood concludes his paean to the didactic opportunities of the stage by claiming that 'He that denies then Theatres should be,/He may as well deny a whole world to me'. The marginalia to this final couplet reads 'No Theatre No World'. Similarly John Marston claimed of plays that 'the life of these things consists in their action'. There is, of course, a wealth of discourse on the evolving 'author' of the sixteenth century, probably epitomised in the figure of Ben Jonson, whose entrepreneurial drive to publication

structural and representational devices of the theatre; the preface could simulate the prologue and the author could appeal to the imaginative ears and eyes of his audience.[40] One sixteenth-century commentator explains that 'unlike poetry meant for reading, dramatic poetry "joins together with the mind ... the image of things which are represented, and acts upon the senses as if it were the thing itself".[41] Similarly, the metaphoric potential of the symbolic consciousness found its way through the 'world' to both the book and the stage.[42] Whilst the book could offer, at least until the representational crisis of the latter sixteenth century, a tangible exposition of the known, the stage could simulate 'the actions a man might play' and 'the revolutions of the times'.[43] Such metaphoric potential runs through Shakespeare's use of the book of fate

---

within the context of his masques for James I, marked him, unlike Thomas Nashe, for instance, as balancing a self-created marketable identity within the caprice of royal politics. The subject of 'authorship' as it evolves during this period has recently become more central to any discussion of the early modern theatre, particularly through the works of materialist critics such as Stallybrass, Hulme, Barker and de Grazia, and post-structuralists like Elam, Goldberg, Evans and Belsey. The significance of collaboration in play-writing has begun to de-construct any Romantic or post-Romantic notion of the single privileged genius, as it has also centralised the physical properties and values of the mechanics of book and play production. Whilst I recognise the importance and integrity of redressing this balance within early modern discourse, I do not attempt to offer a Marxist or materialist account of the discernable and physical mechanics of the book and its production within Shakespeare's theatre. My discussion is strictly focused on the way in which Shakespeare uses the literal and figurative book on stage, and I am unable to take this discussion into the Elizabethan marketplace for reasons of both space and clarity.

[40] Within this context, the relationship between the book and the stage is superbly chronicled by Julie Stone Peters, who explains the fluctuating relationship between the book and the stage in terms of their appeal to the senses. The Aristotelian privileging of the ear over the eye (the ear functions here as the internal voice of the reader and the eye as something potentially seduced by images and more vulnerable to deception) raises the veracious, cognitive and imaginative value of the book above that of the theatre. However, the fluctuating dialectic between the structures of the theatre and the book provided the potential for manipulating and accommodating levels of representational perspective.

[41] Robortello, as quoted by Stone Peters, *Theatre of The Book*, p. 108.

[42] Dante's *Divine Comedy* is perhaps the first allegorical and emotional fusion of the representational potential of the book. In *Paradiso*, Dante looks down from heaven onto the world: 'In its depth I saw that it contained, bound by love in one volume, that which is scattered in leaves through the universe, substances and accidents and their relations as it fused together in such a way that what I tell of is a simple light.' Dante Alighieri, *The Divine Comedy: Paradiso*, trans. John D. Sinclair (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1939), Canto XXXIII. Eric Auerbach's famous exegesis of the narratives and languages of realism sees that in the *Commedia*, 'More accurately than antique literature was ever able to present it, we are given to seek, in the realm of timeless being, the history of man's inner life and unfolding', *Mimesis: The Representation of reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968), p. 202.

[43] Knapp, in *Shakespeare: The Theatre and The Book*, pursues the cognitive psychology of the self's confrontation with 'the moving image'. For Knapp, the theatre proposes an 'hypothesis', which activates our communication with the 'real': 'A hypothesis, we might say, is a Machiavellian strategy in our war upon the Real; it is the position from which we spring into dialogue with the Other – into that *hypokrisis* from which Greek theatre developed; it is the part we choose – as rationally as we know how – in the social and metaphysical action, the *mythos*, that we see developing. Push further and a hypothesis turns out to be a moving image offered by a hypocrite', p. 140.

or life on stage and the imaginative scope of the Globe theatre as the 'world's stage'. Jonson famously canonised such an image in his comment on the destruction of the Globe by fire in 1613: 'See the World's ruins'.[44] However, it was only after the secularisation of the theatre that 'the image of the world as stage' could become a significant trope. Anne Righter, in *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play*, focuses on the way in which the play-within-play and the metaphor of drama transmogrifies from Pythagoras's prosaic and cognitive metaphor of life to the self-conscious fusion of the practical and the possible on the Elizabethan stage.[45] The trope of the world as both book and theatre reinforces the representational potential and pleasure of such structures and ideas. The developing crisis in representation, the expanding fissure between text and experience, image and word, the re-evaluation of an inherent value system, and an epistemological drive toward expanding the limits of individual endeavour foregrounded both the book and the theatre, in all their socio-political vagaries, as representational paradigms for the self in motion.

Intertextual references, sources and identities are symptomatic of the intellectual and ideological climate through which Shakespeare formulates an idea of the iconic, material or metaphoric book. However, my purpose is not to examine sources nor trace pretexts, since not only is such work extant, but it also pursues a different end. Shakespeare's intellectual and educational integrity is central to his hermeneutic and dramaturgical

[44] As cited by Frances A. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: Pimlico, 1992), p. 350. Yates quotes Jonson in the context of Robert Fludd's Theatre of Memory, which, she claims, is, in both architectural detail and concept probably based on similar designs to the second Globe theatre. In the light of this, the theatre is constructed as a stage upon which not fictions but resemblances and representations are placed. The theatre is the acute repository for the real rather than the fictitious. '"All the World's a stage'. Fludd teaches us to reconsider those familiar words', p. 350.

[45] Anne Righter, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1962), p. 65. Righter explains that the theatre and the play-as-world metaphor developed to enable ideas of illusion a powerful place within the realms of imagined and represented reality: 'This belief was fundamental to the new relationship of actors and audience, and to the effectiveness of the play metaphor upon which the relationship was based', p. 74.

choices, but the use of the book on Shakespeare's stage does not explicitly manifest as either an intertext or source, though traces of those functions are always present. Ovid, and particularly his *Metamorphoses*, features significantly within Shakespeare's theatre, not only as a material object which facilitates the drama, but, perhaps, also as a commonplace book from which Shakespeare retrieves and accommodates language, paradigms, and images that accompany rather than invade the play.[46] Shakespeare's use of Ovid operates on various paratextual levels, which range from serving a poetic allusion or classical pretext to manifesting in support of, and juxtaposition to, the ineffable. The dramatic use of Ovid is significant to Shakespeare's stage since the book materialises as an identifiable text and in direct relationship to the drama. However, although we may claim some certainty as to the texts and pre-texts of Shakespeare's education — his reading of Ovid, Plautus, Plutarch and Holinshed — and though we may trace references or allusions to Horace or Cicero, Chaucer or Greene, only Ovid appears in book form on stage. Understanding what we can of Shakespeare's reading and education is important within the context of analysing the textual and dramatic choices that he makes, but we can no more assume a direct relationship between his schooling and his dramatic books than we can between his sexuality and his sonnets.[47]

The Elizabethan theatre presented a space of social fusion, of aspiration, of the impossible, desirable, plausible, damned and delightful; it devised and accommodated

[46] See Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford: Clarendon press, 1994). Bate explores Shakespeare's 'imitation' of Ovid's writings, as well as his more emblematic association with processes of transformation and poetics, through the contingents of sixteenth-century humanism. Exposing humanist ideas of 'affinity' and 'allusion' Bate signifies different levels of interaction between the text and the imagination: 'an allusion may signal a more far-reaching correspondence, but it may be merely incidental or ornamental; an affinity may be made apparent on the surface of the text, but it may operate at the level of the imagination', p. 190.

[47] The most recent exposition of Shakespeare's education is Robert S. Miola, *Shakespeare's Reading* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), however, most books on Shakespeare's life include some description of his grammar school education. See also Robert Weimann, *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), and Virgil K. Whitaker, *Shakespeare's Use of Learning: An Inquiry into the Growth of his Mind and Art* (San Marino, California: The Huntingdon Library, 1969).

the imagination alongside the brutal and the mundane. The book grew up under the auspices of Christian humanism and corporate endeavour, as well as the classroom, the inns of court, the courtly coteries, the ballads in the barber shop, the doggerel in the street, the pamphlets and publications of everyday interaction; and the plays, protests, processions and politics that came through the press marking, erasing and eliding the 'revolutions of the times'. As the printing-house and the book stalls of St Paul's churchyard flourished so did London's public theatres, the performances at the inns, the pageants and festivals, the executions and trials of a culture that was building an image of itself through fashioning and re-fashioning conditions of communication and representation. On Shakespeare's stage, the book and the theatre find a vantage point through the conjuring glass that shows 'there is a history in all men's lives' and that 'every red-nosed rhymester is an author; every drunken man's dreame is a booke'.[48]

[48] W. Chappell, *Popular Music of the Olden Time; a collection of ancient songs, ballads, and dance tunes, illustrative of the national music of England*, vol. I. (London: Cramer, Beale, & Chappell, 201 Regent Street). Chappell includes this quotation from *Martin Mar-sixtus*, 1592, in reference to the large number of ballads that were printed in the reign of Elizabeth I.

II

'Sad stories chanced in the times of old': the book in performance in *Titus Andronicus* and *Cymbeline.*

When Lavinia, without hands or a tongue, flies after her nephew in pursuit of his books, or Imogen's nurse, turning down the page of Philomel's rape, leaves her mistress to the nightmare of Iachimo's desires, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* enters the playing space with the dramatic impact of a narrative voice. Appearing on stage as a graphic thought or an allusive dream, the book asks the play to 'read the subtle shining secrecies' of 'what obscured in this fair volume lies'.[1] Within the sum of Shakespeare's drama an identifiable material book appears in only two plays, which mark the length of his career, *Titus Andronicus* and *Cymbeline*. In both plays it is Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and the text is the rape of Philomel. Ostensibly *Metamorphoses* fulfils a similar function in both plays, tracing the shadows of the woman's plight in actuality or potential. The book appears at the moment theatre comes into contact with its own limitations, when the stage seems incapable of supporting an audible silence; yet, as Posthumus says:

> Be what it is,
> The action of my life is like it, which
> I'll keep, if but for sympathy.[2]

[1] William Shakespeare, 'The Rape of Lucrece', in *The Narrative Poems,* ed. Maurice Evans (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989), 101; *Romeo and Juliet*, 1.3.87.
[2] William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, ed. J. M. Nosworthy, The Arden Shakespeare, third series (London: Thomas Learning, 2000), V.IV.149-151. All subsequent references, unless otherwise stated, are to this edition. Any deviations from the Folio, including stage directions, will be noted.

Although *Titus Andronicus* is replete with allusions, Aaron making the first to *Metamorphoses* in his anticipation of the rape of Lavinia, the idea of the book first materialises in the context of both sympathy and diversion. Helplessly observing his mutilated and mute daughter Titus declares:

> Lavinia, go with me;
> I'll to thy closet and go read with thee
> Sad stories chanced in the times of old.
> Come, boy, and go read with me; thy sight is young,
> And thou shalt read when mine begin to dazzle.[3]

Titus leaves the stage, with Young Lucius and Lavinia, in search of stories to 'beguile' her 'sorrow'; the next scene opens with such books as they may have found thrown onto the stage as Lavinia frantically pursues her nephew for a volume of such 'sad stories chanced in the times of old'. Before we see the books, however, we are given a sense of how they may be read and yet whilst Titus looks for comfort in art, Lavinia will reveal tragedy in experience. The terrible tension set up between art and experience begins in attitudes toward reading. Once we become aware of how reading will shape the action of the play, the many textual allusions are heavy with the dialectic between nature and art or, as John Marston said, 'How Nature, Art, how Art, doth Nature spill'.[4]

The woods, as both Aaron and Titus's Ovid have emblazoned them, become repeatedly inscribed with renditions of the rape wherein the mouth is the bloodstained hole that is marked by, yet cannot tell, its story. In anticipation

[3] William Shakespeare, *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Jonathan Bate, The Arden Shakespeare, third series (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 3.2.82-86. All references, unless otherwise stated, are to this edition. Any deviations from the Folio, including stage directions, will be noted.

of the events that will unfold in the wood, Aaron declares: 'This is the day of doom for Bassianus, /His Philomel must lose her tongue today' (2.2.42-3). Aaron's emphasis is on the present; 'the day' and 'today' that will witness Lavinia's and Bassianus' ordeal releases Philomel into the active history of their lives, as though she, like the wood 'Patterned by that the poet here describes', is 'By nature' condemned 'for murders and for rapes'. This wood, as it turns out to be 'patterned by the poet', is translated into the mutilated body of Lavinia who, like a tree, has been 'lopped and hewed' 'Of her two branches, those sweet ornaments/Whose circling shadows kings have sought to sleep in' (2.3.18-19). Lavinia becomes supported by the artistic and natural fabric of the paratextual world, as it is understood to exist through *Metamorphoses*; Lavinia appears to animate her own history through the semiotic of the book. Even before Lavinia has discovered her language of the book, however, her body invites inscription. Titus sees his daughter as 'a map of woe, that doth talk in signs' (3.2.12), from which he will learn a new language:

> ... I will learn thy thought.
> In thy dumb action will I be as perfect
> As begging hermits in their holy prayers.
> Thou shalt not sigh, nor hold thy stumps to heaven,
> Nor wink, nor nod, nor kneel, nor make a sign,
> But I of these will wrest an alphabet
> And by still practice learn to know thy meaning (3.2.39-45).

As a 'map of woe' Lavinia's body is a surface drawn through by her distress with lines and proportions that in their physical relation to each other mark

[4] John Marston, *The Scourge of Villainie*, ed. G. B. Harrison (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University press, 1966), Satyre I. *Fronti nulla fidel*, p. 14.

her as something to be deciphered. Her 'signs' imagine the frantic gestures she makes in an attempt to make herself audible — discernable —locating her ordeal and its narrative within the body of her presence. Lavinia's body becomes the book from which Titus will learn to read. Titus charts his process of learning through imitation, he will 'learn' her 'thought' and from that thought he will replicate the dumb language of its communication, rendering Lavinia readable as he determines to read her. Titus's analogy to the 'begging' hermit's prayers re-presents his commitment to Lavinia as one of silent devotion bound by a body and a text. Meaning begins to become enmeshed in a developing relationship between the gesture and the sign, as Titus must learn to re-read the narrative of Lavinia's body. From Lavinia's 'sign' Titus will extrapolate meaning through constant ('still') practise and determine its alphabet. In this way, Titus turns his daughter's silence into the makings of a legible language — an 'alphabet' — through both translation and practice. Ideas of learning — imitation, practice, translation — begin to inform Lavinia's presence on stage even before her pedagogic relationship to Young Lucius is realised.[5] Since no-one can hear Lavinia, reading becomes the central model of signification. The 'alphabet' begins in Lavinia and is put together by those around her dramatically performing the relationship between reader and text, wherein marks and signs are translated through recognition into a common structure of information and response. Yet, we are not asked to 'read' Lavinia in the conventional sense of interpreting the body on stage, wherein movements, asides, intonation or irony reveal dual presence, dissimulation or double meaning; rather, we observe Lavinia for the

[5] The Folio's stage direction cites 'young Lucius' and the text refers to him as 'Boy'; for the sake of

surface and familiar patterns of truth; we must learn, as it were, to read the nature as art. The basic gesture that precedes the knowing world must be transformed by that knowing world into its representational system of signage. Yet, Marcus reminds us that this is a potentially arbitrary process, when he says of Titus: 'He takes false shadows for true substances' (3.2.81). What appears to corroborate readings and sort the substance from the shadow is the book; however, the book itself has become involved in an apparently endless cycle of meaning dependent upon both art and nature.

In the scene that directly precedes the flight of Young Lucius onto the stage carrying and then scattering his pile of school books, Marcus learns to communicate with Titus by recognising the different thought processes that make up their realities. This scene depicts Titus, his hand severed, and his family, of whom Lavinia is tongueless and handless, trying to eat together.[6] During the meal a fly enters the room and sparks off in Titus a violent and emotional struggle between representation and recognition, meaning and action. Titus begins by accusing his brother of incessantly reminding him of their predicament: 'O handle not the theme, to talk of hands, / Lest we remember still that we have none' (3.2.29-30). Soon after, Titus repents and declares:

> Fie, fie, how franticly I square my talk,
> As if we should forget we had no hands
> If Marcus did not name the word of hands (3.2.31-33).

---

syntax I will refer to him as 'Young Lucius'.

[6] This scene was not included in the published play until the 1623 Folio.

Titus recognises that 'the word of hands' bears little or no relationship to his own reality because it no longer signifies simply that part of the body that has been severed from him and Lavinia.[7] The word 'hand' signifies nothing because it does not carry the weight of reality that supports and surrounds his physical and emotional sphere, and, more importantly, it has no power to change that reality. When Marcus kills the fly Titus demands a justification, which exposes this cognitive shift. Marcus explains that he killed the fly because it was 'coal-black' like Aaron, and sharing a nominal quality with Aaron signifies sameness. Here the word 'black', unlike the word 'hand', acquires a real significance that supports the efficacy of the sign. One of the things this scene demonstrates on an intimate and domestic scale is the process of shared cognition as it is made communication. Marcus and Titus recognise their social processes of thought, and it is though this recognition, and not the sign itself, that they learn to communicate. Once Titus has discovered the book, and Marcus the language, a similar process is available to Lavinia. For Lavinia, her thoughts and signs become both constructed and recognised by the book. The book, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, forms and reflects the social process of thought in context.

Within these terms, and indeed much of early modern discourse, the role of the book raises questions as to the relationship between Nature and Art. Central to the re-deployment of the poetic and aesthetic is a decorous balance between reflecting a pre-existing plenitude and articulating that richness in a fluent and full way. Famously, Jonson's preface to the first folio affords

[7] The 'hand' has a particular significance in the context of the written word since the maniscule or hand

Shakespeare such a skill: 'For, though the *Poets* matter, Nature be, / His Art doth giue the fashion'.[8] The right relationship between Nature and Art accepts the sign as though it is destined to reflect and familiarise our processes of both thought and language. The arrival of *Metamorphoses* on stage, and the subsequent reactions to the book, signal Art as having become Nature, and it is the response to that Nature that becomes available as Art.

The fly-killing scene comes to a close as Titus suggests to his daughter that: 'I'll to thy closet and go read with thee / Sad stories chanced in the times of old' (3.2.83-4). Here the book is located as a refuge and an activity in which history will assimilate their relationship and offer comfort. When Young Lucius drops his books and Lavinia frantically searches out pages of Ovid, Titus misinterprets her actions, believing his daughter to be looking for the kind of 'sad stories' he suggested they read together. At this point, Titus stands on the cusp of understanding despite having dedicated himself to learning the language of Lavinia's dumbness, he still observes her within the context of his own apprehensions:

> Some book there is that she desires to see.
> Which is it, girl, of these? Open them, boy.
> [*to Lavinia*][9]
> But thou art deeper read and better skilled:
> Come and take choice of all my library,
> And so beguile thy sorrow till the heavens
> Reveal the damned contriver of this deed (4.1.31-36).

---

with pointing finger was used in both manuscript and book to highlight important passages and paragraph breaks.

[8] Jonson's comment is, of course, tempered with a reminder of mortal imperfection since he appears to want to remind the readers that Shakespeare needed to labour for his art: 'And , that he, / Who casts to write a living line, must sweat'.

[9] SD] *Oxf*

Soon Titus will realise the appalling irony of the books that lie between them, but here, the books and his library lie beyond the bounds of confrontation. The books do not, as yet, enter into the tragedy of their lives. Yet, for Lavinia — and for Young Lucius — they are the very logos of the tragedy itself. Despite her family's commitment to reading Lavinia, even emblematically confronted with the material essence of the very process Titus had earlier described, Marcus cannot decipher her gestures toward the book: 'What means my niece Lavinia by these signs?' (4.1.8). Yet, despite failing to recognise Lavinia's response to the book, Marcus construes his niece textually, reassuring Young Lucius of her love for him through a Roman exemplar of maternal pedagogy:

> Ah, boy, Cornelia never with more care
> Read to her sons than she hath read to thee
> Sweet poetry and Tully's *Orator*
> Canst thou not guess wherefore she plies thee thus? (4.1.12-15).

Yet, whilst Marcus reassures Young Lucius through reading, it is also through reading that the boy fears Lavinia:

> And I have read that Hecuba of Troy
> Ran mad for sorrow. That made me to fear,
> Although, my lord, I know my noble aunt
> Loves me as dear as e'er my mother did,
> And would not but in fury fright my youth,
> Which made me down to throw my books and fly,
> Causeless perhaps (4.1.20-26).

Young Lucius's fear is born of his reading, probably with Lavinia, and rooted in the textual precedent of Hecuba's madness, and it was 'That' image and cognition that made him 'down to throw my books and fly'. Young Lucius's

comment, 'Causeless perhaps', amplifies both the irony and the drama of the book's presence on stage. Had he not made the textual connection, he would not have dropped his books and Lavinia might not have found *her* textual precedent. The 'stories chanced of old' that Titus had promised Lavinia to beguile her sorrow until the gods stepped in are not mere adjuncts to their tragedy but the very signs—or 'alphabet'—themselves.

Young Lucius's frantic entrance in flight from Lavinia would probably position the dropped books centre stage.[10] Learning and books are assimilated and thrown directly into the present world of experience. Young Lucius's analogy to Hecuba is, as he well knows, insufficient. The prosaic distance afforded by literary education cannot prepare him for, or contend with, the immediate world of experience and, strategically, at this point, the books lie between him and Lavinia. History and the book are an inadequate bridge between innocence and experience, art and life, imagination and reality. However, the book seems to support the language of familial relationships. Despite both its generic distance and difference, it precipitates and recognises a way back from trauma and miscommunication. Perhaps because, or in spite, of the book's general accessibility it becomes an emblem of discourse. The book lies upon the stage between three generations of readers all of whom are able to understand each other by virtue of the stories they have read and the book that they see. Marcus offers us a history of Lavinia as pedagogue and, like Titus, synthesises reading and care, books and familial integration. The book provides the way back to communication and the family bonds. During

[10] This is noted in the Arden edition, p. 216, n. 3.

this scene only Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is nominally referred to on stage. However, the presence of a selection of books is important. Despite the sinister allusions to Ovid's tale from the outset, the material presence of his work here is situated within the pedagogic context of experience and expression. The impact of the scene and the importance of the book are supported by Lavinia's choice. If only *Metamorphoses* appeared on stage it would speciously position Lavinia as an allegorical figure playing out a recursive historical continuum in which each character on stage would simply fulfil their role.[11] The books must afford Lavinia a choice, and once that choice has been made we realise in hindsight how the idea of the book has been weaved into the drama, like Philomel's 'tedious sampler'. The story of Philomel surfaces within the play through varying degrees of subtlety; Titus, observing Lavinia's frantic attention to the books, asks Young Lucius 'what book is that she tosseth so?', when he replies, ''tis Ovid's *Metamorphosis*; /My mother gave it me', Marcus then makes a connection based on emotion rather than intellect: 'For love of her that's gone, / Perhaps she culled it from among the rest' (4.1.43-44). Young Lucius's mother is, of course, Lavinia's sister and yet Marcus's 'her' does not explicitly alert us to the dramatic irony of the sibling relationship.[12] However, Marcus points us to a physical and emotional relationship to the book that ushers in the body of Lavinia's sister, as Procne was to Philomel. Despite the title of the book, Lavinia's attention to it and the sisterly relationship, Marcus does not appear to notice the

[11] James Calderwood, in *Shakespearean Metadrama* ((Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971), argues for an allegorical reading of *Titus Andronicus* in which the play 'metadramatically presents us with a rape of language, with the mutilation that the poet's "tongue" suffers when forced to submit to the rude demands of theatre', p. 29.

[12] Technically Young Lucius's mother is Lavinia's sister-in-law, however, in the semantics of Elizabethan relations she would be called her 'sister'.

significance of what he observes. Later, as Titus plans his revenge, he will return to the story of Procne, but here *Metamorphoses* seems to emerge on the stage through different shades of dark and light finding acknowledgement in the textual and physical strains of its own presence. However, the power of the book's performance often lies in the characters' ignorance of its significance and, particularly, the unacknowledged significance of their reading of it. Despite Titus's antithesis between his library and the gods, the book develops an analogous power to the gods in having the capacity to 'Reveal the damned contriver of this deed', as it will also inspire his revenge.[13]

The presence of the book, its textual content and the characters' use and response to it, again return us to the complex synthesis of life and art. Despite the shaping force of *Metamorphoses*, the ways in which the characters treat the text shows the play to resist any sense of predetermination. Although, after the revelation of Lavinia's rape, Titus returns us to the wood he hunted in as 'Patterned by that the poet here describes, / By nature made for murders and rapes' (4.1.57-8), his and Marcus's failure, despite intention, to recognise Lavinia's performance (her signs and props, as it were), as well as the profound irony of some of their observations, prevents the play from becoming a paradigmatic response to Ovid's tale. Equally, Titus's appropriation of Procne's revenge and Marcus's re-organisation of Philomel's 'tedious sampler', acknowledges the role of the tale in informing their cognition rather than dictating their actions. That Marcus and Titus make an

[13] I use the word 'antithesis' in its cognitive rather than rhetorical sense. The relationship between the

explicit decision through the text of Ovid exposes an intellectual distance that is not commensurate with the inexorable nature of predestination.

Lavinia resembles Philomel in her experience of being raped and mutilated, but there their similarities stop. Philomel's communicative potential, 'to sew her mind', sparks in Marcus the desire to enable Lavinia a mode of expression, as it also informed Aaron's attitude to the assault. The book, and Lavinia's frantic plying of its pages, is merely a passage to the potential wresting of an alphabet; it is neither an end nor an answer in itself. As Titus later explains, since the poet 'patterns' Lavinia's experience, it is on the basis of such patterns that Titus will find his own voice. Finding himself a voice and a story towards the end of the play, Titus once again locates Lavinia within the pages of history. Appealing to Saturnius for his knowledge of Virginius's murder of his violated daughter, Titus explains: 'A pattern, precedent, and lively warrant / For me, most wretched, to perform the like' (5.3.43-4).

Like the tale of Philomel, the story of Virginius is manifest within the drama as a 'pattern' or 'precedent' that corresponds to an effective language of shared communication. However, Titus observes such a story as a living testimony to or sanction of the murder he is about to commit of his daughter. The story of Virginius is re-animated by its pertinence to life, and the living itself is what happens when 'pattern', 'precedent' and experience meet in the 'lively warrant' of the reader. The appalling irony of Titus's language is that

---

book and the gods is again exposed in *Cymbeline* when Posthumus's 'tablet' arrives courtesy of

he uses it to sanction the death — not life — of Lavinia, and there is a sense here that the play itself is simply another story, playing out its narrative alongside the recursive texts of Ovid or Livy.[14] In articulating the narratives Titus gives the stories a place in his own world and corroborates the truth of his experience. Yet where story ends and experience begins is not always clear in the play. The ambiguous interplay of the animate 'lively' and the inanimate 'pattern', as well as recourse to the written at times of action, and oratory at times of contemplation, does not make it clear how the play distinguishes *imitatio* from *mimesis*. Paradoxically, however, it is during the book's performance on stage that we are given a moment of clarity as to the ways in which text represents thought. As I have explained, although both Marcus and Young Lucius begin to think textually, observing Lavinia within the context of Cornelia and Hecuba, neither character initially makes the present connection between book and experience. However, once Lavinia has located the tale of Philomel and 'signed' her attachment to it, Marcus re-orientates her within the written word:

> My Lord, look here; look here, Lavinia.
> *He writes his name with his staff,*
> *And guides it with feet and mouth.*[15]
> This sandy plot is plain. Guide, if thou canst,
> This after me. I here have writ my name
> Without the help of any hand at all.

Jupiter.

[14] Grace Starry West, 'Going by the Book: Classical Allusions in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*', *Studies in Philology,* Vol. 79 (1982), goes so far as to claim: 'Whether specifically alluding to an ancient poem or not, they all have the education – and the erudition – to speak as if they were characters in a beautiful book', 71. However, her suggestion that the characters' education supports their eloquent narrative of barbarism is in contest with her later claim: 'As Marcus Andronicus' first speech to Lavinia shows, he is apparently incapable of having a thought that does not either immediately point to some literary precedent or take its inspiration from an event made beautiful by literature....so Marcus looks at the pitiful Lavinia from a poetic distance, then speaks to her and of her in a thoroughly literary way. His obsession with beautiful speech has made him silly and ineffectual', 73. It seems unlikely that 'beautiful speech' can render someone 'silly and ineffectual', whilst at the same time supporting his or her position as a character in 'a beautiful book'.

[15] SD] Q1

> Cursed be that heart that forced us to this shift.
> Write thou, good niece, and here display at last
> What God will have discovered for revenge.
> Heaven guide thy pen to print thy sorrows plain,
> That we may know the traitors and the truth (4.1.68-76).

The presence of the book on stage provides a graphic recognition of the ways in which written language can provide a 'lively warrant' for modes of being. Marcus continues to deploy Lavinia through the written word, 'Without the help of any hand at all', and, as he marks the sand with his mouth and staff, the natural and the textual world meet as a turning point of recognition. Some ten years later in *Hamlet*, Shakespeare would develop the relationship between nature and art under the conditions of extremity, but here, as 'Cursed be the heart that forced us to this shift', Marcus extends the presence of the book for Lavinia to write and reveal not only 'What God will have discovered for revenge', but the 'truth' as it becomes available in temporal terms. The suggestive relationship between the gods and the written word is harnessed by the notion of truth. Despite Titus's original distinction between his library as a refuge from sorrow and the gods as the effective revealers of the 'damned deed', Lavinia's response to *Metamorphoses*, Marcus's extension of the written to the sandy plot, and, later, Titus's injunctions to the gods through writing: 'Of my word, I have written to the effect:/There's not a god left unsolicited' (4.3.60-61), all bring the written into play under the auspice of a celestial truth.[16] However, the book is also distinguished by its pedagogic context, carried by the young pupil, Lucius, and recognised by his 'teacher', Lavinia. The scene in which Lucius flies across the stage dropping his books

[16] The Andronicis, however, only sanction this relationship between the written, the gods and the truth, as Tamora writes 'a fatal writ', outlining 'the complot of this timeless tragedy' to falsely implicate Quintus and Martinus in the murder of Bassianus.

is the child's most significant role within the entire play, and there is a sense in which he is simply a vehicle for the books rather than the other way around.[17] In the light of this we begin to see how the book performs, and how its material presence and voices of the past share the stage with the Andronici's. What we learn from the book, however, is how to translate passive art into active nature. Equally, however, ideas of imitation remain in the shadows of the play, so that as the poet patterned the woods, Chiron and Demetrius patterned Ovid, Lavinia patterns Marcus, and Titus will pattern Procne and Virginius. Grace Starry West, however, sees the play's juxtaposition of 'education' and 'barbarism' as confounding the essence of humanism or the right moral virtues of teaching:

> … Shakespeare has his former schoolboys, Chiron and Demetrius, use Ovid as a manual for successful crime. They have learned from Tereus' mistake as reported by the source and have cut off their victim's hands in addition to her tongue. Their brutal understanding and its pitiful results certainly ought to make us pause, those of us at least who believe education and learning always make men better, more civilized, and, ultimately, wise. These Goths are as civilised and as humane as Roman letters can make them. Yet their learning does not lead to wisdom; it only enables them to add refinement to their barbarism.[18]

Although Starry West maintains that 'Shakespeare's characters do learn from Ovid's book; but they learn how to be evil, not good', she does not seem to take it into account that the book in *Titus*, including its allusions, accompanies rather than defines the tragedies. The play's references to the narrative acknowledge the efficacy of a shared cognition; the book is a short cut to action because it locates a pre-history in the lines between description, event and effect. Aaron's anticipation of the rape — 'Philomel must lose her tongue today' (2.2.43) — or Titus's banquet reflect the play's events within

[17] Young Lucius also appears in the 'fly-killing' scene and the play's close, in both instances he has only one, brief speech.

the context of a linear narrative. The book is effective since it acknowledges occurrences outside of the confines of the present moment but does not create them. For instance, when Aaron guides Tamora's sons to the rape of Lavinia, he describes the decorum of the wood:

> The emperor's court is like the house of Fame,
> The palace full of tongues, of eyes and ears;
> The woods are ruthless, dreadful, deaf and dull:
> There speak and strike, brave boys, and take your turns (1.1.626-629).

The woods shade the boys 'from heaven's eye', and, in contrast to the court, keep their secret. If Aaron devises Lavinia's ordeal from his reading of Ovid, Chiron and Demetrius learn from Aaron, who in 'improving' on the poet with the device of severing Lavinia's hands, translates rather than replicates the story. Equally, it is only in hindsight that Titus recognises these woods as made for 'murders and for rapes', 'patterned' by 'the poet', but made, as indeed Aaron observes, 'by nature'. The book affords a language that accrues its power only when it is applied outside of its textual confines. Titus recognises the power of the book when Lavinia holds a version of her tale in her stumps; what ultimately becomes significant is the way in which they learn to communicate through a shared reality, not the narrative itself. If, as Starry West believes, education precipitates the tragedies, it also redresses them. The moment when Lavinia finds Ovid's book amongst Young Lucius's pile is a moment of profound dramatic relief, since the textual allusions that have hitherto supported the play are physically manifest as a source for change. The book is an outlet for human suffering because, irrespective of voice or tense, it brings both order and expression to trauma and revenge.

---

[18] Grace Starry West, 'Going by the Book: Classical Allusions in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*',

Whether it is the dumbness of mutilation, or 'grief' 'like an oven stopped', *Metamorphoses* re-engages the characters in an effective awareness of their own condition; how far the book dictates that condition is dependent upon how we are guided through their processes of reading.

Yet, how far the graphic text supports the endurance of human history is to some extent complicated by the very nature of Ovid's text in representing change and the metamorphic or even metaphorical relationship between story and event. On the one hand, the written word is manifest as the pre-history of experience, whether Lavinia may 'beguile' her 'sorrow' in 'sad stories chanced in the times of old' or tell her story in the tragic tale of Philomel. On the other, the written word enables transformation, locating the names of the rapists or outlining the 'complot' of their nemesis. The distinction between the book and the written word is that the book provides the dramatic moment of anagnorisis, representing 'story' as a point of mutual cognition beyond the requisites of speech or time. Although Titus had suggested that the book might play this role, until Lavinia makes contact with Ovid, he had not acknowledged the 'lively warrant' of its text.

When Tamora and her two sons, disguised as Revenge, Rapine and Murder, seek Titus, they find him in his study, bearing 'papers':

> Who doth molest my contemplation?
> Is it your trick to make me ope the door,
> That so my sad decrees may fly away
> And all my study be to no effect?
> You are deceived, for what I mean to do
> See here in bloody lines I have set down,

Studies in Philology, Vol. 79 (1982), 72.

And what is written shall be executed (5.2.9-15).

In 'contemplation' and 'effect' or 'executed', Titus exposes his right application of a humanist imperative, yet what marks this scene in performance is its heightened attention to theatre. Replete with dissimulation, Tamora and her sons dressed for destruction and Titus's apparent acceptance of their roles, the scene presents a mini-performance, a play both on the emblems of action, Revenge, Murder, Rape, and the inexorable tides of narrative, 'what is written', that work both alongside and against the visual events. Titus's 'bloody lines', set down as he studies in contemplation, probably turn out to be the designs for his vengeful banquet, and, as such, come back into contact with *Metamorphoses*: 'For worse than Philomel you used my daughter, /So worse than Progne I will be revenged' (5.3.194-5). Titus, like Aaron, improves on art in devising something 'worse' than Ovid had recounted. In extending the boundaries of Ovid's tale, Titus claims the moment and activity as his own as he writes the 'bloody lines' and determines that 'what is written shall be executed' he devises his own narrative. Yet, the allusion to Ovid's tale engages the audience with theories of reading; we understand Titus's action in terms of revenge, but, perhaps more significantly, hear him respond to the narrative as potential for action. Perhaps Titus has come so much to believe in the power of the written word to inform history that not only shall what is written be executed but who is written shall be executed too. In simply writing the denouement to Lavinia's tragic tale, Titus goes some way to fulfilling, or 'decreeing', its substance.

Titus appears to develop this belief in the written word after Lavinia's performance with the book; seeing Lavinia's revelation in the sand, he exclaims that 'The angry northern wind'

> Will blow these sands like Sibyl's leaves abroad,
> And where's our lesson then? (4.1.105-6).

Titus needs to transform the ephemeral lines upon the sand into something graphic and indelible:

> Let alone,
> And come, I will go get a leaf of brass
> And with a gad of steel will write these words,
> And lay it by (4.1.101-4).

Where reading provided the window into Lavinia's story, Titus understands inscription as an expression of effective reality; something that, like his 'bloody lines', will render the 'lesson' permanent.[19] However, despite the proliferation of the written in *Titus*, within the play-world the characters assume an intimate, isolated or merely allusive relationship to their written material. When Titus encourages his daughter to explore Ovid's text: 'Give signs, sweet girl — for here are none but friends — ' (4.1.61), he does so within the private context of intimate relations, or when Aaron refers to the terrible dark wood in which Tamora's sons will attack Lavinia, all is shielded

[19] The word 'lesson' here is signifies understanding, communication and the written information made accessible rather than the more modern, punitive sense.

'from heaven's eye', including the allusion. When Titus sends Chiron and Demetrius 'a verse on Horace', Aaron mordantly observes:[20]

> The old man hath found their guilt,
> And sends them weapons wrapped about with lines
> That wound beyond their feeling to the quick (4.2.26-8).

Just as Titus protected his 'bloody lines' from the eyes of his visitors, or sends his missives to the gods, 'Sweet scrolls to fly about the streets of Rome' (4.416), text and textual allusions do not fully acknowledge a consensual awareness of the play-world until the play's final scene and, even here, Saturninus responds with some confusion as to Titus's point.

Titus extracts his own history from that of Procne and Virginius. He sets his world against the written word, for 'more than that tongue that more hath more expressed', and, in doing so, such books become the 'eloquence and dumb presagers of ... [his] speaking breast' (Sonnet 23). Titus has responded to the rape of Lavinia with a quotation from the same play through which Demetrius had anticipated it.[21] The text, whether Ovidian or Senecan, remains the locus for the characters in this scene but like Titus's response to the fly and Aaron, he must learn how to be effective amidst 'false shadows ... [and] true substances' (3.2.81). Before Titus engages with Lavinia and the book, he denies the telling of tales, through a textual allusion, which reflect life: 'Ah, wherefore dost thou urge the name of hands / To bid Aeneas tell the tale twice o'er / How Troy was burnt and he made miserable?' (3.2.26-28).

[20] SD] *aside* Johnson.

Titus makes a distinction between 'Sad stories chanced in the times of old', 'some pleasing tale' and those which 'handle ... the theme' (3.2.84, 47, 29), rejecting the latter for reminding him of his grief. When the book surfaces, however, to 'wrest an alphabet' from the speechless Lavinia, order a pattern for the chaos of their condition, or anticipate resolution and justify revenge, the written word and its precedent offer an effective means of relief that does not teach the Romans evil but recognises their experience of it. In *The Rape of Lucrece*, Tarquin tells us that 'Thoughts are but dreams till their effects be tried' (353),[22] and, in this way, books are just 'thoughts' until they represent a 'lively warrant' for life. *Titus Andronicus* is replete with ideas of learning, yet ultimately what the play engages in is processes of reading and mis-reading. In re-deploying and imaging the book, the play performs ways in which we assimilate the written when it comes into contest with the real. However, to some extent, recourse to quotation or textual parallel is conventional in tragedy. In Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*, Hieronimo, grief stricken and desperate for the revenge of his son's murder, enters reading a book. The book is Seneca's *Agamemnon* and during his frantic soliloquy he quotes, in Latin, justifications and inspirations to enact his bloody revenge. The point of Hieronimo's book is that it turns him away from Christian patience and trust in divine vengeance to active personal revenge. Hieronimo appears not to have sought the book for this purpose, but alights on its precepts accidentally, even though he holds it in his hand. Previously, Hieronimo had expressed the

[21] Demetrius, in his anticipation of the act in I.1.635, quotes from *Hippolytus*; Titus 'reacts to the discovery of it with a quotation from the same play', Bate, Arden Shakespeare, p. 216, n. 81-2.
[22] William Shakespeare, *The Narrative Poems*, ed. Maurice Evans (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989). All references are to this edition.

agony of silence forced upon him and his quest for justice by an infallible hierarchy:

> I find the place impregnable; and they
> Resist my woes, and give my words no way (3.7.17-18).[23]

The book inspires him to revenge and releases him from silence because it recognises a version of giving his words a 'way' without resistance.

Yet, as Hieronimo finds revenge in the Old Testament and Titus infanticide in Livy, or as Lavinia's ordeal is suggested, but not defined, by Ovid, we realise the profound limitations of the texts themselves. In recognising the lively warrant of history we must also recognise its inadequacies. Francis Bacon, in his approach to the intellectual development of the self, advises a rational objectivity in relation to either books or experience, in order to understand and interact with the world.

> Neither can the experience of one man's life furnish examples and precedents for the events of one man's life: for as it happeneth sometimes that the grandchild or other descendent resembleth the ancestor more than the son; so many times occurrences of present times may sort better with ancient examples than those of the later or immediate times.[24]

And equally 'ancient examples' may resemble experience but they cannot respond to it. 'Examples', 'ancient' or of 'the later or immediate times' furnish the reader with a network of communication through which he or she can move. This 'network of communication', as Vološinov claims,

---

[23] Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. J. R. Mulryne (London: A & C Black, 1989).
[24] Vickers (ed.), *Francis Bacon: A Critical Edition of the Major Works*, p. 128.

humanises, 'since one cannot exist outside the network(s) of communication and remain human'.[25] The book re-presents networks of communication when relationships become strained or subject to confusion. Lavinia, through her mutilation and rape, is rendered socially and culturally inhuman; bound by a society where revenge can, to some extent, imitate justice she can neither communicate her ordeal nor kill herself. The book proffers its pages as a 'network of communication' wherein those choices — revenge or suicide — can be restored. Predicated on humanism the book humanises; yet not in terms of signifying sapience but, rather, as a way to transform silence, through the shared voice of literature, into something familiar and therefore sympathetic. In *Cymbeline*, the 'sympathy' that Posthumus observes in Jupiter's tablet might be expanded in terms of 'a (real or supposed) affinity between certain things, by virtue of which they are similarly or correspondingly affected by the same influence'.[26] The 'same influence' may recognise Warwick's injunction to Henry IV, that 'There is a history in all men's lives', and the nature of the book to reflect experience, story or even a version of the self, as Montaigne declares, 'my book and I go hand in hand together, and keep one apace', acknowledges a corresponding force between the text and the reader.[27] Yet, where, as in *Titus*, the text is realised in the performance of the action, through allusion or imitation, in *Cymbeline* the material of the books is sustained in the realms of the imagination or illusion. Despite existing in the hinterland of the performable, however, both books, Imogen's *Metamorphoses* and Jupiter's tablet, mark decisive turning points

[25] James R. Siemon, *Word Against Word: Shakespearean Utterance* (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press), p. 25.
[26] *OED*, 1.a.
[27] Montaigne, *Essays*, p. 237.

— crudely, from comedy to tragedy, and from tragedy to comedy — in the play's action.

One of the first things we may notice about Shakespeare's books on stage is that they often appear in the hands of women.[28] In examining the dramatic presence of the book Imogen and Lavinia are Shakespeare's most significant 'readers', yet the book also appears strategically in the hands of Bianca (*The Shrew*), and Ophelia (*Hamlet*). Both Lavinia and Imogen read Ovid's *Metamorphoses* at a turning point in the play's action. Yet, whilst *Titus Andronicus* may explore action through the precedent of story, *Cymbeline* looks behind the book in its exploration of the imagination and theatre. In the context of Imogen's scene, the book and textual allusions function, to some extent, on the same level as a soliloquy or an aside, providing the space for confessional or isolated moments to take shape outside of the immediate action. In contrast to *Titus*, where we notice the book's role in unifying shared objectives, in *Cymbeline* both Imogen and Posthumus's books appear at moments of intense privacy or isolation; strange intruders, Iachimo or the Leonati ghosts, however, complicate the relationship between the book and isolation.

We are taken into Imogen's bedroom through the wager between Posthumus and Iachimo that sets her virtue at the price of her bracelet. Iachimo's duplicitous means of gaining access to her privacy creates a dual sense of

[28] The main exceptions to this are Hamlet and Henry VI, and exclude certain ambivalent references to the Book of Common Prayer which may or may not be put into the hands of various characters according to the director's discretion. References to 'reading' also occur in relation to the characters of Richard III, Brutus, Benedict and Ulysses.

reality wherein we move from one perspective to another in the material and emotional construction of the scene. The scene begins as Imogen 'enter[s]' 'in her bed'. She has been reading for 'three hours' and, as it is 'almost midnight', asks her lady, Helen, to 'fold down the leaf where I have left'. Imogen asks for the taper to remain alight and falls asleep. Within the first few lines of the scene Imogen has been caught between her own story, her reading, and Iachimo's, who narrates the action. However, at this point, we only become aware of Imogen's plight through the allusions of Iachimo's whispers. As Imogen falls asleep Iachimo emerges from the trunk. At this point we know only that Imogen is reading a 'book' and it is Iachimo who immediately, and yet intertextually, takes up the narrative by way of 'Our Tarquin'. A little later we will discover that, since Imogen is reading *Metamorphoses* and that her leaf is turned down at the tale of Philomel, she and Iachimo are 'reading' similar narratives within different 'books'. Yet, significantly, the book lies beside the sleeping body of Imogen, imaginatively and dramatically suspending her history within the pages of Iachimo's active dreams and her passive nightmare. For Iachimo, however, the parallel tale of Tarquin and Lucrece emanates from an independent desire which appears to emerge almost unconsciously.

As Iachimo surfaces from the trunk he observes how 'Our Tarquin thus / Did softly press the rushes' (II.II.12-13), noticing Tarquin in the hushed fall of his own feet.[29] Or, a little later in his speech, when Iachimo sees the

[29] Interestingly, Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor see the trunk in this scene as 'supply[ing] a potent visual image of his [Iachimo's] ascent from and descent into "hell"'. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor, with John Jowett and William Montgomery (eds.), *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 605.

incriminating mole on Imogen's breast and declares: 'this secret / Will force him think I have pick'd the lock, and ta'en / The treasure of her honour' (II.II.40-42) he finds a similar analogy to Tarquin's extended assault in his very approach to Lucrece's bedchamber where 'his guilty hand plucked up the latch' (358).[30] The seething mass of Tarquin's desire, ambition and determination that sets *The Rape of Lucrece* to a heart rhythm is condensed to a mere allusion, ironically lost through the single-perspective of Iachimo, who, failing to harness the potential of his own references or Imogen's reading, very nearly lets the entire drama of this scene slip through his speech. Yet, when Iachimo first meets Imogen, we find traces of Shakespeare's Tarquin in his response. Attempting to discern the nature of 'admiration' through the 'eye', 'judgement', or the 'appetite' Iachimo declares:

> Sluttery, to such neat excellence oppos'd,
> Should make desire vomit emptiness,
> Not so allur'd to feed (I.VII.44-6).

Whilst after the rape of Lucrece we are told:

> Drunken Desire must vomit his receipt
> Ere he can see his own abomination (703-4).

The power and impulse of desire are expressed in the physical force and profound bodily reaction of vomiting, which shocks our senses into an awareness of the moral dialectic between compulsion and revulsion. Although Iachimo appears to transfer his desire for Imogen into an

[30] William Shakespeare, *The Narrative Poems*, ed. Maurice Evans (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989).

apocryphal tale of Posthumus's lust, and although he only symbolically assaults her virtue in the removal of the bracelet, the allusive glances to Tereus and Tarquin are suggestive of an attack that is construed textually. Yet, as John Kerrigan observes, the language of the book or text often works in *The Rape of Lucrece* as a gloss for sexual innocence or experience; noting the following verse, Kerrigan explains: 'If Tarquin misreads, Lucrece fails to interpret. Innocence makes her illiterate, incapable of discerning Sextus' intent':[31]

> But she that never coped with stranger eyes
> Could pick no meaning from their parling looks,
> Nor read the subtle shining secrecies
> Writ in the glassy margents of such books (99-102).

Later, however, Lucrece understands her rape as illuminated and written for all, even the illiterate, to read:

> The light will show charactered in my brow
> The story of sweet chastity's decay,
> The impious breach of holy wedlock vow;
> Yea, the illiterate that know not how
>   To cipher what is writ in learnèd books
>   Will quote my loathsome trespass in my looks (807-812).

Even as she could not read, Lucrece will be read, and the book draws both the innocent and the abused into its semantic field. The book as a signifier of experience, or 'learning' in its most perverse sense, flanks Imogen's sleeping body in textual allusion and material presence.

[31] John Kerrigan, 'Keats and Lucrece', *Shakespeare Survey 41* (1989), 107.

Imogen's direction to the book before she sleeps may enable the allusive fabric of Iachimo's thoughts to emerge, and those thoughts, though they may be 'but dreams till their effects be tried' (353), hang about the presence of the book with profound dramatic potential. The dynamic between the written and the dramatic word is to some extent confused in the juxtaposition of 'forms'; whilst Imogen's book appears in material form on stage, Iachimo's 'text', the tale of *The Rape of Lucrece*, is brought, through ecphrasis, into the room. The way Lucrece's hair plays about her pillow as she breathes or Tarquin's 'drumming heart' and 'flaming torch' amplifies the visual drama of Shakespeare's poem; we are told how Tarquin, having entered Lucrece's bedchamber with 'new ambition bred', responds: 'What could he see but mightily he noted? / What did he note but strongly he desired?' (414-415). Seeing, noting and desiring become symbiotic activities, and noting, Tarquin's capture and retention of certain images, forms the compulsive link between perception and action. The external, visual image and the internal, mental image are supported by the word 'note' as if the eye and imagination respond to a single linear narrative. 'Note', however, carries a double meaning here, suggesting both record and distinguishing feature; Iachimo traces the word though both meanings:

> But my design.
> To note the chamber: I will write all down:
> Such, and such pictures: there the window, such
> Th' adornment of her bed; the arras, figures,
> Why, such, and such; and the contents o' th' story.
> Ah, but some natural notes about her body
> Above ten thousand meaner moveables
> Would testify, t' enrich mine inventory (II.II.23-30).

Iachimo's semantic shift adumbrates one of the ways in which this scene asks us to register the dynamic between the visual and the written. 'The contents of th' story' could be the story he will tell Posthumus, the tale of the tapestry he later mentions, the visual narrative he will construct from the contents of the room or Imogen's book and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Although Iachimo does not create a particularly detailed picture, the juxtapositions of writing, note, story and body, alongside his own allusion to Tarquin, explores his experience through a synthesis of text and image that opens the dramatic space to the inference of Imogen's reading:

> She hath been reading late,
> The tale of Tereus, here the leaf's turn'd down
> Where Philomel gave up. I have enough (II.II.44-46).

Yet just before Iachimo picks up Imogen's book, which of course he must do to notice both the contents and the folded leaf, he suddenly decides

> No more: to what end?
> Why should I write this down, that's riveted,
> Screw'd to my memory? (II.II.42-44).

Having seen the 'voucher' of Imogen's mole, Iachimo rejects the written in favour of his memory, taking the 'note' of her body as the central loci of his mnemonic storehouse. His observation of *Metamorphoses* is the last observation he makes, and since he has gleaned enough —'No more: to what end?' — it appears to play no part in the configuration of Iachimo's picture or mental story. Although he must at least handle the book to discover its turned down page, and must at least read some part of it to register 'the tale of Tereus', his reference seems both in passing and dismissive. Yet 'the tale of

Tereus', like that of Tarquin, is central to the dramatic potential of the scene as it ushers in both voices and shadows to lurk between the inanimate body of Imogen and the, at times banal, narrative of Iachimo's whispers.

In the symbolic construction of good and evil, light and dark often become signifiers of a moral fabric. In *Lucrece*, the darkness contained by closed eyes supports the innocence of not seeing, and in not seeing, the eyes are closed to the sentience of evil. When Tarquin enters Lucrece's chamber, her virtue shines through the dark of her shrouded room:

> Even so, the curtain drawn, his eyes begun
> To wink, being blinded with a greater light.
> Whether it is that she reflects so bright
> That dazzleth them, or else some shame supposed,
> But blind they are, and keep themselves enclosed (374-78).

As Tarquin is briefly 'blinded' by Lucrece, he is kept from the sin of his own desires as well as the vision that inspires them:

> O, had they in that darksome prison died,
> That they had seen the period of their ill!
> . . . .
> But they must ope, this blessèd league to kill;
> And holy-thoughted Lucrece to their sight
> Must sell her joy, her life, her world's delight (379-80; 383-5).

Contrary to our expectations, darkness provides the moral relief from sin, since sin is predicated on seeing. The gloaming of Imogen's bedchamber suspends her narrative between the light and dark of Iachimo's presence, just as Imogen's closed eyes — if only Tarquin's had remained so — protect her from the violation of his presence. As the light dawns, 'Swift, swift, you dragons of the night, that dawning /May bare the raven's eye!' (II.II.48-9),

Imogen has been dramatically suspended between four narratives, her own and Iachimo's and Tereus's and Tarquin's, which are symbolically realised through the scene's attention to story, writing, the book and intertext. The scene is short and its significance relies heavily, as indeed does much of the play, on its iconic gestures to the larger effect. This scene marks a turning point in the play, which we might crudely construe as from 'comedy' to 'tragedy', releasing Imogen into a world of dissimulation, murder, violence and exile, and a world in which she quickly and unequivocally rejects the written word.

> To write, and read
> Be henceforth treacherous (IV.II.316-7).

Imogen, here, is specifically referring to the letters that Pisanio gave her establishing the assignation at Milford Haven. But where in *Titus* the written, however misconceived, always works toward the definitive execution of action, in *Cymbeline* written words are often displaced, ineffective, overwritten or merely forgotten. Pisanio does not carry out Posthumus's injunction to murder his wife, and Imogen wakes up next to the headless body of her Cloten believing herself to have been betrayed by her friend. The book in Imogen's bedchamber adumbrates the possible and articulates the imagination; it neither foretells nor concludes since it remains a passive accessory to the scene. Despite having read for three hours, Imogen never actually reaches the terrible moment of Philomel's violation, and despite Iachimo's careful rendition of the room, his artful mnemonics, loci and attention to detail, he never mentions the book again. *Metamorphoses*

amplified and contextualised the recesses of Iachimo's fantasy but played no narrative or physical role in the evolution of their ultimate realities. Neither character takes up the book; whilst Imogen puts it down, Iachimo merely observes its presence. Since Iachimo communicates his desire through Tarquin rather than Tereus, and since Imogen is unaware of her threat, the book plays its part for the audience. The book is the sign to which the dramatic depth of the scene is referred but not realised.[32] For the moment it was on stage the book took Iachimo's language into the level of Imogen's dreams. Once he leaves such dreams and such pages dissolve into thin air. Much like the play-within-the-play the presence of the book serves to expose and image the processes through which we assume the real. The heavy shadows of *Metamorphoses* and the tale of Philomel signify what did not happen to Imogen rather than what did. However, despite Iachimo's departure at the notice of 'where Philomel gave up', the tale is not over; the imaginative assault on Imogen almost reaches its experiential conclusion in Cloten's intention to rape her dressed as Posthumus: 'With that suit upon my back, will I ravish her' (III.V.138-9). Cloten is, of course, apprehended and murdered by an irate Guiderius before he can get to Imogen, but the threat to her virtue and life, posed by the allusions to *Lucrece* and the visible presence of *Metamorphoses*, do not disappear with the close of the scene or its 'books'. Rather, Iachimo unleashes a devastating narrative that gathers momentum and profound consequences, until Posthumus, imprisoned and sentenced to death, falls asleep, and, like his wife, wakes up next to a book.

[32] Despite the significance of the book in this scene, in most modern performances *Metamorphoses* is barely visible on stage and almost all the audience members I asked have no memory of the book at all. I suspect that this is largely a result of our relative unfamiliarity with Ovid and the significance of *Metamorphoses* within this scene.

When all seems lost to Posthumus – he has been captured and fettered awaiting death, wrongfully ordered the murder of his wife and lost his faithful servant – he is brought onto the stage between two gaolers. Shortly after their departure, Posthumus sleeps during which time the ghosts of his dead family appear. At first Posthumus wakes from his dream/vision to find 'nothing' (V.IV.129), yet reflecting on that nothing he realises that in such a dream he is blessed:

> But, alas, I swerve:
> Many dream not to find, neither deserve,
> And yet are steep'd in favours; so am I,
> That have this golden chance, and know not why (V.IV.129-133).

Posthumus knows it was more than a dream — 'What fairies haunt this ground?' — and in turning from 'nothing' to 'this golden chance' he sees the book: [33]

> A book? O rare one,
> Be not, as is our fangled world, a garment
> Nobler than it covers (V.IV.133-5).

His observation of the book marks the turning point from the dream to the present as well as being a vestige of the 'reality' of both; the book bridges the

[33] The inscription that Jupiter lays on Posthumus's breast is in fact only a short paragraph long and later Posthumus refers to it as a 'label', thus in strictly semantic terms it is not a 'book' (given that a book is a 'collection of sheets of paper fastened together'). It does, however, have a 'cover', which suggests something more than a single sheet. My inquiry is based upon Shakespeare's use of the word 'book' and how and when that word is manifest in reference to a material object. Since Posthumus initially recognises Jupiter's tablet as 'a book', I have taken the word to signify something more than a sheet of paper. Within this context it is interesting to note that the word 'book' can signify the same as a 'tablet' or a 'label'. I suggest that the idea of the book is employed since it signifies something greater,

space between those two states and physically testifies to a relationship between them. The language of Posthumus's response directs our attention to ways in which the book might appear; in order for Posthumus to express the hope that this book, unlike 'our fangled world', may be as good as it seems we may assume the book to be visually exciting. The attention to 'fangled', 'garment' and 'cover' suggests a material quality of some decoration. On the other hand, however, it may be the sheer presence of the book and the arresting circumstances through which it appears that lead Posthumus to approach it with a mixture of suspicion and excitement. However the book may be theatrically presented it harbours a dramatic significance in its very essence. Like Imogen's book, however, not only does it accompany Posthumus's sleep but it remains in the hinterland of his proper awareness. He, like Shakespeare's Lucrece, is figuratively illiterate, yet where Lucrece's illiteracy is attached to her innocence, Posthumus's is a product of his ignorance. As Posthumus reads he also fails to read, returning to the quality of the dream for its support of irrational construction: ''Tis still a dream: or else such stuff as madmen / Tongue, and brain not;' (V.IV.146-7). Yet Posthumus is right to find refuge in his dream and its sense in senselessness, for it is at this point and during this scene that the book signifies anagnorisis.

Posthumus's use of the word 'rare', combined with the strange synthesis of dream and vision, recalls 'Bottom's dream'. When, in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Bottom wakes from the caresses of a drugged Titania he declares: 'I have had a most rare vision. I have had a dream past the wit of man to say

---

inscrutable or even recondite in the arms of Jupiter than a single sheet. Equally, a 'tablet' might conjure

what dream it was' (IV.I. 203-4). Bottom cannot understand his dream or vision and, like Posthumus's, his experience both is and is not. Whilst Jupiter's tablet and the ghosts' verse adumbrate things past and things to come, Bottom's rare vision signifies a confusion of the play-world's social order and sensory reality, which although is ultimately rejected, celebrates the play's attention to perception. However, both uses of the word seem to sign a sensory distortion, but one that needs to be taken seriously. Bottom's admission that he can neither understand nor describe his experience suggests both his acceptance and the significance of what has occurred: 'The eye of man hath not heard, the ear of man hath not seen, man's hand is not able to taste, his tongue to conceive, nor his heart to report what my dream was' (IV.I.204-207). Although a moment of comedy, Bottom's synesthesia also reflects the interference of the fairy or cosmic world, as the faculties of man are disturbed by unearthly conditions. The kind of madness Bottom describes as he wrenches our senses from their proper place is similar to Posthumus's appraisal of his own experience having read Jupiter's book:

> 'Tis still a dream: or else such stuff as madmen
> Tongue, and brain not: either both, or nothing,
> Or senseless speaking, or a speaking such
> As sense cannot untie. Be what it is,
> The action of my life is like it, which I'll keep,
> If but for sympathy (V.IV.146-151).

Jupiter's text, although indecipherable to Posthumus, offers a possible narrative of resolution with which the audience is already familiar; we know that the 'lopped branches' of Cymbeline in the shape of Guiderius and

---

an image of something in stone, marble or even metal, but as Posthumus carries about him for the rest of the play we must assume it is reasonably, and discretely, portable.

Arviragus have survived and that the 'lion's whelp', Posthumus, shall embrace Imogen, the 'tender air'. Posthumus, however, finds no meaning in the words themselves but only in their strange configuration, and even though more 'like a dream than an assurance', he finds the book sympathetic, since in impression it resembles the 'action' of his life. Yet, Posthumus takes this book and its 'sympathy' as a valediction since he believes he is about to die. Where for the audience Jupiter's book provides a vision of relief and resolution, for Posthumus it is simply a talisman that affords him some comfort in a 'sense' he 'cannot untie'.

Like Lavinia's *Metamorphoses*, Posthumus's book is a way back into the play-world; yet, unlike Lavinia, Posthumus cannot appropriate the text for its potential relief. The significance of the book is ironically echoed in the language of the gaoler. Since Posthumus had decided to 'keep' the book 'if but for sympathy', he is presumably holding it in some way (although his 'shanks and wrists' are 'fetter'd') when the gaoler, talking of the great acquitter that is death, says: 'Your neck, sir, is pen, book, and counters; so the acquaintance follows' (V.IV.170-172). Although both the language and sentiment is that of book-keeping or accounting, the gaoler's attention to sleep ('but a man that were to sleep your sleep' (V.IV.175)) and the book as a way of expressing his sentiments on Posthumus's execution is deeply ironic in the context of Posthumus's awakening from the dream of his life with the book of resolution.

The tablet that Jupiter lays upon his breast determines and communicates the narrative of Posthumus's fortune and future. Posthumus calls it a book and it comes to signify, in both Jupiter's imperative and Posthumus's analogy, the past, present and future history of his life:

> This tablet lay upon his breast, wherein
> Our pleasure his full fortune doth confine (V.IV.109-110).

However, although we may have some idea as to the meaning of Jupiter's text, it is not until the end of the play and the work of the soothsayer that the information is dramatically decoded. As it stands, the contents of the book can only be harnessed abstractly, wherein the idea and not the text is appropriated. Yet, the idea or abstraction of the book is not Jupiter's point. Posthumus's blatant misapprehension exposes the ways in which the book can operate within the confines of the drama. In both scenes with a book there is anamorphic potential: whilst for Imogen the book lies beside her sleeping body as a narrative from which she reads, for the audience the book emblazons her sleeping body with 'the contents o' th' story'; equally, whilst the book lies upon Posthumus's breast as a response to his dreams and a configuration of his future, for him it is an emblem of confusion with which he identifies impressionistically in order to die. In both cases the book responds to the body of the reader and the interpretive trajectory of the play as a whole, marking dramatic turning points in the play's action and thereby suggesting the ways in which both imagination and interpretation determine the choices we make. What begins to emerge from Shakespeare's use of the book in both these plays is how it may offer an imaginative journey beyond

the immediate requisites of the scene. In the light of this, we may observe the book's relationship to the imagination and how it supports — much like illusion or art, Hermione's statue or Prospero's magic — the link to the unrepresented.

One of the central bookish tropes in both *Titus Andronicus* and *Cymbeline* is the relationship between the written and the gods. Both plays invoke the presence of the book within the sphere of heaven's response to earth. *Titus* is more ambivalent, since the play traces a loss of faith in a theistic world. Titus began by waiting for 'the heavens to reveal the damned contriver' of Lavinia's ordeal, and Marcus imagined the voice of God in Lavinia's sandy scrawl:

> Write thou good niece, and here display at last
> What God will have discovered for revenge (IV.1.73-4)

Yet, as the play develops, and Titus has 'not a god left unsolicited', he takes upon himself the act of 'mortal revenge' through the 'lively warrant' of story. Where Titus initially only sees *Metamorphoses* as an observer of Lavinia's pleas to heaven, lying beside her as she 'lifts' 'up her arms in sequence thus', and offers his library 'to beguile' her 'sorrow' until the heavens act, Posthumus's book is a direct gift from Jupiter 'wherein / Our pleasure his full fortune doth confine'. It is unlikely that either of the plays suggests a directly iconic relationship between the book and heavenly interaction, since both plays trace their allusions through the traumas of distinctly mortal weaknesses; however, the proximity of the book to both a breakdown in

communication and a desire for justice intimates a possible site for expression when conventional networks have failed. Although *Cymbeline* is set in pre-Christian Rome and invokes pagan gods, the apparition of Jupiter, 'upon his eagle back'd' holding a book, is reminiscent of an Anglican lectern, carved in the shape of a spread eagle and supporting a Bible. Classically, Jupiter represents anger and warfare and he reluctantly arrives in Posthumus's dream. His 'godly' presence is reluctant, and his oblation of the book appears as a substitution for any real engagement with Posthumus's predicament. The book then remains with Posthumus as a token of his potential relief. The three books that appear in both these plays require, and are dramatically dependent on, interpretation. Posthumus identifies such interpretation in terms of (de)construction; turning the book to the soothsayer, he declares: 'Let him show / His skill in the construction' (V.5.434-5). The book is then 'read', both aloud and deciphered by the soothsayer, who construes the inscription as a construction itself:

> Thou, Leonatus, art the lion's whelp,
> The fit and apt construction of thy name,
> Being Leo-natus, doth impart so much (V.V.444-6).

The soothsayer validates Posthumus's sympathetic response to the book as a 'fit and apt construction' of his identity. From Posthumus's confusion ('sense in hardness') comes the language of restoration, which facilitates the resurrection of shared realities and networks of communication. The book marks the culmination of justice as it is drawn from the heavens and laid with a 'most heavy hand':

> The fingers of the powers above do tune

The harmony of this peace (V.V.467-8).

Shakespeare's use of the material book in these plays, its theatrical presence, devolved 'readers' and semiotic scope suggest the ways in which the book could accommodate and precipitate what Bakhtin would call the 'utterance'. In other words, the visible and dramatic book on stage negotiates our awareness of other voices within the play and how those voices — whether they originate in Ovid or Philomel, Tarquin or Tereus, Jupiter or the soothsayer — enable other voices and signs to appear and determine our ways of seeing. In imaging the book and the characters' responses to the book in their various contexts of high trauma, silence, fear, threat, or confusion, we are drawn into the polyphonic discourse of not only history and pre-text but how, in appropriating or rejecting narrative and imagination, we signify both our reality and its expression. In positioning the book on stage, Shakespeare appears to extend theatre's inquiry into representation through the vagaries of cognition. The books do not serve as metaphors or allegories of life. Instead, much like the audience's experience of watching the play, they expose us to precedents or ideas through which we may learn to both recognise and reject our sense of reality. Understanding the ways in which the idea and the image of the book experiments with both response and recognition is only part of the process through which Shakespeare's books emerge.

III

'The lunatic, the lover, and the poet': *The Taming of The Shrew* and *Love's Labour's Lost*

Written within about two or three years of each other, *The Taming of The Shrew* and *Love's Labour's Lost* are Shakespeare's only comedies to explore the pursuit of love through the semiotic of the book, its institution (the school), and its ideology (the Academe). To begin with, in both plays, the book is introduced in its particular relationship to the institute of learning. However, almost immediately the imperatives of the play-world begin to cast doubt on the stability of both the book and its pedagogic context. In *The Shrew*, Lucentio's scholarly appetite and Tranio's academic caveats, alongside Petruchio's taming and bold anarchic force, evolve as powerful and, yet, ambiguous methods of achieving the same end. Both lovers wager their intentions through performance and imitation in a city famed for its university, and a play-world intent on a marriage of profit and delight. Equally, in *Love's Labour's* the nature of the Academe authorises a particular image of the book, which opens the play in an attempt to define and herald its potential. Yet, quite quickly such attempts at definition lead the men into a metaphorical hinterland through which they begin to try and evaluate and valorise modes of expression. In examining *The Taming of The Shrew* and *Love's Labour's Lost* together, I will explore the ways in which representations of love are scrutinised through the book and, more particularly, how a language of the book emerges in the dynamic between the lover and beloved. Whilst in *The Shrew* we may identify a dialectic between

teaching and taming 'under the name of perfect love', in *Love's Labour's* we become aware of a more sophisticated semantic field in which the book provides an imaginative and ideological landscape for the movement of a potential self. Ostensibly, *The Shrew* and *Love's Labour's* share a bookish topography of love and learning; they also share a certain ambiguity of ending and suspended resolution, as well as navigating an unresolved scepticism in the relations between men and women. Both the idea of love and the idea of the book, however, evolve in very different ways.

'Faith, he is gone unto the taming-school.'

'The taming school! What, is there such a place?'

George Gascoigne's 1575 translation of Ariosto's comedy *I Suppositi (Supposes)* offers a loose model for the plot of Bianca and Lucentio in Shakespeare's *The Taming of The Shrew*. Here Polynesta, our Bianca equivalent, explains to her confused nurse that she does not love Dulipo (because he is not Dulipo), to whom the nurse had thought she was betrothed:

> The man whom to this day you have supposed to be Dulipo (as I say) Erostrato, a gentleman that came from Sicilia to studies in this city, and even at his first arrival met me, and of such vehement force were the passions he suffered that immediately he cast aside both long gown and books, and determined on me only to apply his study.[1]

Erostrato, on falling in love, directly exchanges his books for his beloved, and is determined 'to apply his study' only on Polynesta. Erostrato, unlike

Lucentio, throws off his books to woo his beloved, but like Lucentio he approaches his desire with the alacrity and eloquence of a scholar. Where one lover may 'cast aside' his books and another 'offer' them, the book and the book of the heart surface as lucid and symbolic objects of exchange.

When, in *The Taming of The Shrew*, Lucentio falls in love with Bianca he exchanges his individual pursuit of 'ingenious studies' for the role and appearance of a schoolmaster. Armed with 'small books of Greek and Latin', Lucentio takes up his position, and, as Hortensio warns us to 'Stand by and mark the manner of his teaching', he declares:

> *Luc.* Now, mistress, profit you in what you read?
> *Bian.* What, master, read you? First resolve me that.
> *Luc.* I read that I profess, the Art to Love.
> *Bian.* And may you prove, sir, master of your art.
> *Luc.* While you, sweet dear, prove mistress of my heart.[2]

This scene marks the apotheosis of Lucentio's seduction of Bianca, and the performance and tension of this interaction depends upon processes of reading and misreading. Whilst Lucentio aligns himself with the erotic implications of Ovid's poem, Bianca resists the animate body of Lucentio's text by consciously deflecting his meaning back to the inanimate book. Lucentio initiates the dialogue according to the emblematic and hermeneutic potential of the lover's 'book'. Such hermeneutic potential emerges through the book's presentation of a symbiosis between text and reader. The image of

---

[1] John W. Cunliffe (ed), *Supposes and Jocasta:* two plays translated from the Italian, the first by Geo. Gascoigne, the second by Geo. Gascoigne and F. Kinwelmersh (1575) (Boston and London: D.C. Heath and Co., 1906), 1.1.109-18. I have modernised the spelling.
[2] William Shakespeare, *The Taming of The Shrew*, ed. Robert B. Heilman (London: The New English Library, 1966), IV.II.6-10. All further references, unless otherwise stated, are to this edition. This

the book and the particulars of *The Art to Love* are connected and supported by reading and the body's textual and sexual relationship to profit and delight. Attitudes to reading – to unfold, to discover, to appropriate, apprehend, devour and delight – are terms and ideas that support both the reading of a book and the desiring of a lover. Yet, as Alberto Manguel explains, reading itself is dependent upon a larger metaphoric network:

> To say that we read – the world, a book, a body – is not enough. The metaphor of reading solicits in turn another metaphor, demands to be explained in images that lie outside the reader's library and yet within the reader's body, so that the function of reading is associated with our other essential bodily functions. Reading ... serves as a metaphoric vehicle, but in order to be understood must itself be recognised through metaphors.[3]

The book negotiates the art of reading into a figurative relationship to the body, which releases the metaphoric potential of reading into the wider semantic field upon which it has become dependent. The book for Lucentio provides both a material article of and a figurative advance into a language of reciprocation. 'Reading', as the cognitive process which supports the physical and metaphysical response between image and expression, connects the body of Lucentio to his metaphor, which in turn draws in and upon the body of Bianca through the potential of the book in hand. Through *The Art To Love* Lucentio traces, not letters and signs with which to either decipher his beloved or determine his eloquence but, concepts, passions and feelings. Ovid does not articulate the relationship or expression between the lovers his work simply signifies the concept of desire, the idea of reading and the titular promise which Lucentio proposes as his will and his intention. Reading, here,

---

edition is based on the Folio only deviating in emending F's incomplete act divisions and various 'unclear or erroneous speech assignments'.

pre-exists the book, and the metaphoric potential of reading generates a figurative and semantic space through which the lovers may move and develop their contact.

Although expressions of sexual desire did not obviously accommodate the language of the book until the thirteenth century, 'One of its most important ancient sources was Ovid'.[4] As the sheer eroticism of Ovid's poem, *The Art to Love*, may have contributed to his banishment and the poet spending the rest of his days in exile, the performance of the text recreates a space for the imaginative relationship between desire, displacement and eloquence.[5] However, the erotic nature of the text was not simply confined to explicit description but an evocative synthesis of sexuality and writing. Ovid 'had used writing symbolism in sexually suggestive ways, as with the confidante carrying a love-letter "concealed by a broad band on her warm bosom," or even a secret message written directly on her body'.[6] In this way, the written material itself becomes implicated in sexual contact and fantasy, and the idea of Ovid supports an image of how the language of desire moves within and without the pages of text.

Only moments before he sees Bianca, Lucentio introduces the book into a conversation with Tranio. Lucentio explains that he has arrived in Padua (famous for its university and dissemination of Aristotelian discourse) to

---

[3] Alberto Manguel, *A History of Reading* (London: Flamingo, 1997), p. 170.
[4] Here the notion of sexual desire needs to be separated from love, since spiritual and religious love have significantly informed the semiotic of the book in its emotional and corporeal relationship to the expressive subject.
[5] Although it is often claimed that the Emperor Augustus exiled Ovid on the basis of his love poetry, it is not resolved.

embark on 'A course of learning and ingenious studies' so that he may 'deck his fortune with his virtuous deeds' (I.I. 9, 16). Tranio immediately responds by warning his master not to commit to learning at the expense of pleasure: 'No profit grows where is no pleasure ta'en' (I.I.39). Specifically, Tranio asks him not to 'so devote to Aristotle's checks /As Ovid be an outcast quite abjured' (I.I.32-3). Both of Tranio's statements anticipate Lucentio's language of seduction played out in Bianca's schoolroom. The reference to Ovid wittily glances at *The Art to Love* in warning Lucentio against his own restraint as well as the poet's own exile. Similarly, Tranio's echo of Horace's statement, 'Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci', anticipates Lucentio's pleasurable reading of Bianca: 'Now, mistress, profit you in what you read?' (IV.II.6). Tranio concludes his speech with the advice, 'In brief, sir, study what you most affect' (I.I.40), upon the utterance of which Bianca enters.[7] Both the comedy and the creative value are largely dependent upon our awareness of the adaptability of the book to the beloved (an adaptability that has more convoluted dramatic resonance in *Love's Labour's Lost*). The readiness with which the scholar may cast his books aside in favour of the beloved, and yet retain his academic alacrity, endorses an imaginative translation of the language of the book into that of the body.

The dramatic potential of 'study' to manipulate sexual and material readings of the book/body is ironically anticipated by Gremio who, in the hope of winning Baptista's approval, decides 'by any means [to] light on a fit man to teach her [Bianca] that wherein she delights' (I.I.110-111). The notion of

[6] Eric Jager, *The Book of The Heart* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000), p. 66.

'delight' proposed by Horace and frequently re-deployed by humanists and coterie writers — most famously Sidney — here establishes a playful dynamic between the head and the heart at the hands of the male. Although the phrase was rooted in a scholastic commitment to mix the intellectual with the pleasurable, and thereby embrace the full potential and reward of knowledge, Thomas Thomas's definition of *studios* suggests a semantic synthesis of the academic head and the desiring heart. Thomas expounds the term as 'desirouslie, ... with diligence and affection, ... with taking pleasure and delight'.[8] Affection and desire could of course relate to the subject rather than to the woman, but the readiness with which the scholar can 'apply his study' to the beloved suggests that such terms carried an ambivalent attachment to both the text and the heart. Tranio's early admonition to his master skilfully traces the classical premise through Aristotle to love by way of Ovid, who imaginatively sustains the tension between eroticism and art: 'Fall to them as your stomach serves you. /No profit grows where is no pleasure ta'en' (I.I.38-9). The book may be translated into the body through the appetite; both hunger and eating accommodate knowledge and lust. Referring to the title of Ovid's poem alone is enough to establish a witty transition from the scholar to the lover, and yet, rather than function intertextually, the book provides a hinterland through which desire can move from the material to the physical. Once Lucentio has brought *The Art to Love* to bear upon his situation he is able to create a multiple dialogue between himself, Bianca, Ovid, the idea of the book as a figurative and literal displacement of the self, and the abstract animation of instruction of the tutor

---

[7] SD] F

and pupil, who presuppose the living dynamics of 'reading' and expounding: 'Now, mistress, profit you in what you read?'. Within the context of love, the book further exposes the nature of mutuality since both the pursuit of love and the pursuit of knowledge require the presence of another. Where the pages and content of a book translate the absent or textualised 'author', loving demands an imagined or objectified beloved — either way neither state can exist in isolation. The book initiates a pretext for the fulfilment, or at least explication, of two roles. In *The Shrew* neither the book nor reading are presented as solitary activities; both the idea and process of reading are specifically, perhaps even exclusively, mutual and only emerge in relation to a subject and a response. Where in *Hamlet*, *Cymbeline*, *Titus* and, to some extent, *Love's Labour's Lost*, the book is given a particular and often solitary relationship to the reader, in *The Shrew* it carries no such dramatic weight outside of the imperatives of the scene. Although the idea of the book may shift through the play, its theatrical role is only accommodated and defined by the devolved dynamics of the lovers.[9] The metaphor of 'reading' sustains the book as the idea of Ovid harnesses the lovers. The subtle transition from Ovid's *The Art to Love* to the reading and dialogue of the lovers shifts the focus from the actual text of the poem to the exposition of their selves. However, in terms of the education of the female, the text itself is unstable since, as Juan Luis Vives explains, it was expelled from the woman's curriculum. Shortly after asserting that 'As for a woman, she hath no charge to see to, but her honesty and chastity', Vives declares 'Therefore in my mind

[8] All early modern dictionary definitions can be found at www.chass.utoronto.ca/english /emed/ emedd. html.

no man was ever banished more rightfully than was Ovid, at leastwise, if he was banished for writing the Craft of Love'.[10] Unlike the *Heroides* or the 'small packet of Greek and Latin books', Lucentio probably does not literally bring *The Art to Love* on stage, and the illicit nature of the text simulates and reflects the position of the lovers. The instability of the text, in any female education programme, typifies Lucentio's spurious teaching practice whilst at the same time sexualising Bianca's encounter with the book. Yet, wittily navigating the book around its dramatic relationship to desire, the couple confine their 'reading' of each other to the happy synthesis of 'profit' and 'delight'. In this way marriage — established by Petruchio as something of profit, and delight established by Lucentio as the sexual interplay between the lover and the book — becomes a concept that appears to dynamically sustain the play's exploration of teaching and gratification.

Yet, in line with humanist assumptions, the book and its material underpinned the evolution of the educated female as much as the male. Perhaps the two most crucial distinctions between the education of the male and female, however, were, firstly, that the male was directed toward civic pride and intellectual responsibility, and the female toward a silent, pious and domestic attitude, and secondly, where the male fashioned himself alongside fabulous and historical warriors, knights, patricians, sages and heroes, the female largely learned through antithesis the penalties of transgression and the

[9] In Dante's Hell of *The Divine Comedy*, we might imagine an appalling precedent for the relationship between the lovers and the book; as Paolo and Francesca, who blamed the book that brought them together, are condemned forever to be beside each other but never to touch.

[10] Foster Watson (ed.), 'J. L. Vives: Instruction of a Christian Woman, translated into English by Richard Hyrde in 1540', *Vives and the Renascence Education of Women* (London: Edward Arnold, 1912), p. 34, pp. 34-5.

rewards of virtue. The role of the book in the fashioning of the female mind was distinctly tied to the ideological containment of her body.[11] Vives's occlusion of Ovid's *Art to Love* in his *Instruction of a Christian Woman* augments the male celebration of pious and restricted education alongside chastity and verbal and bodily restraint. The importance of mimesis in humanist learning was largely predicated upon a faith in the developed moral and intellectual integrity of the individual. Women, however, were not credited with such discernment or control so that their education needed careful handling; particularly when 'The assumption was that individuals could be brought to internalise paradigms of exemplary masculinity or femininity by reading a book or copying an aphorism'.[12] The relationship here between male imperative and female imitation is similarly played out in the main plot of Katherina and Petruchio. Petruchio's teaching of Kate, unlike Lucentio's seduction of Bianca, is distinctly not 'by the book', and such a juxtaposition of these two ideas of teaching and loving is brought into sharp relief in Petruchio's travesty of a marriage ceremony, wherein he throws *The Book of Common Prayer* to the ground and 'cuffs' the priest.[13] However, both men offer their object of desire an example through which they aim to achieve satisfaction; where Bianca may be located in the schoolroom and the pretexts of desire, Kate is situated outside of institutional decorum and practice in demotic ballads and folklore. Kate is forced to internalise her

[11] See William C. Carroll, 'The Virgin Not: Language and Sexuality in Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Survey* 46 (1993), 107 –119; Eve Rachele Saunders, *Gender and Literacy on Stage in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998); Suzanne W. Hull, *Chaste, Silent and Obedient: English Books for Women 1475-1640* (San Marino: Huntingdon Library, 1982), and Clare Sponsler, *Drama and Resistance: Bodies, Goods, and Theatricality in late Medieval England* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1997).

[12] Eve Rachele Saunders, *Gender and Literacy on Stage in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 2.

suitor's behaviour in order to reject it and be received back into the kind of structure (of sobriety and silence) that Bianca, at least initially, represents.

Vives directly and persistently equates good learning with chastity, so that, for his women, right knowledge is commensurate with purity. As chastity is the corollary of decorum and diligence, Vives strikes out against the 'perjury, deceits, murder, slaughter, [and] destruction love has caused', citing Helen of Troy as a flagrant example. However, it is Eve who epitomises the sin of her sex, when Adam 'for the love of Eve lost and castaway mankind'. Thomas Salter's *The Mirror of Modesty* (1579), is similarly concerned with the education of the female:

> I would not have a maiden altogether forbidden, or restrained from reading, for so muche as the same is not onely profitable to wise and vertuous women, but also a riche and precious Jewel, but I would have her if she reade, to reade no other bookes but such as be written by godlie Fathers, to our instruction and soules health, and not suche lascivious Songes, filthie Ballades, and undecent bookes as be most commonly now a daies sette to sale.[14]

Vives, like Salter, emphasises the interrelationship between learning and sanctity, which seeks to contain women within the boundaries of prescribed information and authority.[15]

> For it neither becometh woman to rule a school, nor to live amongst men, or speak abroad, and shake of[f] her demureness and honesty, either all together, or else

[13] Although the play is not set in Protestant England, I recognise *The Book of Common Prayer* in the marriage ceremony, as would any member of an Elizabethan audience.
[14] As quoted in Saunders, *Gender and Literacy*, p. 8.
[15] This view was largely hypothetical and does not represent the actuality of the female relationship to learning; rather it imagines a fantasy that both the mind and the body of a woman can be controlled and maintained by her education. However, although women were not in practice 'silenced' by marriage the proportion of reading-only literacy amongst women testifies to their restraint in public. Equally, that such opinions were circulated by leading (and, in Vives' case, royal) humanists reflects a very real anxiety as to the place and potential of the female voice.

a great part; which if she be good, it were better to be at home within and unknown to other folks, and in company to hold her tongue demurely, and let few see her, and none at all to hear her.[16]

Vives articulates the overarching masculine fear of the public female voice, which is expressed in many sixteenth-century conduct books as a kind of, if not literal, promiscuity. Vives sanctions his argument with reference to the Apostles:

> And unto his disciple, Timothy, he [Paul] writeth on this wise: "Let a woman learn in silence with all subjection." But I give no licence to a woman to be a teacher, nor to have authority of the man, but to be in silence.[17]

The decorous silence prescribed in conduct books, however, also functions figuratively as it signifies the importance of the controlled female body:[18]

> Open female mouths – whether giving vent to gusty laughs, wide yawns, or unrestrained speech – carry a double threat, as late medieval court cases make clear. They breach corporeal boundaries, making the woman's body dangerously open, while also disrupting social relations by launching the dangerously open body into the social realm. For this reason, advice aimed at closing the female subject, one that is less of a threat to the masculinist social order.[19]

Silence is conspicuously problematic in many of Shakespeare's heroines, notably, of course, Cordelia, Isabella and Hermione, but in *The Taming of The Shrew* conceptual and nominal silence is manifest in relation to both physical beauty and language. The sisters are physically emblazoned through

---

[16] Foster Watson (ed.), *Vives and the Renascence of Women* (London: Edward Arnold, 1912), p. 55.
[17] Ibid., p. 56.
[18] The relationship of the body and the book was not, of course, only confined to the female reader: 'The many paintings and engravings of Renaissance figures holding books, their fingers marking a page, suggest what [Roger] Dranton calls the "corporeal element in reading" opens into the history of the body and the self as well as of the book', Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, p. 46. However, the graphic relationship of the book to the body was usually emblematised in terms of physical male dominance and female sexuality. Whilst many images depicted men holding books with their fingers inserted into the pages, women were shown holding the book to their crotch, hidden in their skirts or reading in bed.

their behaviour, so that whilst Bianca is 'maiden', 'mild' and 'gentle', Katherina, for the majority of the play, is referred to in devilish and brutal terms. Such a process of characterisation enables Katherina's transformation to be realised in both physical and social terms at the end of the play. Although Katherina is initially described as beautiful, she quickly becomes blazoned by her shrewishness, and only her ultimate docile performance restores her beauty, so that in Petruchio's exclamation, 'now there's a wench, come kiss me Kate', we see Kate as the new object of desire and Bianca as the petulant other.[20] Whilst Katherina's shrewishness makes her undesirable, Bianca's beauty is characterised by Lucentio's desire for her 'silence'. Lucentio's love originates in a synthesis of eye and ear:

> But in the other's silence do I see
> Maid's mild behaviour and sobriety (I.I.70-1).

Lucentio's love for Bianca begins in seeing her 'silence', from which he extrapolates perfection, construed as the feminine values of mildness and sobriety. Yet, a little later, Lucentio's passionate response also turns both him and Tranio not only into women, but sisters: 'As Anna to the Queen of Carthage was, / Tranio, I burn, I pine, I perish, Tranio' (I.I.154-5), and amplifies the relationship between woman, desire and story. As love turns Lucentio to his female textual precedent, his heart becomes 'fleshily' realised in the very visceral conditions of burning, pining and perishing. Lucentio's 'teaching' of Bianca is not only anticipated in his own scholarship but also in

---

[19] Sponsler, *Drama and Resistance*, p. 63.
[20] It is, of course, debateable how far Katherina's subservience is presented in earnest and whether, in the light of the theatrical coupling, Kate's behaviour may be construed as part of a performance that parodies rather than endorses 'taming'.

the pre-texts through which he imagines her. Similarly, Katherina's bold physicality, her noise, violence, and resistance, her ignominious self-portrait, quibbling on the dancing bear ('I must dance bear-foot on her wedding day') pre-empts the bestial treatment she receives from Petruchio.[21] The teaching and taming of both women in this play is based upon the 'book': Bianca is taught the extent of Lucentio's desire through lines and layers of Ovid, Katherina, however, is tamed through the books that do not appear in the classroom. Her taming is supported by books of hawking as well as ballads and pamphlets in the fabliau tradition, of which the anonymous 1550 verse tale *A Merry jest of a Shrewde and Curst Wyfe, Lapped in Morrelles skin, for Her Good Behaviour* is a notorious example.[22] Petruchio, unlike his counterpart Lucentio, never brings such books onto the stage, but the teaching and taming that directs the play brings the relationship between the book and courtship into sharp relief.[23] As Petruchio hurls 'priest and book' to the ground we become aware of the book's performative potential (be it appropriated or rejected) in the pursuit of love.

Teaching, as Stephen Gosson knew and feared, is based upon 'showing' whether that is through the written or embodied 'character'. Gosson, in *The*

[21] According to the *OED*, a 'shrew' as a 'wicked', 'mischievous or vexatious person' acquired its figurative 'transference of meaning' from the rodent because of 'superstitions as to the malignant influence of the animal'. Thomas Blount, in his English hard word dictionary of 1656, maintains the devilish image alongside the rodent: 'a kind of Field Mouse, which if he bite go over a beasts back will make him lame in the chine [shin]; and if he bite, the beast swells to the heart and dyes.... From hence came our English phrase, I beshrew thee, when we wish ill; and we call a curst woman, a Shrew'.

[22] Despite Petruchio's taming of Katherina like an animal, his methods are, to some extent, humanist; he bases his methods on observation, imitation, and repetition.

[23] Although Petruchio tames his shrew without any specific recourse to scholarly or romantic text he initially identifies possible classical pre-texts for his case: 'Be she as foul as was Florentius' love,/As old as Sibyl, and as curst and shrewd/As Socrates' Xanthippe' (1.2.68-70). The plight and patience of Socrates was frequently redeployed in humanist texts, including Erasmus's colloquy, Robert Snawsel's

School of Abuse, becomes particularly self-conscious about the ways in which information is imparted or imposed; in attacking the representational potential of the 'show', he is equally and acutely aware of both his medium and his metaphor:

> And I intend not to shewe you al that I see, nor halfe that I heare of these abuses, lest you judge me more wilful to teach them, then willing to forbid them.[24]

Whilst on the one hand the book provides Gosson with the representational and educational imperative he requires to proclaim his purpose, he is also aware that he has chosen a medium that works on a similar basis to the one that he condemns. *The Taming of The Shrew* is supported by a self-conscious relationship between theatre and the terms and practices of teaching with which it engages. The 'play', as it will be performed for Sly, is set up within the ideas of profit and delight. The Lord's plan to have Sly treated as a lord, to be told his memories of drunkenness and poverty were those of disease and lunacy are briefly thrown into doubt by the arrival of the players: 'Lest over-eyeing of his odd behaviour — /For yet his honour never heard a play — / You break into some merry passion/And so offend him' (Ind. i. 95-8). The Lord's plan is to 'practice on' Sly through sustaining the illusion of a performance, which will in turn sustain the illusion of his presence. Ironically, part of both the comedy and instruction of Sly's experience is in him never being told where reality begins and the dream ends.[25] The

---

A Looking Glass for Married Folk (1610), and Matthew Hopkins's *A Juniper Lecture*, as well as *A Homily on the State of Matrimony* (1623).

[24] Stephen Gosson, *The School of Abuse and A Short Apology of The School of Abuse*, ed. Edward Arber (London: Alex. Murray & Son, 1868), p. 37.

[25] Since the Folio text of Shakespeare's play does not return us to Sly we are given no resolution between his play and the play proper. In *The Taming of A Shrew*, however, Sly not only learns 'how to

performance within which Sly finds himself is made up of the players' play and the dramatics of the Lord's household together these levels of illusion combine to provide an image and a 'reality' through which Sly will move to forget himself. The play begins with practices of teaching, delightful, profitable and punitive, based on imitation and dissimulation. When, at the end of *The Taming of A Shrew*, Sly claims to go home and tame his wife, the comedy lies in our knowing how unlikely it is that he shall succeed. To modern eyes the deception of Sly is uncomfortable, yet the story or 'kind of history' upon which the action is based is played out in *The Taming of The Shrew* through other 'stories', the 'taming-school' and *The Art to Love*. Whilst Lucentio begins his pursuit of desire as a scholar with a story (his own as Cambio/Lucentio and Ovid's books), Petruchio begins his 'wooing dance' as a kind of story, a performance and a narrative in which he becomes 'author's pen' and 'actor's voice'. The story emerges as a powerful emblem for the ways in which narrative and theatre interact as forces of change in social relationships, and to some extent, we begin to seeing a circular and dynamic relationship between teaching and performance.

The 'stage' in *The Shrew* is ambiguously school-like since not only does the play proper begin with the presentation of Sly's lesson, but also it continues to operate through a synthesis of performance and persuasion.[26] Although

---

tame a shrew' but he has done so through 'the best dream /That ever I had in my life' (As included in Dolan, *Texts and Contexts*, p. 153, 154).

[26] Here the plot of Katherina and Petruchio is exemplary, since Petruchio devises a series of performances as part of the practices of his 'taming-school'. Significantly, Petruchio's art is supported less by the humanist tradition of patience and endurance as exhibited by Socrates in relation to his captious wife Xantippe, as it is by the slightly earlier and draconian *fabliau* tradition. Petruchio's techniques find their textual precedent in many mid sixteenth-century ballads championing physical and emotional humiliation of a shrewish wife. The idea of theatre and audience is essential to Petruchio's taming, and he almost consistently invokes the spectator in his dealings with Kate, whether

public theatre was a recent phenomenon, the 'play' had a long and ambivalent history of didacticism.[27] Similarly, the book, despite its material and social shift from manuscript to print had a present history that was under the process of reconstruction. Lucentio uses the book to both perform and tell his story; whilst his own scholarship precipitates his performance as a tutor to his beloved, Ovid's texts become palimpsests upon which he writes and tells his desire. Initially, however, the idea of the scholar simply enables the book to manifest as a sign, from which reading emerges to fashion the speaking subjects.

Gremio's presentation of Lucentio to Baptista is played through a humorous irony at the expense of both scholarship and Bianca's education:

> I promised to inquire carefully
> About a schoolmaster for the fair Bianca,
> And, by good fortune, I have lighted well
> On this young man — for learning and behaviour
> Fit for her turn, well read in poetry
> And other books, good ones I warrant ye (I.II.165-70).

We know that Gremio has neither enquired nor enquired carefully, but in asserting so he establishes the sincerity of Baptista's request. Yet, Gremio's attitude to Bianca's education is immediately what we might call sentimental. Nominally he refers only to 'poetry', thereby eschewing at least five of the

---

it is the old man on the way to their wedding who must witness his lunar/diurnal confusion, his servants, tailor, or friend Hortensio. In fact, the only time we are given an indication that Kate and he are alone it is in an almost entirely theatrical context; Petruchio's description of his nocturnal madness is directly reminiscent of 'Curtain Lectures', which were amplified images and parodies of the railing wife in her bedroom.

[27] Medieval morality plays, mystery cycles and much of Church ritual presented the sacraments and liturgy in performance in order to both teach and fashion their laity. Equally, in Plato and the first public theatres BC we can discern the beginnings of the contention between imposing and performing that became central to the arguments of Stephen Gosson and Philip Stubbes.

seven liberal arts, and such other books as there might be are simply 'good ones'.[28] The books, the text, even the tutor himself are defined according to the imperative. Although the books may exist, although the tutor may appear (as Cambio indeed does) and although the majority of the play-world may observe Cambio in earnest, the idea of the book at this point is in fact nothing more than a metaphor. The ideological book creates a space for Lucentio to enter into a reciprocal contract with Bianca and, once the idea of the book has been established, the context becomes 'All books of love'. Here too, we might notice the relationship between love and story — whilst Tarquin tries to seduce Lucrece with 'stories to her ears [of] her husband's fame', or Lady Capulet's blazoning of Paris 'that in gold clasps locks in the golden story', or *A Midsummer Night's Dream's* presentation of 'love's stories written in love's richest book', or even Othello's seductive 'witchcraft' in the telling of his story: 'if I had a friend that loved her,/I should but teach him how to tell my story' — love, and represented or ecphrastic love are bound to the reading presence of the subject.

Lucentio's direct reference to the book in the context of his feelings toward Bianca exposes how the meaning of the book can adjust its parameters according to the figurative potential of the textual self. Lucentio plays upon the book as object and the title of the book as objective to bring Bianca into a space of double meanings. Yet, according to William Carroll, the very process of playing with or punning on meaning is already sexualised: 'female sexuality in Shakespeare's plays is invariably articulated as linguistic

[28] Since Baptista also employs a musician in Hortensio we might assume that Bianca and Katherina's

transgression — that is a verbal replication of female obliquity. Often, the ordinary relation between signifier and signified has slipped, been dislocated or even reversed, the linguistic equivalent of the world turned upside down'.[29] Carroll's observation of female sexuality in the disjunction of the sign is more easily visible in the battle between Katherina and Petruchio. If we concede that such disjunction can be a 'verbal replication of female obliquity' then it is significant to recognise Katherina's initiation of verbal play between herself and Petruchio as a possible site of her own annihilation. Katherina begins her dialogue with Petruchio by manipulating his feeling of being 'moved' to him being a 'moveable', and it is on the basis of this that Kate begins the highly sexualised interaction with the 'joint-stool'.[30] Much of the play's pace and comedy comes from the spaces created by the lovers between signifier and signified, and whilst Kate is almost the author of her own obliquity Bianca is the controller of her sobriety. Petruchio's 'taming-school' is run on the basis of fragmenting — and at times shattering — semantics. The most significant part of his process involves humiliating and exhausting Katherina, and his most effective weapon is (mis)interpretation. Petruchio fractures the cognitive response between sensory perception and expression. Yet, what seems to abuse Katherina the most is that this is done 'under the name of perfect love'. For both Petruchio and Lucentio, 'love' is pursued through the semantic spaces made available by teaching, when imitation shapes response.

---

education is intended to include grammar, rhetoric and music.

[29] William C. Carroll, 'The Virgin Not: Language and Sexuality in Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Survey* 46 (1993), 107.

[30] The scene takes place in II.I.180-272, and almost immediately Katherina and Petruchio communicate with each other through a series of linguistic assaults which ricochet between the suggestive and the abusive.

If there could be, at this point, a history of women's education then it was one that determined to impose upon women more than inform them. In a scene from *A Mad World My Masters* (1608), Middleton comically exposes the ambivalently erotic nature of how woman and text is used to impress chastity through fear and example. Middleton's hero, Master Harebrain, having become consumed with jealousy and sexual insecurity, employs a courtesan (Lady Gullman) disguised as a 'pure virgin' to read piety to his 'erring' wife. The iconic use of devotional works was not unusual, since such books support the cultural and educational strictures upon women; however, Middleton through a juxtaposition of ideology and dissimulation exposes the fragile and arbitrary relationship between husband, wife and book. Having enlisted Lady Gullman, Master Harebrain directs this 'pure virgin' to his wife, explaining:

> I have convey'd away all her wanton pamphlets, as *Hero and Leander*, *Venus and Adonis*: oh, two luscious mary-bone pies for a young married wife! Here, here, prithee take the *Resolution*, and read her a little.... Terrify her, terrify her; go, read to her the horrible punishments for itching wantonness, the pains allotted for adultery; tell her her thoughts, her very dreams are unanswerable.[31]

The book in question, *A Book of Christian Exercise Appertaining to Resolution,* never achieves any stable or iconic meaning on stage, since, as soon as Harebrain leaves the women to their book, Lady Gullman counsels Mistress Harebrain in the art of deception and pleasure:

[31] Gāmini Salgādo (ed.), Thomas Middleton, 'A Mad World, My Masters', in *Four Jacobean City Comedies* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975), 1.2.45-48; 53-5. Within the context of this chapter, there is some degree of irony that Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* is specifically mentioned as a banished text, and yet it makes frequent appearances as an explicit and a popular book; according to John Johnson, as I quoted in the introduction, the popularity and content of *Venus* almost made Shakespeare a synecdoche for sexuality: 'Shakespeere ... who creepes into women's closets about bedtime'.

> If he chance to steal upon you, let him find
> Some book lie open 'gainst an unchaste mind,
> And coted Scriptures, tho' for your own pleasure,
> You read some stirring pamphlet, and convey it
> Under your skirt, the fittest place to lay it (1.2.90-4).

Yet rather than neglect the book (erotic or devotional), Lady Gullman simply advises the use of one to cover up the other. Reading appears as an exercise in which the woman and her thoughts are localised and managed and, although the male may be a proponent of the book, the reading of it is harnessed and managed by the female. The ambivalent figure of the prostitute/virgin amplifies the already sexualised encounter with the book and her teaching of Mistress Harebrain to conceal her 'stirring pamphlets' blatantly places devotional material above the skirt and 'other' material below. What remains central, however, is the woman's skirt or genitals in relation to the book. Although the book may serve on one level as the male interrogation of female presence, on the other it both represents and enables female sexuality. Where we have seen how humanists like Vives or Salter expose women to certain types of education to manage her fallen mind, for Middleton and other writers of the period, the book supported sex. In John Taylor's *The Practical Part of Love* (1660), he 'describes the chief item in the pornographic library of 'Loves Academy' as "a Book that had no Title, and therefore I cannot tell its name; I was almost as much pleased with looking on its outside, as on its inside … I could not find that it had above two leaves in it"'.[32] As Gordon Williams explains, Taylor 'has in mind a figure which became common currency following its use in Marlowe's *Ovid* (1580s), where the lover

declares that even if he sees his lady "ope the two-leav'd book" to a rival, he will trust her words of innocence "more than mine eyes"'.[33] Middleton amplifies the ambiguous relationship between woman and book in his synthesis of sexuality and chastity. For Harebrain the book will condemn his wife's 'thoughts and her very dreams', yet, for the audience, such condemnation is re-routed by the body of the reader to the humiliation of the 'teacher'. Thus the process of reading always informs the performance of the book, and it is within this context that Lucentio introduces how he is reading (as he acts and desires) before what he is reading (*The Art to Love* and Bianca).

Gremio, synthesising sexuality and 'teaching', registers the material and aesthetic significance of the book:

> Hark you, sir, I'll have them very fairly bound –
> All books of love, see that at any hand,
> And see you read no other lectures to her (I.II.145-7).

Here the image and aspect of the book transcends any specific textual imperative; the beauty of the object — its 'fair' binding, amorous content and material and visual monopoly — identify the relationship between woman and book as pleasing referential property. The book of love will, hopes Gremio, offer a precedent and a pretext for Bianca's response. Equally, in the presentation of 'this small packet of Greek and Latin books' to Bianca's father, a set of codes is established which take symbolic precedent over the

---

[32] Gordon Williams, *Shakespeare, Sex, and the Print Revolution*, p. 49.
[33] Ibid.

scholar himself. The performance through which Gremio and Tranio present Lucentio is played out through a series of ideas which find their apogee in the donation of the books. Whilst Gremio establishes Lucentio's academic history (in comparison to the equally spurious Hortensio), 'this young scholar that hath been long studying at Rheims — as cunning in Greek, Latin, and other languages, as the other in music and mathematics' (II.I.79-82), Tranio offers 'this small packet of Greek and Latin books' to seal the contract and facilitate the exchange. Almost as soon as Baptista holds the books in his hands he directs Lucentio to his daughter: 'take ... the set of books. /You shall see your pupils presently' (II.I.106-7). But although both tutors are sent to both pupils, Lucentio never actually comes into academic contact with Kate whilst Hortensio, on the other hand, has a lute broken over his head. The books, therefore, despite being Greek and Latin, have only ever been books of love and destined for Bianca. Initially, the books ritualise and mark an exchange of authority from the father to the lover. Such an exchange is introduced by the figure of the tutor who, in the case of Lucentio, creates a nexus between the authority of the teacher and the husband. The father's bestowing of his daughter to her husband is anticipated in the transaction with the books. And, importantly, Tranio, who has become 'Lucentio', is now fatherless ('supposed Lucentio/Must get a father, called supposed Vincentio' (II.I.400-401)), as is Cambio since he is merely an impostor fashioned for a part. When Lucentio becomes the tutor to Bianca he is 'fatherless', and therefore is himself both the patriarch and the pedagogue. Directly after Lucentio has left for Bianca with his books, Petruchio enters and establishes his material position in relation to marrying Katherina. The idea of exchange

— of offering and receiving — is augmented under the terms of marriage. However, I do not mean to imply a Freudian interpretation of the transition from the father to the lover through the figure of the pedagogue, but rather an ideological reflection of the relationship between Christian humanism and female education.

Lucentio offers Bianca a text which he hopes she will refer back to him: '"*Simoi*", I am Lucentio, "*hic est*", son unto Vincentio of Pisa, "*Sigeia tellus*", disguised thus to get your love' (III.I.31-33). Yet here the 'real' text of Ovid's *Heroides* plays an ambiguous role, since on the one hand the Latin exercise simply enables Lucentio's romantic interpolations to emerge through the conditions of scholarship but, on the other, Lucentio's witty displacement of gender roles, which sees his Penelope pleading for Bianca's Ulysses, endorses a travesty of the gender dynamics he appears to be exploiting. Where the book had initially enabled a contact and an exchange, an ellipsis in the 'text' is now created and translated into individual intention and desire. The structure of teaching and the transmission of texts provide a pretext for both imitation and expression. Lucentio's articulation of his desire through his own interpolated ellipsis harnesses and imposes upon Bianca a precedent for her response. The precepts of the grammar school are re-conditioned by the requisites of desire. Lucentio interposes his Latin lines in response to Bianca's request to 'Construe them'. Bianca's request seems to imply both her knowledge and her acquiescence in Lucentio's presentation of *Heroides* as a palimpsest. The construction she asks for recognises the activity of the text as complicit with that of the lover, whilst at the same time retaining the

verisimilitude of the tutorial. But even though the book of the heart here becomes the book *construed* as the heart, Ovid's text continues to sustain and support the dynamics of the scene as Bianca maintains the textual dialogue and replies:

> Now let me see if I can construe it. *Hic ibat Simois*, I know you not, *hic est Sigeia tellus*, I trust you not, *Hic steterat Priami*, take heed he hear us not, *regia*, presume not, *celsa senis*, despair not (III.I.40-43).

The dialogue between Bianca and Lucentio is constructed through the text, and by virtue of that text the couple 'read' each other, partly through the material book that is held between them, and partly through the figurative potential that such practices of reading and interacting assume. The idea of reading augments the necessary intimacy and privacy of their interaction and, since Hortensio must not hear them, the text of Ovid shelters the 'silent' text of their selves. In this way, their reading of each other is covered by the book. Bianca does not construe Ovid she construes Lucentio, and his 'text' becomes the lesson. However, the choice of text is neither arbitrary nor without significance. The heroines of *Heroides* are imagined through their letters to absent lovers, and we might recognise a similar synthesis in the process of composition, desire and identity as is apparent in the use of *The Art to Love*. The woman, text and lust are implicitly and explicitly imagined in writing and reading. Although the idea of the female reading is somewhat complicated by a controversial history of devotion and desire, Lucentio directly transfers his appetite and ambition to Bianca, as he also uses the work of Ovid as a pre-text of eloquence. The processes of expression and response made available

by the book are amplified in the play's exposure of teaching practices. The particular books in *The Shrew* have specific and limited roles; what becomes significant is the way in which a mere idea of an available text enables the characters to bring a version of communicable love into being. In *Love's Labour's Lost*, on the other hand, the book moves centre stage; it becomes the place in which art and love vie for a language of truth.

'That unlettered, small-knowing soul'

Love's Labour's Lost opens with the King's declaration that he and his attendant lords shall study: for three years they will eschew all other desires and imperatives; their court 'shall be a little academe' and 'still and contemplative in living art' they will cheat 'cormorant devouring time' in attendant fame and recognition. Navarre presents his lords with an oath, which requires them to devote themselves to learning at the expense of all else, particularly women, and it is at this point that the 'book-men' consider what it is to learn and what it means to study.

> Berowne:[34] What is the end of study, let me know?
> King: Why, that to know which else we should not know.
> Berowne: Things hid and barred, you mean, from common sense.
> King: Ay, that is study's god-like recompense.
> Berowne: Come on, then, I will swear to study so
> To know the thing I am forbid to know,
> As thus: to study where I may well dine
> When I to feast expressly am forbid (1.1.55-62).[35]

[34] The Norton edition, largely using the Quarto text of 1598, prints Berowne as Biron, however in line with the rest of this thesis, I have maintained the 1623 Folio orthography.
[35] All references are to the Norton edition. Although most modern editions of *Love's Labour's Lost*, including the *Norton Shakespeare*, follow the quarto of 1598, they also include the Folio scene

The language of feasting, prohibition, concealment, sanctity and fealty glances at the opening speech of Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and sets an ambiguous tone of righteous aspiration and dangerous aggrandisement. Berowne's later reference to 'angel knowledge' is hinted at here as something more than the 'Schoole Diuinitie' or the 'contemplatory knowledge of God, angels, and soules of men', which underpinned the academic study of metaphysics.[36] Conventionally, the language of appetite is usually associated with transgression rather than asceticism, since the latter is normally accompanied by a bodily restraint, whereas the former's combination of satiation and sapience images Eve's fatal pursuit of knowledge and food in Paradise. Yet Berowne's navigation of the senses in his understanding of Navarre's request anticipates the significance of sex in scholarship. However, it is important to recognise that desire and knowledge did not automatically signify sex. In medieval scholasticism the physical body became sanctified in its pursuit of the absolute and faithful heart, a trope which continued into the seventeenth century. George Whither, in his book of emblems, depicts an image in which 'desire' signifies the love of the faithful and learned: displaying 'A smoking and winged heart sit[ing] on an open book', the motto reads "The Heart of him that is upright, in Heavenly-knowledge, takes delight", whilst the epigram explains: 'The book represents wisdom; the winged heart, desire for knowledge; the smoke those perturbations within

divisions and the, still contentious, replacement of Catherine by Rosalind in Berowne's first exchange with her. Here I follow Norton with the exception of 'Berowne' for 'Biron'.

[36] See Bullokar's definition of 'Intelligence' and 'Metaphysickes' (1616), at the Early Modern English Dictionary Database.

man until he understands heavenly wisdom.'[37] Yet, Navarre's displacement of women, the appetite with which the men chew over their commitment, and the contest between forms of gratification foreground the sensual body and the cerebral book.[38] However, at this point Navarre only seems to observe the importance of the female in her exclusion 'on pain of losing her tongue', and Berowne is, as yet, unaware of the potential power and performance of his synthesis. Much of this dialectic between love and scholarship, like *The Shrew*, is informed by Ovid's *Art to Love*, yet, where in *The Shrew*, the book exposes a specific and erotic semiotic in the art of seduction, here, although not nominally referred to, it shadows the development of the play.

The opening dialogue between Navarre and Berowne circumnavigates various themes that the play will later confront and expand; together they adumbrate the commonplace humanist trinity of contention — passion, action, contemplation — as well as the dispute, experienced by every conscientious courtier, between reason and passion, and, not least of all, the dialectic between self-knowledge and knowledge. What links these ideas, exploits their ambiguities and exposes the 'great feast of language' at the outset are the words 'study' and 'book'. 'To study', according to the most recent lexicon of Shakespeare's language, is either an individual, even private, act of meditation or a more social, didactic act of intellectual and

[37] From George Whither's *A Choice of emblems, ancient and modern* (1635), as shown in Huston Diehl, *An Index of Icons in English Emblem Books 1500-1700* (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986).
[38] Within the context of Whither's emblem, it might be tempting to read Armado's later disparaging reference to the 'sweet smoke of rhetoric' (particularly if we relate Moth's 'cannon', from where this smoke came, to the phallic pen) as pointing to the kind of rejection of 'heavenly wisdom' for temporal pleasure that underpins the play.

mnemonic endeavour.[39] However, the idea of study we find elsewhere in Shakespeare, in *Hamlet* or *Titus* for example, with its powerful and profound ability to propel the subject through recesses of thought and private places has no semblance here. Rather, as Thomas observes and I quoted earlier, *studios* is an idea that involves desire and affection, which, even within the initial Academe, is translated by the men into something more whimsical. The language of desire haunts the cognitive process that engages the mind in a quest to obtain or reflect, imagine or represent a language of 'knowing' — be it forbidden or appropriated. However, the play offers three different confrontations with a broader idea of knowing and learning through the semiotic of the book. The King and his lords present one perspective, which is directly set up in opposition to the Princess and her ladies who accommodate another, and the third is the exposition of specific modes of education expressed by Holofernes, Nathaniel and Armado. Unlike *The Shrew*, none of these encounters with the book is explored for instant dramatic gratification rather they extend the *idea* of the book into a hinterland of knowing and longing, and how such processes can ornament the self.

Berowne's difficulty in accepting the King's proposition is expressed though his inability to reconcile himself to a reasonable definition of 'study'. Initially, the word conjures an empty, or at least confounded, prospect he then perceives it as an elite exercise harbouring its own rewards, 'Study knows

[39] David Crystal and Ben Crystal, *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary and Language* Companion (London: Penguin Books, 2002). The word 'study', however, is not defined as a place despite the fact that it is referred to as such in *Romeo and Juliet*, *Julius Caesar* and *Titus Andronicus*. In *Titus*, the study plays an important and significant role in the drama and development of the play, where presumably, in line with the majority of Elizabethan uses, it functions as a library.

that which yet it doth not know' (1.1.68), until at last he comes to an impasse from which he obfuscates definition:

> Study is like the heavens' glorious sun,
> That will not be deep searched with saucy looks.
> Small have continual ever plodders won
> Save base authority from others' books (1.1.84-7).

Conceptually, the play dallies with both Christian and Platonic ideas of knowledge, salvation and election. Whilst the Academe itself, Navarre's esoteric aspirations, and a male orientated quest for Truth can be associated with Plato, notions of love/charity, metaphysics and linguistic play are rooted in Christianity and, more specifically, Protestantism. Berowne disengages himself from and mystifies 'study' through manipulating its heavenly allusions in Christ/Cosmos (sun/son) and aspiration and ineffability ('will not be searched'). Equally, in 'continual plodders' and 'base authority' he treats methodical scholarship pejoratively. Yet, ultimately, Berowne turns 'study' from an activity to a thing and, as a thing in itself, it supports an inherent value and signification, which works to contain the word and exonerate him from any active relationship to it. By manipulating study into an abstract position Berowne is able to dispense with its allusions, and formulate the power of the word to orientate its own end without becoming involved in that process. The idea that the word is responsible for its own reality is central to the play's exploration of how love becomes love, and 'representations' (written, spoken, performed and imagined) are central to that exploration. Just before this pronouncement Berowne had declaimed:

> Why, all delights are vain, but that most vain

> Which, with pain purchased, doth inherit pain;
> As painfully to pore upon a book
> To seek the light of truth while truth the while
> Doth falsely blind the eyesight of his look (1.1.72-5).

Referring to the kind of stoicism that came under similar fire in humanist discourse, Berowne dismisses the act of learning as 'painfully to pore upon a book'.[40] Berowne casts a distinctly temporal and transitory shadow over the exercise in which Navarre had intended to find immortality. The end and the act are self-defeating and unrewarding since the 'truth' of scholarship only dims the light and blinds the eye. The metrically assertive 'look' overrides the 'book' and re-orientates the book's journey through the senses which becomes more sophisticated and subtle as the play develops.[41] Where here, the book impinges on the eye to overshadow the figurative text of grace or truth, later Navarre's eye becomes the book in which Boyet reads the 'still rhetoric' of his love for the Princess. Such 'still rhetoric' is reminiscent of the eloquence of sonnet 23's books, which become the 'dumb presagers' of the poet's breast. The figurative potential in the discourse on study allows us to see the ways in which the semiotic of the book can create a poetic typography of the body and the mind. Whilst the Princess separates the word from the eye, since beauty 'needs not the painted flourish' of 'praise' but is 'bought by the judgement of the eye', Boyet observes so much in the expression of Navarre's 'face's margin': 'But to speak that in words which his eye hath

[40] Whilst Erasmus in *Praise of Folly* uses the rambunctious figure of Folly to satirise the foolish ignorance of unchecked self-belief, Agrippa in *De Vanitate Scientiarum* condemns all human knowledge as ultimately subject to doubt, and therefore pursued only by those who are vain enough to seek perpetual self-reflection. In the context of the ambivalent Christian and (Neo)Platonic shadows behind much of the 'book' in *Love's Labour's Lost*, and assuming that Shakespeare could have had both these authors in the back of his mind, there is a further irony in the representation of the Christian and the occult in Erasmus and Agrippa respectively.

disclosed / I have only made a mouth of his eye / By adding a tongue' (2.1.250-2). Boyet inscribes the space or 'still rhetoric' that lies between the body and the word. Conventionally the book often supports the metaphor of reading or discerning a person's feelings/disposition by their face. Although, famously, Duncan disputes such a skill in *Macbeth* ('There's no art to find the mind's construction in the face'), Shakespeare, in love, often uses the book as a leap through silence. We have already seen how Lucentio 'sees' Bianca's maiden sobriety in her silence, and reads her body in response to Ovid. Yet, in *Love's Labour's* the women's resistance to the 'word' is explored through their rejection of the 'painted flourish' of poetry, which finally leads them to refer their lovers to the kind of silence or solitariness that the bookmen could not initially sustain. The violent distrust of ornamentation sets the women apart from any real communication with the 'maggot ostentation' of Navarre's court and is based upon an evaluation of the representational relationship between truth and art.[42] Ultimately, the women conclude their lovers' declarations by understanding them to be 'At courtship, pleasant jest, and courtesy', thereby negating not only the oaths the men had taken to abjure such courtship, but subjecting their signs to a hierarchy of meaning

[41] It is worth noting this relationship between 'look' and 'book' within the context of the textual discrepancy of sonnet 23. How far we may observe a synthesis between books and looks is deeply suggestive about the relationship between an actor and his part, the book and the stage.

[42] Although it is not directly relevant to this chapter, I would like to suggest a possible reading of the women's relationship to the 'word' in *Love's Labour's Lost*. The Princess arrives at the court to claim a hundred thousand crowns owed to her father by the now King of Navarre. Navarre, believing he is in fact owed the money, asks for some proof of this debt, to which the Princess replies, 'We arrest your word'. From this point on, the play abounds with the word 'word' and its many quibbles and puns. A few scenes later in 3.1, Costard discusses his promised 'remuneration' for carrying out Armado's errand; deconstructing the nature of promise and payment, Costard claims 'Remuneration. O, that is the Latin word for three-farthings: Three farthings remuneration ... I'll give you a remuneration: Why? It carries it remuneration: Why? It is a fairer name than a French crown. I will never buy and sell out of this word'. Since Navarre had claimed that if the Princess could prove her claim he would 'pay it back, /or yield up the Aquitaine', I would suggest that the Princess in 'arresting Navarre's word' aims for a French crown or remuneration, a 'word' Costard and the play will never get out of. What I would like

wherein only the sign that emerges as the truest expression of itself is accepted.[43]

The intensity with which the bookmen set up their Academe — their particular ideas of knowledge, what it means to them to aspire and achieve such learning, and the dialogue through which they dispute this commitment — adumbrates a space within the play that no character will actually inhabit. Instead, they wrest from the idea of study a self-conscious ideology of language, which is set up and against the pretentious and pedantic dictates of Armado and Holofernes. In its organised written form, love runs covertly alongside the 'sweet smoke of rhetoric' or perhaps the 'helpless smoke of words' (*Luc*). For both Armado and Berowne, for instance, the book and its study create a space out of which the men creep to secretly write their love. The peculiarities of space within Shakespeare's plays has often been noted for their dramatic effect; the forest of Arden in *As You Like It*, the island in *The Tempest*, the heath in *King Lear* or the wood in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* all work to impose counterintuitive pressures on the characters, and Anne Barton has shown how the park, the court and the 'play' affect different tides of illusion and artificiality in *Love's Labour's*.[44] Albeit unwittingly, the bookmen create illusory structures from which they covertly move to affect their own reality. Barton claims that the Academe is organised precisely

to suggest is that it is this 'word' 'remuneration' that the Princess looks for in the play, and it comes to her in the King's declaration of love.

[43] In these terms, it is music that emerges as the purest form of art or representation since it manifests as the absolute expression of itself and cannot be represented, as itself, in either words or images. Silence too, as it can neither be represented nor described, perhaps comes closest to our purest mode of human expression.

[44] See Bobbyann Roesen (Anne Barton), 'Love's Labour's Lost', in *Love's Labour's Lost: critical essays*, ed. Felicia Hardison Londré (New York and London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 126-143.

within the conditions of its own failure: 'The paradox of the Academe and the reason why its failure is not only understandable but absolutely necessary lie in the fact that this elaborate scheme which intends to enhance life and extend it through Fame and even beyond the boundaries of the grave would in reality, if successfully carried out, result in the limitation of life and, ultimately, in its complete denial'.[45] Berowne's resistance delineates the abnegation such a commitment would determine; yet the elaborate discourse on study establishes an idea of something that the men aspire to, and their attentive and self-conscious relationship with expression is dependent upon this. Contrary to Barton's claim I would suggest that whether or not the Academe itself is designed to fail, its inherent ideology remains significant throughout the play. Conventionally, the book or writing was often a symbol of how the self could express immortality or fame, and Geoffrey Whitney celebrates this idea in an emblem of a ruined building alongside a pile of books on a table, which bears the motto "Scripta manent" and the epigram: "Writing lasts when all other monuments decay in time".[46] Navarre's commitment to study betrays his desire for both recognition and a feeling for something that lies beyond his park gates. Navarre creates his own 'building' out of the book, which defines the boundaries of his court in excluding women and transcending earthly delights.[47] The desire to transcend and move beyond the intellectual confines of the court is often explored in the men's

[45] Ibid, p. 127.

[46] Huston Diehl, *An Index of Icons in English Emblem Books 1500-1700* (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986), p. 33. In the nineteenth century, Victor Hugo, in *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*, similarly iconicised this image, when the priest, seeing from his study window at the shadow cast by the cathedral, looks down at his books and says 'This will kill that'.

[47] In excluding women, and thereby procreation, Navarre focuses his entire desire for immortality in the written and reputed idea of his self. The contest of the represented self between the marked page and the imprinted child not only informs the language of love (as when Viola warns Olivia: 'Lady, you

physical shifts within the play. As the Princess and her ladies are installed on the periphery of the palace, the men begin to travel towards them as they each individually step outside their sworn place and declaim their love. Yet from their nebulous Academe they bring with them a belief in the force and efficacy of language, but, crucially, one that can be translated into temporal gain. However, the play only charts a potential which is never ultimately fulfilled, and in the women's deferral of their lovers for a period of isolation or evolution they are in some respects returned to the 'trial' or 'war against affections' with which the play began. Even though Berowne is the Academe's fiercest detractor it is he who is set the most specifically linguistic task of conversing with 'groaning wretches' and the 'speechless sick'. Although the Princess declares she is not one 'to teach a teacher', that is precisely what the women set out to do.

To some extent, and as Barton suggests, the men's rebellion against the constraints of the Academe demonstrates a shift from Knowing to Being, and this shift is performed through a recognition of the compatibility — rather than exclusivity — of these terms. As Gremio advised Lucentio, and as many diverse writers of the period including Montaigne, Francis Bacon, Robert Burton and Roger Ascham recognised, knowledge must be accompanied, indeed augmented, by experience. The lovers' recourse to text, to the sonnet, the written page, 'numbers' and prose, situates their development of love alongside their attention to intellectual improvement. As Navarre and his lords develop that sense of self-consciousness through the text (rhyme, prose,

---

are the cruell'st she alive/If you will lead these graces to the grave/And leave the world no copy'

extempore, line and type) of love-poetry they attach themselves to an evolving history of love and letters. Although Shakespeare may have parodied Petrarch's painted flourishes, the love sonnet (amplified within the context of the play by the significance of Eleanor of Aquitaine in the transmission of the language of chivalry and romance)[48] attempts to recover its poet-author in the expression of his love.

Love's Labour's Lost has been often described as Shakespeare's most language-orientated play; in other words, it self-consciously navigates and explores structures of meaning, ideas of discourse and the language of language.[49] Within this matrix, meaning and the idea of meaning is attached to various themes and places within the play. Nathaniel, for example, examines the 'word' and the teaching of philology for its contradictions and illogical constructions. Yet, once the men have secretly abandoned their abjuration of women they turn their ambition to describing their love. The Princess and her ladies in their rejection of love as 'courtesy', deferral of consummation, and insistence on a truth beyond appearance adumbrate a deeper desire for signification than the play has hitherto seemed capable of supplying. Having wrested their aspiration and awareness from the book of

(*Twelfth Night*)), but significantly informs the language and structure of the sonnets.

[48] Melvyn Bragg, in *The Adventure of English: 500AD to 2000, The Biography of a Language* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2003), directly attributes the English inheritance of words (and therefore ideas) of 'courtesy' (cortesie), 'honour' (honor), 'damsels' (damesieles), and 'tournament' (torneiement) to Henry II's marriage to (and importation of) Eleanor of Aquitaine, p. 45.

[49] Keir Elam, in *Shakespeare's Universe of Discourse: language-games in the comedies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), makes a distinction between 'language' and 'discourse'; in terms of Elizabethan English, he explains that the former specifically refers to different tongues, Latin, French, Spanish, etc. and the latter refers to 'language in *use*'. Elam's emphasis on the 'pure self-activity of the word' (quoting Cassirer) understands Shakespeare's use of the word as a dynamic and autonomous instrument that exchanges kinetic energy and meaning within a system of 'self-advertising' response and representation. I have, however, maintained the modern understanding of

study, the men apply themselves to writing, where they might have read. As the play began tracing what it would mean to study, the bookmen evolve through what it would mean to love, and how to mean it.

The transition of the book from humanist article to feminine metaphor is determined by Berowne to release him, not only from the oath but also from the insubstantial pageant of cerebral living. The educational directives of the Academe are consciously elusive, and life, for Berowne at least, is about presence. The expressive, effective text of written desire seems to appear to the bookmen as a blessed and tangible relief from the nebulous idea of 'Things hid and barred' from 'common sense'. The written word, signified as poetic-verse or sonnet, is a consistent trope throughout the play, appearing as a performance of the presence of the word itself. Whilst the women often comment on, and occasionally mock, the nature and efficacy of rhyme, the men plunge at it to affect their desire. Armado, desiring a Muse to aid his seduction of Jaquenetta, declares:

> Assist me, some extemporal god of rhyme, for I am sure I shall turn sonnet.
> Devise wit, write pen, for I am for whole volumes, in folio (1.2.162-4).

Armado is a figure of fun both within and without the play-world and we might draw parallels with a number of renaissance writers who looked to 'some extemporal god of rhyme' to conjure their pen, not least of all Sidney in his opening lines to *Astrophil and Stella*.[50] Although the king mocks

---

both 'discourse' and 'language' in order to avoid any confusion within New-historicist or Post-structuralist terminology and for consistency within the thesis as a whole.

[50] There are other instances where the play draws similar images to *Astrophil and Stella*, most particularly the rendering of fair as black. For a discussion of Sidney in relation to *Love's Labour's*

Armado, he in fact articulates a version of the behaviour of the bookmen; 'turning sonnet' is turning the beloved into a sonnet and in doing so this practice aims to identify and appropriate the thing it describes. However, the women's reaction aims to expose this belief in referential love as both naive and superficial. The idea that the book can somehow embody its inscription is carried over from the original idea of the Academe and translated into the texts of love. The written text provides an expressive link between the physical and metaphysical contingents of truth in meaning. Both scholarship and love must emerge as processes through which we may travel to seek truth and reflection; both depend on a reciprocal relationship with the object, be it the book or the beloved, and neither scholarship nor love can exist inherently or in isolation. The women reduce the men's search for signification to mere graphic configurations of words, referring the men's need for reflection back to them, and their own sentience to truth as beyond the margins of pre-text. Whilst the women recognise and reject an embodied sign of love, the men persist in offering their love in verse as though the text itself has become the embodiment of something more than its medium. The women devote their disparagement not to the peculiarities of love but to its construction in writing. Receiving the King's letter, the Princess declares:

> Nothing but this? – yes, as much love in rhyme
> As would be crammed up in a sheet of paper
> Writ o'both sides of the leaf, margin and all,
> That he was fain to seal on Cupid's name (5.2.6-9).

Lost, see H. R. Woudhuysen's introduction to the Arden edition, third series (Walton-On-Thames: Thomas Nelson, 1998), pp. 2-6; 11-14.

Like Armado's rapacious attitude to 'some extemporal god of rhyme', the King's lack of linguistic restraint breaches poetic decorum and amplitude takes precedence over intimacy; form and quantity become a synecdoche for love. Yet at the same time the childlike lack of restraint, the crammed page and homage to an abstraction of love in Cupid and rhyme denote the King's inexperience in both emotion and expression, an inexperience Boyet has already noticed in the stunned silence and still rhetoric of the King's eye. The intellectual naivety of Navarre and his lords was initially exposed in their inability to harness or express the studious standards to which they would commit themselves; as the play develops however, the women expose a similar naivety that sets words before expression. Dramatically, the women govern the audience, since we have only their responses to the love-letters rather than the letters themselves. Such little faith is placed in the words that the women turn on the materiality of the page; Rosaline laconically observes that Berowne's verses 'hath drawn my picture in his letter':

> Princess: Anything like?
> Rosaline: Much in the letters, nothing in the praise.
> Princess: Beauteous as ink – a good conclusion.
> Catherine: Fair as a text B in a copy-book (5.2.39-42).

The women, attending to the graphology, pun on Rosaline's ethnicity likening her to the colour of ink[51] and it is only in this empirical way that Berowne has

[51] It is not entirely clear whether Rosaline has dark hair and eyes or dark skin. There are a number of references to her as 'dark' within the play and it is clear that her colouring is discordant with the synchronic ideas of courtly beauty. However, the poetic trope of configuring or copying the beloved's beauty in black-ink or lettering is not uncommon: Sidney uses it to great effect in both *Arcadia* and *Astrophil and Stella*. It is Stella's 'beamy black' beauty that the poet 'copies' onto the page 'When Nature made her chief work, Stella's eyes / In colour black, why wrapt she beams so bright? / Would she in beamy black, like painter wise, / Frame daintiest lustre, mixt of shades and light?' (7: 1-4). Shakespeare, similarly, drew analogies between the dark colouring of his beloved with the ink through which they were marked in verse: 'What is in the brain that ink may character, / Which hath not figured

captured an image of his love. The women are compelled to make a tendentious leap to discover a semblance of themselves and, in this case, it is localised not in the ritual of verse but in the visible marks upon the page. Catherine, drawing upon the image of a schoolroom exercise, likens Berowne's composition to translation or repetition, 'text B' being only a version or image of the original (A) and not the thing itself. Even in image, figurative or ironic, Berowne has only managed to capture a copy of a copy in an attempt to configure his beloved. The powerful image of the ink as copy of the beloved but not the love has an equally arresting counterpart in the play's frequent reference to the 'snow-white pen'. As I have already suggested, the relationship between the book and the body had tremendous figurative potential, and, where in *The Shrew* we witness Lucentio's creation of intimacy in the interpretation and eroticism of Ovid and Bianca, in *Love's Labour's* the relationship between the corporeal and the textual is ambiguously, and at times unsettlingly, sexualised. Later, in *Othello*, Othello explicitly terms Desdemona's virginity as an unmarked page defaced by her adultery: 'Was this fair paper, this most goodly book, / Made to write whore upon?' (4.2.73-4). In 'goodly', Othello conflates good (pure, chaste) with godly, directly imaging the virtuous female with Christian education and her body with the Bible. In this condemnation, Othello stains his wife's body with the profanity of sin and the scourge of another man's mark, making and

---

to thee true spirit?' (Sonnet 108). The championing of black as the new blonde ('Then will I swear beauty herself is black, / And all they foul that they complexion lack') is not exclusive to Shakespeare and Sidney and, as Stephen Booth points out, 'the self-consciously heretical practice of praising dark hair and dark eyes was an established part of the tradition it violated'. In the context of *Love's Labour's Lost*, Rosaline's 'blackness' has often been the subject of critical contention, since it is not clear as to whether it refers to specific features or her ethnicity. Elements of her darkness come under attack from other characters in the play, which has led some critics to interpret Shakespeare's portrayal of her as 'alien' or 'other'. However, my interest is in the relationship between writing and meaning, ink and aesthetics.

inscribing her a whore. Here, however, the trope is completely reversed, since the body is not the book but the ink, and fair is not beautiful but black, and the page is not white but the pen.

Further confounding the conventional trope of love-poetry, the Princess robustly rejects the bookmen 'to the death'; even accepting the possible quibble on orgasm, her stubborn determination in these terms darkly anticipates the play's awkward — and unsuccessful — navigation of love and death. Turning away from the letters and the love, the Princess announces:

> No, to the death we will not move a foot,
> Nor to their penned speech render we no grace,
> But while 'tis spoke each turn away her face (5.2.145-7).

It is tempting to infer from the Princess's reference to 'foot' that she is punning on the metrical foot and pronouncing that they will not return the affections with similar, rhythmic, copies of love.[52] The women's view that the men are merely playing at courtesy in copy may be exacerbated by the spaces in which they receive their rhymes. Since the bookmen operate within the symbolic structure of precedent and sonnet, and since they try to trade inherent meanings across words, distance and estrangement, in the park which houses the Princess and her ladies, they lack the supporting correlative of court. The abstract nature of the men's love is visually and intellectually stylised in their transference of authority to the exchange and recognition of love tokens. The charade in which the men fail to recognise their true

[52] Shakespeare puns on 'foot' as metrical rhythm and body part in *As You Like It* when Rosalind says of Orlando's love-poetry: 'the feet were lame, and could not bear themselves without the verse, and therefore stood lamely on the verse' (3.2.155-7).

beloveds on the basis of their tokens of dress dramatically articulates the women's fears through another medium. The women's distrust of the men's relationship to language is symbolically amplified in the male attachment to the fripperies or 'silken taffeta phrases', as it were, of appearance. And Berowne's later description of language within the flattering fabric of ostentation goes some way to augmenting the play's exposure of language as surrogate intimacy. The Muscovites' manipulation of ritual and deception of the love-object is central to the revelation of public pre-text over private meaning. The unfortunate entrapment brought about by the women is effected as they each adopt a token of the others' dress (which is what the lovers respond to as signifying identity rather than all the attributes they claim to adore in their praise).

During the Muscovite performance, the disguised 'book-men' try to court the women, and, unbeknown to them, prostrate themselves before the wrong lady; Longueville, hoping for some capitulation, says 'Let's part the word', to which Catherine responds, 'No, I'll not be your half' (5.2.249). Putting aside the sexual innuendoes, the dialogue suggests a particular understanding of the word within the play's search for signification. Richard Mulcaster's *Elementarie* (1582), a standard humanist text, explains how the noun performs its meaning:

> What a cunning thing it is to give right names, and how necessarie it is, to know their forces, which alredie given, bycause the word being knowen, which implyeth the propertie the thyng is half known, whose propertie is emplyed.[53]

The 'force' and purpose of the word is that it inherently contains half of what it represents, so that, if we 'part the word', half shall be the thing itself and half the activity of the signified idea. Longueville's attempt to 'part the word' appears to act or 'employ' love in conjunction with its inherent signification. Longueville's attention to the word surfaces as part of the bookmen's belief in the authority of language to convey and enable inherent meaning. Locating the word in its parts signals Longueville's perception of himself as an appendage to the performing sign and suggests a profound faith in the authority of language to determine his reality. Equally, Catherine's devolved relationship, wherein she has the capacity, in reciprocating his love, to re-form the word, glances at the more 'earthly delights' of Platonic Image and Form. Representing half of Longueville's objective and meaning Catherine has the ability to harness the word and contain the 'force' of the word between them. Longueville's skittish approach to seduction situates his relationship to his beloved within a powerful and evolving discourse on love and language. His playful parting of the word indicates a much more serious and problematic area in the play, where all meaning is subject to disruption once it stands apart from the speaker and the subject. Yet, the prevailing understanding of language in early modern hermeneutics imagines the word as a contained and reflective mirror of the perceived and empirical world; the process of naming and referencing works to both adorn and augment a reasonable structure of engagement and response. Poetry, as we are frequently reminded in its arcane inspirations or intellectual apologies, elaborates on the known and knowing world through association, attachment

[53] As quoted by William C. Carroll, *The Great Feast of Language in Love's Labour's Lost* (Princeton:

and sensory imagination. The location of language in the mirror-mind is symptomatic of the harmonic relationship between man and his world that simultaneously defines and designs him; for the bookmen the union of lover and beloved has become the language of naming.[54] Yet, in this, the men make no distinction between love rendered meaningful in the pretexts of poetry and love rendered communicable in contact with the beloved. The language of love becomes a contentious site of meaning as it floats freely in the unspecified space of illusion and disenchantment.

In one respect, the dialogue between Catherine and Longueville is symptomatic of the discourse-dance through which the characters operate, choosing or rejecting properties and rhythms of the word. In another respect, Catherine's response is indicative of a wider and more sceptical concept of marriage, which, much like education, determines the behaviour of the woman according to her reflective response to her husband.[55] John Case in his *Thesaurus Oeconomiae* (1597) addresses various questions concerning the moral responsibilities and social dynamics incumbent upon the married couple. Case values love highly as a contingent of marriage and, in

---

Princeton University Press, 1976), p. 13.

[54] See above. For Carroll, the act and implications of 'naming' are central to the play. The emphasis on the propriety and impropriety of naming arises from, not only his argument for the centrality of language, but also a pre- and post-lapsarian dialectic between essential and corrupt language which, for Ann Barton, is expressed in the contention between reality and illusion, 'Love's Labour's Lost', pp. 125-143.

[55] Robert S. Knapp in his essay '"Is it appropriate for a man to fear his wife?": John Case on Marriage', *English Literary Renaissance* 28 (1998), 387-415, charts the language and ceremony of marriage within the concept of community. One of Case's concerns is the role and value attached to truth or illusion in the language and dynamics of conjugal living; for example, does it matter if your wife is not the most beautiful woman in the world if you, as her husband, believe her to be? What are the social and cultural consequences of truths and illusions supported by perception? Interestingly, in the context of this chapter, Case understands the relationship between man and wife as similar to Sidney's understanding of the function and benefits of poetry. Knapp suggests: 'By explicitly associating his understanding of the relationship between man and wife with Sidney's account of the function of ideal,

determining the language of affection between couples, argues for a degree of flexible subjectivity. The language of love cannot and should not be tried on empirical or existential grounds, and 'affection' is therefore deemed to be exempt from finite rules of representation. Case focuses our understanding on a relationship between representation and love which finds no absolute relief in naming:

> Finally to say that the father is more like God is to confuse finite with infinite, and words with reality: there is no comparison between God and man, and though in name the father may seem more to resemble God as begetter and cause, the similitude in name only is no cause for greater affection, since love is seen in the truth of affection, not in the shadow of a name.[56]

For Case, language, particularly the language of love, is only a shadow of the feeling it expresses, since not only are feelings metaphysical but language is only an idea of the 'truth' searched for in words but supported by emotion or action. Emotional truth — and faith in that truth — as it is, and in order for it to remain so, is at an oblique angle to semantic definition. This apparently romantic view of love is qualified by Case as he advocates a temperate and reasonable conduct in marriage:

> And as he insists in the *quaestiones*, this is neither idolatry nor intellectual error: the husband admires his wife rather than adores her; he does not make a god or idol of her, but rather the mirror and consolation of his life; this judgement is necessarily a matter of affection and opinion, not of knowledge and intellect.[57]

The distinction between knowledge and affection is central to the trajectory of the play. Navarre and his lords began their search for knowledge heavily

---

poetic images, he lets us see something of the way in which "Petrarchan" literary thought could have ethical, psychological, and spiritual effects within marriage', 402.

[56] Ibid., 398.

[57] Ibid., 409.

informed by feeling — whether it was the desire for something beyond their status or the abjuration of physical pleasure — in rejection or pursuit, their desire leads them into an awkward and ambiguous synthesis of affection and intellect. As Case suggests, only in registering the limits of opinion and intellect can a harmony of love and knowledge be sustained. Once the bookmen step outside the boundaries of their prescribed knowledge — the court, the oath, the clothes — they lose the support of a determined reality. And it is this absence of determining support that translates their love into 'jest' or 'courtesy'. However, this is not to say that the women merely misunderstand them, for the bookmen have much to learn, and when Berowne returns us to the book at the end of the play we realise that the men have simply transferred their idolatry from the book to the beloved — hence their various trials at the close of the play. This understanding of language and love is, as yet, too sophisticated for Longueville and, unlike Case, his separation of love from knowledge is not based upon recognition of alternative approaches to truth. Whilst Case deems affection to be ineffable and exempt from absolute definition or objective correlatives, Longueville supposes love to be as prescriptive as learning but subject to a different discipline and alternative text. The lovers' rather desultory relationship to either language or love is summed up in Rosaline's comment on their performance: 'Ah, they were all in lamentable cases. / The King was weeping-ripe for a good word' (5.2.273-4).

The play on the general absence of 'a good word', either in approval from the women or affection from the men, suggests the seminal difference such a

word would have made. Indeed, the very proliferation of puns situates the word as a significant part of the infrastructure of the play,[58] but the 'good word' that the King could not provide was the harmonic signification of moment and meaning, word and self. Of course the women are largely culpable for this destabilisation of language since it is through their transference of identities that the men fail to overcome the obstacle of objectification. Yet, the women's role in exposing processes and failures of translation illuminates our faith in naming to affect reality. In contrast, the bookmen's deference to the letters of love highlights their inexperience and emerges as a particular and public aspect of their humiliation. The hopeless lovers are forced into obliquity through the eyes of each other as well as the audience. Believing themselves to be alone they fall upon the opportunity to declaim:

> Berowne: By heaven, I do love, and it hath taught me to rhyme and be melancholy, and here *[showing a paper]* is part of my rhyme, and here *[touching his breast]* my melancholy (4.3.10-13).
> Longueville: I fear these stubborn lines lack power to move.
> O sweet Maria, empress of my love,
> These numbers I will tear, and write in prose (4.3.50-52).
> Dumain: This will I send [an ode], and something else more plain,
> That shall express my true love's fasting pain (4.3.117-8).

As Berowne demonstrably performs a relationship between his heart and his text on stage we see how, when the written word comes into contact with character, a dialogue between thought and action emerges. In a need to animate their silenced selves, the men move beyond the imaginative (and, here, public) presence of the book to the idea of poesy, wherein language and

[58] For an insightful and provocative look at the role of the pun in creating and releasing meaning, particularly in relation to sexuality and gender definition, see William C. Carroll, 'The Virgin Not:

form appear to determine the space between isolated feeling and reflexive being. As each lover steps forward with his own idea of love he exposes 'rhyme', 'lines' 'numbers', 'prose' and 'odes' as free-floating signs of intimacy. For the lovers, verse pattern as ritual or pre-text operates in a similar way to the schoolbook primer, as a copybook on which to impress their selves and imitate precedent. In this way rhyme, metre and generic structure seem to embody the very idea of poetry and poetry seems to embody the very idea of love.

The response of the three lords to their desire and writing denotes three different, but all parodied, ideas of the transaction between language and feeling: Berowne equates rhyme with love, therefore the former will always express the latter; Longueville, alternatively, feels hampered by the boundaries of verse and turns to prose in the hope of a more liberal range of meaning, and Dumaine, perhaps most interestingly, caught by an awareness of the limits of language to represent the self, sends his beloved two alternative missives of desire, an ode and 'something else more plain'. All three men feel confident that, whatever their particular method, the generic constructs of 'poesy' will write and represent their inner feelings. The possibility of the private self or individual consciousness in language, as isolated from either imaginative experience or experienced imagination is subject to doubt. As the play navigates the two most profound human emotions of love and grief we begin to wonder whether the ability to access

---

Language and Sexuality in Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Survey* 46 (1993), 107-119.

and respond to the self in language will always remain in translation.[59] Yet, neither love nor grief fulfils its role in *Love's Labour's Lost* since both conditions are deferred or suspended. Love and grief have alternately and separately re-routed intentions and hopes but neither state provides an entirely satisfactory fabric on which to inscribe the developments of the subjective self.

The play's presentation of learning runs in different directions; what we might call, the potential and the pedantic. The sub-plot of the schoolmaster and his team runs rather obliquely alongside the main play; in terms of love, it crudely harnesses and amplifies the basic boy-tries-to-get-girl-through-love-and-language theme. In terms of learning, however, it brilliantly confronts the conceptual and strategic marks of discourse, parodying the pedant, the prescriptivist, or the grammarian, whilst simultaneously presenting language as the most exceptional and essential of arts.[60] Whilst the Princess and Rosaline discuss the configurations of graphology and, what Walter Ong would call 'the word-in-space', Nathaniel, Armado and Holofernes attend to the nature and problem of elocution and decorum. The men's attitude and attention to language, in the rites of translation and iteration, are straightforward parodies of the humanist schoolmaster and the popular primary texts of philologists such as Lily, Mulcaster and Perkins. The satire is explored in this relationship between 'teacher' and text, learning and

[59] It is the character of Mercadé who epitomises both love and loss: he enters the play at a critical moment, in terms of the resolution of desire, with news of the King's death.
[60] Although it is significant to remember that the characters of Armardo, Holofernes and Nathaniel, to some extent, are representative of the initial imperatives of humanism. Such precise and thoughtful attention to language, its form, technicalities and movements were seminal points in evaluating the nature of 'translation' and how words move through 'historical distance'.

language. Nathaniel, like his companions seeks precision in excess, hyperbole, and zeugma; attempting to explain the ineptitude of Dull, he suggests:

> Sir, he hath never fed of the dainties that are bred in a book.
> He hath not eat paper, as it were, he hath not drunk ink. His intellect is not replenished, he is only an animal, only sensible in the duller parts (4.2.21-3).

Language in *Love's Labour's Lost* is in search of language, and the book, according to Nathaniel, is the iconic map of that journey. Before Berowne develops his sophistic argument centralising the figurative status of the book, Nathaniel de-constructs it metaphorically to exemplify the obtuse, or starved, Dull. Nathaniel strips the sum of the book to its component parts to imaginatively re-form them as a process of ingestion that the animal, in its primitive and uncivilised world, is condemned to live without. The feasting or eating of knowledge by way of the book is the original premise from which Navarre set out and, here, Nathaniel attempts to represent that 'scholarly' claim literally. His only way of expanding or developing the role of the book within the ideological self is to articulate a literal transaction between material and metaphor in an effort to reassure himself of the requisites of learning. Nathaniel registers his superiority through his elaborate use of the figurative book; extending his image through the corporeal appetite and physical condition he sustains his ego in semantics. The ease with which Nathaniel accommodates the transition of the book from icon to metaphor is an important part of his definition of self; using the book as a formative sign he creates for himself and his colleagues 'a little academe' – or he tries to.

Commenting on Armado's amorous letter to Jaquenetta, Nathaniel claims that:

> Study his bias leaves, and makes his book thine eyes,
> Where all those pleasures live that art would comprehend (4.2.102-3).

Unlike the bookmen, Nathaniel is able to create a sustainable bookish surface because it is entirely self-referential, and here, also unlike Navarre and his lords, he can synthesise love and learning without losing his integrity. Nathaniel neither steps outside of nor denies the linguistic and intellectual imperatives by which he exists, so that he is always within the space and moment of his own semantic field. Nathaniel's ability to articulate his subject through a bookish hinterland marks him as one who has 'fed of the dainties that are bred in a book', 'eat[en] paper' and 'drunk ink'. In referencing a sustainable relationship between world and book, Nathaniel comments:

> Nathaniel: ... for society, saith the text, is the happiness of life.
> Holofernes: And certes the text most infallibly concludes it (4.2.147-8).

Irrespective of the sentiment, Holofernes returns the authority to the text since, even though such happiness lies with society, the truth of the judgement lies in the text. It seems impossible for either Holofernes or Nathaniel to separate themselves from the ideology and edicts of text, and together they perpetuate a synchronic system of semantic hierarchy. The word of the book or the text fixes meaning, establishes authority, recognises the speaker and determines experience. As Berowne works toward his anagnorisis, his recognition and re-definition of aspiration and affection, he prepares an oath:

> Where is a book,
> That I may swear beauty doth beauty lack
> If that she learn not of her eye to look?
> No face is fair that is not full so black (4.3.246-9).

The signification of a book in oath is in part both a resurrection and rejection of the initial ascetic oath, but it is also symptomatic of the structure and affirmation of sentiment that surrounds the language of the book. It is usually assumed that Berowne's book is a Bible due to the oath-like context; however, he refers to it as an indefinite article implying that it could be any book; equally, within the Neoplatonic context where Beauty has become the privileged and noble Form, Berowne's book is symbolic of his desire for a sympathetic union of the intellectual trilogy of passion, action and contemplation.

The play's apprehension of the language of learning, conceptualised in 'the book' and the 'word', undergoes a process of transition and transmutation that is emblematic of a similar journey undertaken by the lovers. The play's confrontation with shadows of meaning, rites of wisdom and the search for the definable self is directly invoked in Berowne's peroration:

> For wisdom's sake – a word that all men love –
> Or for love's sake – a word that loves all men –
> Or for men's sake – the authors of these women –
> Or women's sake – by whom we men are men –
> Let us once lose our oaths to find ourselves,
> Or else we lose ourselves to keep our oaths.
> It is religion to be thus forsworn,
> For charity itself fulfils the law,
> And who can sever love from charity? (4.3.331-339).

This speech deserves particular and detailed attention since it juxtaposes, fragments and formulates many central and serious elements of discourse. The first four lines, embedded in rhetorical device, employ 'wisdom', 'love', 'word' and 'author', in a dance of meaning that is underscored and harmonised by 'men' and 'women'. Despite the repetition, or ploce, effective in these four statements, none of the sentences are constructed according to the same emphasis or noun definition. The word 'wisdom' enters powerfully as a concept; a word that men love, aspiring to or appreciating that epistemological end, and, yet, although it is as quickly abandoned in favour of an extended play on 'love', it remains in the shadows of love to support the 'wisdom' of that word and emotion. 'Love's' functions in the second line as a quibble and, according to its specific grammatical disposition, conflates the possessive and the plural in 'love's' and 'loves', exercising wordplay at the expense of precision. The second two lines are involved in a broader and more essential ambiguity; men, conventionally, are not usually described as 'authors' of women (or anyone) since they do not bear gestation or labour, yet within this immediate context 'authors' is given the meaning of 'engendered' or 'created'. In the broader context of Berowne's speech and the play, however, the line proposes that men write, engender or create 'these women' according to their own ideas of identity and composition; in other words they authorise them when they render them communicable in language — or verse. The following line plays upon the ambiguity of the former by allocating women their procreative and supportive role in the development of the male identity. However, rather than function as 'other', in the conventional sense of frictional cipher, women are the formative mirrors of

assimilation and reflection; they enable and ignite the subjective self through positioning it in the sensible world.

Within the play, the women represent the ability to recognise, explore or reject language as an arbitrary and impersonal system of signs. In their recognition of the performance of the 'word', they reject language, like the peripheral space of the park, or illusory fabric of the masque, as a process of translation in which essence is diluted or condemned by representation.[61] The final lines of Berowne's speech temptingly navigate a fundamental point of translation. Arguably one of the most contentious aspects of Tyndale's translation of the New Testament in 1526 from the Greek was his decision to render the Vulgate's translation of 'charity' 'love'. Berowne's question, 'Who can sever love from charity?', recalls a seminal point in the history of the churches in the relationship between translation and interpretation, symbol and meaning. Berowne's question acknowledges a composite, but protean, view of language where meaning is largely established in intention rather than essence. The importance of this is that it retrieves the subjective self from the objective structure: what makes his words subjective, or anybody's words subjective, is the motive or emotion through which they are constructed and communicated. Berowne's image juxtaposes a monk who effects a version of charity in his choices and actions with a layman who can accommodate another version of charity through loving a woman. Both men may swear an oath of love; one to God the other to his wife; both men are forsworn and both love but are contracted to different imperatives and, in the light of this,

we might recall Case's analogy with the ineffable nature of God and the romantic affection of marriage.[62] Tyndale's editorial decision was, he declared, based on a desire to 'interpret the sense of the scripture and the meaning of the spirit', here he deliberately transposes the traditional language of response by 'sensing' the text and 'explaining' the spirit; this idea of the synthesis of self and meaning underpins the development of the play.

The search to signify the self is localised in the transition from knowledge to self-knowledge and in the realisation that they are not mutually inclusive. Berowne terms this realisation in the movement of the book from icon to metaphor, from ideology to affection:

> O, we have made a vow to study, lords,
> And in that vow we have forsworn our books (4.3.292-3).

Recognising the importance of the idea and language of the book in the Academe and aspirations of his fellows, Berowne chooses to re-define and extend its ideology, to not only incorporate women but also to represent them:

> Never durst poet touch a pen to write
> Until his ink were tempered with love's sighs.
> O, then his lines would ravish savage ears,
> And plant in tyrants mild humility.
> From women's eyes this doctrine I derive.
> They sparkle still the right Promethean fire.
> They are the books, the arts, the academes
> That show, contain, and nourish all the world,
> Else none at all in aught proves excellent (4.3.320-28).

---

[61] Appositely, within the context of this discussion, '"translation" [is] a synonym for "metaphor" in Elizabethan English', see Malcolm Evans, 'Deconstructing Shakespeare's Comedies', in *Alternative Shakespeares*, ed. John Drakakis (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), p. 75.

[62] This, of course, is a distinctly Protestant conception since it is directed through justification by faith, and not good deeds or coffers, which would register a more Catholic commitment to either love or charity.

Berowne's 'doctrine' creates a metonymic relationship between women, books, arts and academes, which are then animated by the correlative verbs of 'show', 'contain' and 'nourish'. This verbal arrangement synthesises the art of study with the act of procreation to the extent that woman and book become mutually absorbed in the act and art of sustaining a world picture. The verbs play upon the visible and physical aspects of pregnancy whilst at the same time investing the intellectual life with a generative and material power. Here 'show' works to focus the representative potential of women to reproduce their lover and their child as well as imaging the book and the academe as reflective of knowledge and the bodies who pursue it. As desire informed the initial aspiration to study, here the body contains the presence and potential of all that 'proves excellent'. Even though the speech begins with a certain conventional invocation of love as the essential and poetic muse, Berowne does acknowledge a dialogic relationship between the lover and his language that requires a process of reflection and engagement. Although Berowne displays a developing awareness of the activity of the word, he continues to deploy his desires through the semiotics of pre-text and, where he may push himself beyond a complacent relationship between ink and love, Rosaline will push him back to words that have no textual relief – the 'language' of the speechless sick.

For Berowne, the book ultimately functions as a permissive pre-text; an idea, icon, metaphor, or typographic scheme that enables and allows feelings, desires or aspirations to exist in accordance with an ideology of expression

that signifies commitment and desire. He launches into his justification of love, and its synthesis with learning, through the metaphor of reading the beloved. A similar trope appears in both *Romeo and Juliet* and *King John* Berowne's metaphor, however, is slightly different in that it is not the book of love itself that he reads in the beloved's eyes but an invitation to determine another 'book' or 'doctrine' which supplies meaning. Berowne translates his beloved into a reflection of a comprehensive system of expression predicated on a value system inherent in the book: 'They are the books, the arts, the academes'. The book began as an instrument of access, via the 'little academe', to the 'wonder of the world' with which Navarre opened the play; the book continues to function as the microcosm, but has since accrued 'love's sighs', 'women's eyes' and, in these, 'the voice of all the gods'. The shift in meaning is born from a parallel shift in the art of language; where the referent, sign or emblem could not sustain or animate its essence, the metaphor, metaphysical or collaboration of words opens up a potential discourse between speaker and subject, and, in this way, the 'copy' is rejected:

> O, never will I trust to speeches penned,
> Nor to the motion of a schoolboy's tongue,
> Nor never come in visor to my friend,
> Nor woo in rhyme, like a blind harper's song.
> Taffeta phrases, silken terms precise,
> Three-piled hyperboles, spruce affectation,
> Figures pedantical – these summer flies
> Have blown me full of maggot ostentation (5.2.402-9).[63]

[63] The irony is, of course, that the lines quoted are the octave of a sonnet.

Despite the lovers' recognition of the need to re-define themselves and the language of their desires, despite their re-configuration and expansion of the structure and demands of the bookish world, they are finally pitched against the judgement of the women who refer each man to an equitable experience. *Love's Labour's Lost* ends as Armado claims that 'The words of Mercury are harsh after the songs of Apollo', and the juxtaposition of these two gods is usually taken as referring to the sombre entrance of death after the light of love. However, both Apollo and Mercury are astral gods, and the former is associated with music and poetry, whilst the latter with science and travelling. What we might also infer from Armado's closing statement is the power and presence of language and the arts within processes of change. Mercury was, particularly within the field of alchemy, regarded as a potent aspect of change, and in astrology as a sign of poets or eloquence, as well as mythologically attached to travelling and science. Looking at all these ideas together, we might better understand his role here as symptomatic of the rational and physical shifts the women demand of their lovers as either under the auspice of eloquence or as a process working toward a full realisation of the world in art.

The women, who refuse resolution, defer expectation, and resist a generic formula, are the keepers of a truth that lies beyond the boundaries of graphic art. Yet as the play ends with the bookmen packed off into their various spaces of transition or reform, there is a sense in which the play closes as its discourse begins. Each of the men is taken back to the beginning of his journey, only, this time, in terms outlined by the women. When Berowne

explains that from this moment their lives are 'too long for a play', they are returned to language, 'to weed this wormwood from your fruitful brain', to silence, 'a forlorn and naked hermitage', experience, 'a beard, fair health and honesty', and to thought, after which they will begin their journey into expression once more.

Both *The Taming of The Shrew* and *Love's Labour's Lost* are dramatically supported by a relationship to the book. More particularly both plays expose how the book can appear to translate systems of value and interpretation from which love can either be appropriated or challenged. In *The Shrew* the role of the teacher (be he tamer or tutor) is drawn through institutional and anarchic structures of imitation and response. Working with (Lucentio) and without (Petruchio) 'the book', love is identified as a corollary of instruction referred to the text or sanctioned by the institution. Yet, even within a few years, the performance of the book has dramatically changed. In *Love's Labour's*, the idea of the book begins a semantic and metaphysical journey through the terms and forms of represented and representative truth. From the outset, the play scrutinises and fragments graphic and ideological performances of the book; from the angel-knowledge of academia, through rhyme, prose, odes and inscription to the very ink and page that forms the text, each aspect and sign of the written word is subject to accusations of illusion or art. Yet neither play concludes comfortably nor defines its value system; rather, both plays end with an awkward, unresolved or ambiguous love. Where we might have begun with a faith in 'translation', the tutor to the lover, the shrew to the wife, the bookman to the husband, and the Princess to the court, not one of these

processes of translation is satisfactory. Yet, as the characters unfurl under the semiotic of the book and the auspice of love, it becomes harder to distinguish which — the book or love — has the most power to challenge meaning.

IV

Richard II: *'Marked with a blot, damned in the book of heaven'*

The book that Richard II places at the heart of his reign and his righteousness is the book of heaven, an inscrutable icon of faith that synthesises the celestial and temporal worlds: a 'marriage — 'twixt my crown and me'.[1] The book of heaven is ordained by God in a teleological universe, in which the path of life is justified by the judgement of heaven. This book is strictly bound by the divinity of kings, and it is to these pages that Richard refers his selective conscience for the immutable justification of precedence and power. However, despite the Christian pre-text of this image, Richard appears to create an independent and amorphous space in which he seeks to constantly re-define the limits of his reign. Fashioning himself through theories of un-visibility,[2] Richard harnesses the book to his body as he will later the mirror to his soul. The book, I shall argue, becomes enmeshed in creating and dissolving representational terms of transparency. The figurative scope generated by the arcane book of heaven, in conjunction with the king's self-determined iconography, do not necessarily respond to medieval or even Tudor concepts of kingship, but confront the relationship between presence and thought. A theory of kingship does not exist within the play as a single ideology, which may be — in new historicist terms — subverted or contained. Rather, I would suggest that Richard creates a self-reflexive fabric of authority through images in which he defines and obscures his language of

[1] William Shakespeare, *Richard II*, ed. Stanley Wells (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1997), V.2.72. All references are to this edition, unless otherwise stated. This edition uses the Folio as the control text.

being. Such images, to which the book is central, are subjected to the demands of both an instant and a shifting history, as it is manifest in an ever-changing theatre of power. *Richard II* is by far the most complicated play in terms of Shakespeare's idea of the book, for the image and word become enmeshed in shifting religious discourse as well as theatrical practices of visibility and suggestion. Both the ubiquitous presence of the book and the various devolved icons through which it moves elide our immediate responses to meaning and the, sometimes impossible, dialectic of truth between word and image.

The book in *Richard II* is never strictly referred to as 'the Bible', however, Richard's invocation of transcendental support and monarchical authority, his self-righteousness, identification with Christ, and division of the physical and spiritual clearly locate a theatrical synthesis between medieval kingship and post-reformation supremacy.[3] Yet, Richard's rather nebulous identification with the book becomes central to how he isolates and represents his own terms of meaning. That Shakespeare does not nominally nor distinctly locate the Bible is not unusual, since the word never appears in any of his plays (the exception being a comic reference in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*),[4] but Richard's rhetorical absorption of biblical text into emotional expression,

---

[2] I use the word 'un-visibility' here, as opposed to invisibility, because Richard negotiates his self-image in terms of what is seen and what might be seen, as though his icons of authority rest from sight rather than deny it.

[3] Naseeb Shaheen's study, *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, London: Associated University Press, 1999), identifies that, in terms of secondary sources, 'the most significant biblical borrowing is the betrayal of Christ theme taken from Créton and the *Traïson*. But these works contain very few additional references to Scripture, none of which Shakespeare used.... As was Shakespeare's usual practice, the many biblical references in the play are largely his own', p. 362.

[4] Censorship, of course, played a fundamental role in the stage's exclusion of the Bible, and we notice that the escapade with 'the book and the priest' in *The Shrew* takes place off stage.

alongside his esoteric relationship with the word of God, dramatically determines the ways in which the king seeks to augment his self in the 'word' and book of God. Although no serious consideration of Shakespeare's books can be considered without an exposition of the role of the Bible, it is significant to notice that in *Richard II* the 'book', like the 'show', offer Richard a way of defining and expressing authority through the co-ordinates of a self-determined reality, and the religious implications do not necessarily mark out the book for spiritual exegesis. [5] We cannot be certain that Richard's book is the Bible in a form we would recognise in either the pre- or post-reformation churches of England. What we can begin to explore, however, is the way in which both the symbolic and textual value of the Bible may be absorbed not only into standard humanist culture but also into representations of power in the relationship between language and image.

The play opens in the middle of the history of the reign of Richard II; entering the stage in the midst of a murky dispute over loyalty, Richard immediately invokes the 'oath and bond' that binds a subject to protect his king from treason. Despite the history that defines Richard's relationship to the death of his uncle, and Mowbray's and Bolingbroke's part in it, the play makes no obvious attempt to implicate or narrate the pre-text to this scene. On one hand we have an idea of the historical Richard as we are dramatically thrown into

[5] 'The Book' is usually understood as a synonym for the Bible, since, according to the *Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 'the word "Bible" derives from a Greek word meaning "books"; as the biblical Books came to be regarded as a unity, the word came to used as a single noun'. The *OED*, however, makes this the fifth definition of the noun. Inherent in the use of the Book as a noun are the concepts of 'unity' and the cohesive authority of the application to and understanding of the text. In *Richard II*, however, the king's understanding and application to the Book is dependent, not upon its unification of Christian subjects but upon his individual elevation and justification, through the works of God, to the understanding of men.

the circumstances of his accession — a story and the death of kings — on the other, we see the Richard on stage before us, who is apparently entirely convinced by the word and voice of divine and monarchical authority.[6] As the scene progresses, we witness Richard presiding over an 'appeal for treason', in which the king has absolute and instant authority to decide justice.[7] As Richard apportions blame and exiles his former allies he establishes the terms of his power. To Mowbray he declares:

> The hopeless word of 'never to return'
> Breathe I against thee upon pain of life (I.3.152-3).

In drawing attention to the 'word' of banishment and the imposition of the emotional values of 'hopeless', 'against' and 'pain', Richard lays his language down as responsive representations of authority in the configuration of his 'breath'. Behind his words are the book of heaven and the jurisdiction of God, and Mowbray's anticipation of his exile images what Richard has not said — the walking death of silence as an alien in a foreign land —:

> Within my mouth you have engaoled my tongue,
> Doubly portcullised with my teeth and lips,
> And dull unfeeling barren ignorance
> Is made my gaoler to attend on me
>
> . . . .
>
> What is my sentence then but speechless death,
> Which robs my tongue from breathing native breath? (I.3.166-69, 172-3).

---

[6] Although my study of the book is not based on intertextual sourcing, it is interesting to note that 'Shakespeare borrowed more biblical references from it [*Woodstock*] than from any of his other sources', Shaheen, *Biblical References*, p. 362. In terms of how the play chooses to unfold its history upon the stage, that *Woodstock* contains the pre-history of Shakespeare's Richard and the most secondary biblical references, yet never explicitly defines itself in relation to either, creates a theatrical tension between history and representation on stage.

[7] As Katherine Eisaman Maus explains, in *The Norton Shakespeare,* an 'appeal for treason' was when a 'plaintiff and defendant present their cases in their own persons before the King, who instantly dispenses justice' and was 'already archaic in Shakespeare's time', p. 943.

From Richard's 'hopeless word' Mowbray extrapolates the living hell of enforced silence, impotence and frustration that may remind us of the trials of the Traitors in Dante's book of hell, who were frozen into ice only to watch and murmur away their indefinite time. Mowbray imagines his future in terms that augment Richard's God-like self-image and, in particularly recognising the faculty of speech, Mowbray anticipates the graphic way Richard censures life. The word and breath that begins our image of Richard's reign and sends his traitors into senseless isolation and speechlessness, 'No never write, regreet, nor reconcile', spreads the written word, and its present history, as a stain or 'blot' across the stage. When Bolingbroke urges Mowbray to 'confess' his treason, he responds: 'No, Bolingbroke, if ever I were traitor / My name be blotted from the book of life,' (I.3.201-2). This image of the blot, excising or marking a book, introduces an intellectual and visual paradigm that remains powerful throughout the play. The book of life, as compiled by Mowbray, is a long and ubiquitous volume, in which 'life' is a written history of events and effects beyond the instant demands of recorded speech. The weight of Mowbray's book — like his exile — is construed in what is not said; he may be a murderer but he is not a traitor, and the suggestion of a possible textual truth sets up the book as an image of the competing histories that shadow the stage. Whether 'truth' is construed as determined precedence or possible change emerges in the idea of the book which supports the various relationships to monarchy and absolutism throughout the play. Working from Richard's own application to a divine textual authority, the play exposes how power seeks to augment itself against

the graphic stains of history. Whilst Bolingbroke sees himself 'End in a word — such is the breath of kings', John of Gaunt feels his story or 'tale' to have been unheard, and therefore erased by Richard. Following on from his own censure, Gaunt conflates his son's exile with 'this dear, dear, land,' 'leased out' 'Like to a tenement or pelting farm' as having defaced the book of England:

> England, bound in with the triumphant sea,
> Whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege
> Of watery Neptune, is now bound in with shame,
> With inky blots and rotten parchment bonds (II.1.61-4).

The relationship that Gaunt makes between the 'leased' land and the rotten fabric of the country may glance at the Doomsday Book and Richard's taxation to fund his war with Ireland. Richard's wrongs seep into the pages of his country — imagined as, and recorded in, the book — and the false oaths and bonds through which Richard seeks to consolidate his reign are here evoked as the very land upon which he stands. Calling forth the imperial duty of England's history, Gaunt envisages how Richard begins to rot and stain the pages of his reign, suggesting that both kings and history lie 'writ with blank space for different names'.[8] Yet, whilst Gaunt images the royal precedent as inexorably linked to its country's textual history, Richard writes his own story, as distinct from his subjects, through the symbolic power of what he can either 'show' or 'blot'. As Richard faces Bolingbroke's growing rebellion, he exclaims: 'For God's sake let us sit upon the ground / And tell sad stories of the death of kings' (III.2.155-6). For Richard, the earth or 'ground' upon which he sits is ordained by his duty 'for God's sake', and the

[8] *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 2.1.66.

stories which he will tell place the narrative of the king as responsive to God's earth. Richard's belief in a pre-ordained existence sets him in a contest between being God's spiritual deputy on earth and a physical, substantial king of breath. Just before Richard sits upon the ground to find the narrative of kings, increasingly aware of the impact of Bolingbroke's banishment, he declares:

> O that I were as great
> As is my grief, or lesser than my name,
> Or that I could forget what I have been,
> Or now remember what I must be now! (III.3.136-9).

Richard finds himself mortal under the weight of consequence setting his 'grief', 'name' and memory upon a scale of impact and authority Richard turns to the substance of story and matter for the spiritual reassurance in his book of life. Yet the relationship which Gaunt had feared between the earth and the story, rotten and stained by mismanagement, is re-deployed by Richard into his language of naming. The distinction Richard makes here between his grief and his name is symptomatic of the conscious distance he will pursue between the substance and shadow of representation. Where for Gaunt or Mowbray the book of life is a narrative process of representation in the inevitable effects of action, for Richard it is an individual shadow behind the matter of his performance. Yet, the figurative potential of the book appears to engage with an overwhelming structure of rightness that will not necessarily show things as they are but ultimately what the characters want them to be. Despite the rendition of God's judgment working through the images of earth and story, the relationship to heaven is a consciously

theatrical trope. Richard appropriates the image of the heavenly book as one of his tools of representation within the performance for his life. Richard *plays* the book as a glass in which he will condemn his traitors and confirm his self.

Richard's attention to the 'word', its substance, shadow, and perspective emanate from his self-reflexive stage. The 'drama' through which Richard emerges is often exposed by the peripheral play-world of the rest of the characters. Yet, Richard persists within the language of his own drama — lyrically and intellectually distinct from Bolingbroke, full of Scriptural references and apparent neoclassicism — as he also attempts to direct the image through which he is seen: the mirror, book, 'show'. As the play develops, we begin to notice that Richard becomes involved in a complicated synthesis of Catholic and Reformation ideologies in his relationship to both the *Mythos* and *Logos* of expression and communion. Seeking a stage for the oblique representation of the 'inner' man, Richard pursues the word and the image of a relationship to power through God in order to support the terms of his own drama. In the play's presentation of two plays — the self-reflexive world of the player king and the inexorable vagaries of his observers — *Richard II* stages how the word and image revolve in an apparently unceasing play for authority. Yet, out of Richard's world and into the play as a whole, the media of truth and art become merely delusory tactics sustaining an image that is nothing more than a shadow. Focusing on the moment in *Hamlet*, when the prince notices that his suit of mourning is nothing more than an abstract image of a grief he cannot express — a moment which Robert

Weimann observes as 'the rupture in Hamlet himself, between what is shown and what is meant' — O'Connell suggests that in Hamlet's attention to what is 'implicit', he highlights 'the theatrical means by which he — at once character *and* actor — is defining sorrow in visual histrionic terms'.[9] Some six years earlier, in *Richard II*, Shakespeare had composed a similarly surface disjunction between 'histrionic' and 'implicit' grief; Richard's poetic complaint that 'these external manner of laments /Are merely shadows to the unseen grief / That swells with silence in the tortured soul' (IV.1.295-97), also draws attention to the idea that Richard is playing a part, but a part that is in contention with the body and language of expression. However, in Richard, this 'rupture', rather than point to the 'theatrical means' by which character and actor negotiate the conditions of the stage, signals the way in which the king understands the 'implicit' as an ontological term of authority. Richard's overwhelming need to seek an expression of authority beyond the grasp of his subjects leads him into a permanent state of projection. Recognising the mythical power of referred interiority, Richard lurches after spiritual signs of undisputed communion. In insisting on his own inadequate performance or representation, Richard suggests his potential for interpretation beyond the representational contingents of his reign.

In implicating an unrepresentable alternative, Richard refers his presence to what Greenblatt calls 'symbolic initiative', the 'weapon of the powerless'.[10] The image of the book often appears at critical moments of powerlessness:

---

[9] Michael O'Connell, *The Idolatrous Eye: iconoclasm and theatre in early-modern England* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University press, 2000), p. 133.
[10] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1984), pp. 78-9.

Gaunt's dying invocation of the rotten parchment of England, Mowbray's application to the book of life and, in Richard's deposition scene, the terrible turning point in the relinquishing of his reign. When Richard is asked by his detractors to read a list of his crimes, he responds by turning their deposing into a book:

> There shouldst thou find one heinous article,
> Containing the deposing of a king
> And cracking the strong warrant of an oath,
> Marked with a blot, damned in the book of heaven (IV.2.232-35).

Richard refuses to read his temporal history and instead tries to translate his powerlessness into authority through the image of the divine book. In the Bible, the book of life appears six times (two in the Old Testament and four in the New Testament) and, often in the context of a heavenly ledger, making the book of life and heaven interchangeable concepts. The most profound invocation of the book of life occurs in Revelation, when St John sees the book of life — as the *other* book — distinct from the books of prophesy bound up in the seven seals:

> And I saw the dead, both great and small stand before God; and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is *the book* of life, and the dead were judged of those things, which were written in the books, according to their works (20: 12).

Thus, the book of life is the inexorable record of man's deeds, small and great, observed and invisible. The marginal gloss to the Geneva Bible of 1560 reads: 'Every man's conscience is as a book wherein his deeds are written,

which shall appear when God openeth the book'.[11] Yet, Richard's book becomes conflated with the books of prophecy, in which he reads divine exoneration and vengeance written into the reign of kings. Unlike Mowbray's book of life, which marks his conscience and acts, Richard's book absorbs the intangible distance between his role on earth and his place in heaven. Despite the Bible's emphasis on both election and good works, Richard traces a direct link to heaven from his temporal royalty that may be described in terms of his mortal effects but is not necessarily dependent upon them. However, the profundity of the biblical book of life is dependent upon its nebulous and independent status: calling forth images of the written word it harnesses our mortal dread of both consequence and annihilation. Glossing the reference in Psalms, 'Let them be blotted out of the book of the life, and not be written with the righteous' (69: 28), the Geneva Bible explains:

> they which seemed by their profession to have been written in thy book, yet by their fruits prove the contrary, let them be known as reprobate.

Under the language and the presence of the book, this marginal gloss confirms our greatest fears, discovery, censure and obliteration. However, the book of life is always and only a symbol, partly because, despite Scriptural resonance,[12] it depends on ambiguity in order to enable processes of 'reading' and partly because it must remain invisible in order to defy exegesis and

[11] *The Geneva Bible: a facsimile of the 1560 edition* (Madison, Milwaukee and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969). In all quotations I have modernised the spelling.
[12] 'Rev. 3.5, Bishops': "I will not blot out his name out of the book of life". The Bishops' is the only Bible in Shakespeare's day that has "blot out" in Revelation 3.5. All other versions, including the Rheims New Testament, have "put out."', Shaheen, *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays*, p. 367; 382. The 'book of life' is also referred to in Revelation 20: 12, 10: 8, and 21: 27, Philippians 4: 3, Daniel 12: 1 and Psalms 69: 28. According to *The Dictionary of the Christian Church*, the book of life

support 'faith'. Richard renders the visible text on stage, recording the king's 'grievous crimes', as nothing more than an unravelling of his 'weaved-up follies'. In replacing this domestic image with the symbolic book of divine power, Richard tries to reinstate his authority in an inexorable narrative that will unfold upon the heads of his deposers. However, Greenblatt's location of the book as 'the weapon of the powerless' is far more complicated if we consider what 'power' has come to mean. In terms of the images and rhetoric of Reformers, the book (often Tyndale's *Obedience of a Christian man* or the English New Testament) suggested a symbolic commitment to God in the face of Marian persecution. However, Protestants were still persecuted, so the book had no temporal power to change their plight, only symbolic power to justify their ways to man and God. Yet, in Protestant polemics this 'symbolic initiative' pledging 'justification by faith' carried the weight of God's grace and was surely then more powerful than any temporal outcome. Richard's application to the book of heaven initially plays out a sign of being beyond the representable conditions of show. He supports himself through the singular meditative relationship between man and god, which, although augmented by his 'divine right', belongs to Reformation ideologies. Yet the play-world begins to dissolve any associations of power that the divine order of things may carry. As Gaunt referred us to an alternative image of Richard's book in the decaying pages of the country, the Bishop of Carlisle invokes the sanctity of the king's body within the corollary of the body politic. As Richard promises his deposers consequences inherent in rupturing the text of determined precedence, just before he enters, the Bishop of Carlisle

stems from 'the conception of a heavenly register of the elect [which] is based on ideas found in the OT

graphically corroborates this image of the book. Carlisle's speech to Bolingbroke renders Richard's deposition, and damned and blotted book of heaven, as England's atrophy:

> And in this seat of peace tumultuous wars
> Shall kin with kin, and kind with kind, confound.
> Disorder, horror, fear, and mutiny
> Shall here inhabit, and this land be called
> The field of Golgotha and dead men's skulls (IV.1.140-44).

Carlisle, however, is immediately arrested on grounds of 'capital treason', and we realise that in effect Richard has already been deposed. Carlisle's bold rhetoric and images of damnation and decay spill into the scene as a hiatus in Bolingbroke's order of being. Yet, Carlisle's language appears inappropriate, and the increasingly violent images of the destruction he 'prophesies' for England merely portray his powerlessness and his expendability. York's arrest of Carlisle confirms there is no place for him and his ideology within the play. As Bolingbroke and his supporters begin to cleanse the play-world of this kind of rhetorical sway, we realise that when Richard enters to be visibly de-kinged, the *only* initiative left to Richard is symbolic. However, such symbolic initiative is, according to Greenblatt, determined by ' a force outside the self' responsive to God's word: 'The bible then is the point of absolute, unwavering contact between God and man, the written assurance that God will not be arbitrary, the guarantee that human destiny is not ruled by chance, cunning, or force'.[13] Faith then is a symbol of a deferred power which rests with a belief in a teleological universe. The image of a divine book of heaven inherently containing an order of rightness is entirely

---

and in 1 Enoch'.

conventional within a history play of a medieval king; however, in terms of reformation politics, Richard's relationship to the book charts an uneasy distance between Catholicism and 'Protestantism'.[14] Whilst, on the one hand, the notion of the book of heaven, celebrating and defending the divine right of Kings, belongs to a particularly medieval philosophy of kingship, on the other, Richard places his book as both a literal and arcane icon, imaging an inward and protective faith that is more responsive to Reformation ideologies.[15] Despite the historical narrative of Richard II, and his infamous self-association with canonised kings,[16] Shakespeare's Richard uses his book in a peculiarly ambiguous religious context. In *2 Henry IV*, the king, weighed down with the uneasiness of 'the head that wears the crown' the night before the battle, exclaims: 'O God that one might read the book of fate, /And see the revolutions of the times' (3.1.44-5).[17] Developing his image through how 'chances mock / And changes fill the cup of alteration', he imagines what it might be to read the future, until he declares that 'if this were seen' even 'the happiest youth' 'would shut the book and sit him down and die'.[18] Henry's

---

[13] Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, p. 111.

[14] According to Brian Moynahan, *If God Spare My Life: William Tyndale, the English Bible and Sir Thomas More – A Story of Betrayal* (London: Little, Brown, 2002), the word Protestant was coined in 1529: 'It was used to describe the Lutheran princes and cities who had signed a *Protestatio* opposing the Catholic majority at the diet or parliament of Speyer in April of that year. Reformers differed greatly in their own doctrines – already Lutherans, Zwinglians and Anabaptists were at one another's throats, and a score of new sects would soon arise – but the general term 'Protestant' was now applied to them all.' p. 176

[15] Thomas Cromwell imposed the first significant Injunctions in 1536, abolishing allegiance to the pope and instructing the provisions of both English and Latin Bibles. There followed a series of more radical jurisdictions in 1538, outlawing 'the cult of saints'. However, in 1547, Cranmer published his *Homily of Good Works*, which was 'unmistakably, a manifesto for the forging of the new [religion]'. See Duffy, p. 398, p.407 and p.449. Despite Cromwell's foundations, it was Cranmer who affected the most critical changes, in terms of Protestantism, under Edward VI.

[16] The anonymous altarpiece, 'The Wilton Diptych', which was privately commissioned by Richard, portrays him being presented to the Madonna and Child by three Saints, including Saint Edmund and Edward the Confessor who were the last English Kings to be canonised. The implication is, of course, that Richard hopes for the same honour as his ancestors.

[17] There is, of course, an irony in this comparison since Bolingbroke becomes Henry IV.

[18] These lines were not included in the Folio, although they were published in the 1600 Quarto.

book, although rhetorically harnessed to his role as King, in moving through 'the revolutions of the times', traces the 'mountains', the 'continent', the 'sea' and 'the beachy girdle of the ocean' until it becomes not only Henry's book but one that equally may affect the king and the 'happiest youth' alike. Henry's book carries the fate of his subjects as much as himself and in this way is distinct from Richard's book of heaven summoned as the divine protection and justice of his reign. Both Richard and Henry's books appear to signify an idea of predetermination that denotes an inexorable narrative in which the king is partly author and partly text. But in reading the book that shifts between 'fate', 'heaven' and 'life' these 'entities' become synthesised as though they acted as one shaping force. Yet, according to Reformation ideologies the 'power' of the vernacular New Testament lay in the 'literal text' which offered its readers a direct link to the voice of God within subjective terms and individual free will. Richard's relationship to his book, however, is not merely individual; it is absolutely exclusive, signifying for him a power and authority beyond the bounds of his subjects and effects of his reign. When, however, his court, cousins and advisors ignore and overreach such an image, Richard translates his rendition of iconic power from one symbol to another. Yet, the book's relationship to symbolic authority, from Henry VIII's break with Rome (1535) to Elizabeth's Thirty-Nine Articles (1563), is profoundly ambivalent. Despite the tremendous political and cultural impact of Tyndale's translation and the visible and social turmoil of the dissolution of the monasteries, the 'book' appeared in many injunctions as simply a pictorial sign.[19]

[19] Rendering a pictorial sign as 'simple' is a crude description of an extremely complex medium,

> Reiterating the teaching of the Ten Articles, [Edward] Lee [Archbishop of York] insisted that the people were to be taught 'that images be suffered only as books, by which our hearts may be kindled to follow the holy steps and examples of the saints represented by the same; even as saints lives be written ... for the same purpose'. Moreover, a distance must be preserved between the image and the thing imagined, 'although they see the image of the Father represented as an old man, yet they may in no wise believe that the heavenly Father is any man, or that he hath any body or age'.[20]

Some 'images' were also tolerated as 'unlearned men's books', but, in the very process of devaluing the symbol, the book came to offer a transitional language of signification. Since the metaphorical book, in this context, determines the role of the image as nothing more than a visible suggestion, the semiotic of the book emerges in response to how images should be 'read', and, in moving away from the symbol itself, the book seeks to expose a reasonably straightforward relationship between image and meaning that has no inherent value outside of the surface on which it is presented. The book here carries no incarnate power and such a 'distance' between 'the image and the thing imagined' allows the interpretive heart to move within the visual narrative of Christ's life; a narrative, however, which ultimately — and properly — leads to the text. Both the figurative and symbolic book move forward a process of reading from the visual to the cognitive. Yet, in the devolution of power from the image to the text, the book may culturally begin to absorb the visual role of the icon, which was itself in a state of transition. The limits of idolatry remained ambiguous in this transference of power. Erasmus, in his *A Playne and godly exposition or declaration of the commune*

however, my purpose is to draw a developing point of comparison between a one- and two-dimensional image.

Crede, responds to the dialectic between the word and the image; answering a student's anxiety over the worshipping of the name of God as an act of idolatry, O'Connell explains Erasmus's response as pointing to a word as 'an arbitrary sign, nothing like the thing represented, and there is no peril that a word should be taken for what it represents'.[21] However, Erasmus's translation of the Vulgate into Greek and the more general humanist shift to logocentrism appears in fact to render Christ's body in the Book as an incarnate image: 'For Erasmus — and for humanism more generally — "Christ as text" replaces the painted sculpted Christ. For succeeding reformers Christ's real presence as text would also eclipse his real presence in the visible, tactile Eucharist'.[22] The potential translation of presence from the image to the word in the Book of God and the text of Christ to the body of the representational actor implicate the stage as a possible site of idolatry. Such potential, of course, inflamed anti-theatricalists and informed many of their invectives against the stage; however, Richard's identification with Christ comes less from his Scriptural allusions and pre-texts than from his individual empathy with God's chosen. Richard draws three very powerful parallels between himself and Christ, firstly when he accuses Bushy, Bagot and Green of betraying him: 'Three Judases, each one thrice worse than Judas' (III.2.132), secondly when he uses the same analogy on losing his subjects to Bolingbroke: 'Were they not mine? /Did they not sometime cry "All hail!" to me? / So Judas did to Christ' (IV.1.168-70), and finally, and contextually most profoundly, in his deposition scene:

---

[20] Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400 – 1580* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 413.

[21] Michael O'Connell, *The Idolatrous Eye: Iconoclasm and Theater in Early-Modern England* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 37.

> Though some of you — with Pilate — wash your hands,
> Showing an outward pity, yet you Pilates
> Have here delivered me to my sour cross,
> And water cannot wash away your sin (IV.1.238-41)

Richard traces a version of his authority through both the body and the book of God in his identification with Christ. Setting his traitors upon the stage within the names and narrative of Christ's life, Richard seeks to set the word of God against the word of his detractors, through the body of *his* real presence. The Word of the Bible and the name of God and Christ, despite Erasmus's assertion of the distinction between the word and the thing imagined, represent an ever possible site of presence, and the belief in an affective power of naming, whilst not idolatrous, informs much of the Elizabethan recognition of status. Richard's path to 'the nothing I must be' is consistently informed by his belief in the absolute and incarnate power of names. Confronted by his waning support and authority, Richard exclaims: 'Is not the King's name forty thousand names? / Arm, arm, my name' (III.2.86-7). Richard believes in the power of semiotics to direct his subjects and celebrate his being. However, the power of the word is always augmented by its image, and Richard draws his authority through the image of the book, his body and the mirror as a theatre in which he fashions himself as an icon. The use of the word or image to create an inherent force was a deeply contentious issue within the role of theatre; Richard applies his power — and Shakespeare his characterisation — to a heady mixture of Catholic idolatry, Christian humanism and Protestant word and sermon. Yet, within the amplified context of the theatre, Shakespeare does not subject his King to

---

[22] Ibid.

anti-theatricalist charges, rather, in the single figure of the king, he sustains a distinction between the play-world and the theatre of power.

Within these terms what the book may image and what it may imagine are not inherent in its sign. Whilst the book is on one hand responsive to the 'old' apotropaic value of icons, on the other it emerges within a shifting system of representation. The distance that Archbishop Lee insists upon and the intercession of the interpretative heart are fundamental to the diminishing role of the icon and the rising metaphorical value of the book. There is a distinction here between the 'book' and the Bible. The interpretative contention created by the Reformation, far from establishing and demarcating definitions provided an amorphous space for interpretation and selective understanding. The metaphorical idea of the book accumulates an ideological power that encompasses both metaphysical and physical responses to a subjective world. However, in accordance with the English New Testament, the Edwardine Books of Common-Prayer (1549 and 1552) and the deposing of the icon, the 'book', literal and metaphorical, develops a nebulous power in the re-formation of cultural consciousness.

Given the religious and political history of this image, why does Richard's book emerge at apparently acute moments of powerlessness? Particularly if we notice, in contrast, that Henry IV's 'book' emerges at a critical juncture where both power and consequence are still in contention. But when Richard hurls his book of heaven onto the stage it is too late. In both Catholic and Protestant polemics, the book often appeared as a response to threat. Whilst in

the early stages of the Reformation, and particularly under the Henrican regime, images and idols were allowed to remain in churches but only as 'unlearned men's books',[23] in the Marian heresy trials Protestant martyrs went to their death clutching the Book. The book, in both these cases, represents an opposition or alternative to power. Under the counter-reformation of Mary, the pledging of allegiance to the vernacular Bible was a symbolic, but ineffective, act of faith: 'any individual or group confronting a hostile institution that possesses vastly superior force, has recourse to the weapon of the powerless: the seizure of the *symbolic* initiative'.[24] However, the nature of a symbol is that is does not represent itself but something else; the book functions to represent a relationship between man and his faith, the body and the soul that may be imagined in the idea of the book, which in turn represents the teaching and love of Christ. Thus, as the book emerges in Reformation politics as a material object through which man may read and interpret grace, it also functions as a sign of independent and ineffable communion. John Foxe notoriously ritualises the exhibition of the devout and 'inward' soul in *Acts and Monuments* (1563). His spectacular and detailed accounts of devout Protestants being burned, hanged, strangled and quartered for their beliefs often centralises the place of the Bible during their execution. John Bainham, like many others, went to his death clutching Tyndale's *New Testament* and the *Obedience of a Christian Man,* and as Greenblatt rightly claims: 'what rivets our interest in the case, almost lost in the great mass of Foxe's famous work, is the critical role taken, at the height of the drama of

[23] See Duffy, *The Stripping of The Altars,* pp. 428-9; cf. O'Connell, *The Idolatrous Eye*, p. 38.
[24] Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, pp. 78-9.

abjuration and relapse, by the printed book'.[25] However, Greenblatt firmly posits a developing sense and expression of interiority in the appropriation of the vernacular Bible, and other English works of Scriptural and spiritual guidance, particularly in their value as symbolic resistance. Whilst this may be true in its development over a period of time, the role of the book in heresy trials and Foxe's *Martyrs* performs a distinctly theatrical and visible role which externalises the concept of inward commitment and moral inventory. The 'spectacle' of the book served both the martyrs on trial and those who put them there. For the proponents of the Marian regime, the vernacular Bible being extinguished with the dying 'traitor' acted as a deterrent to would-be reformers. Similarly for the martyr and his proponents, it symbolised a visible commitment to belief. The role of the book in heresy trials dramatically materialised the 'inward' man. Foxe was perfectly aware of this and in his infamous championing of the printing-press, he rendered the 'book' a powerful tool of action rather than meditation:

> The Lord began to work for his Church ... not with sword and target to subdue His exalted adversary, but with printing, writing and reading.... How many printing presses there be in the world, so many blockhouses there be against the high castle of St Angelo, so that either the pope must abolish knowledge and printing or printing at length will root him out.[26]

The book will 'root out' the authority of the Church since it returns us to the 'work' of the Lord himself, and thereby encompasses and represents a power far greater than the intercession of aggressive or aggrandising temporal

[25] Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, p. 76.
[26] As cited by Greenblatt, ibid., pp. 98-9.

authority.[27] Whilst in Reformation politics the book could emerge — at least according to Foxe — as a weapon to rival that of the 'sword and target', it also promised the private salvation of man or woman living by the justification of faith. Equally, the absorption of Scripture into humanist education and commonplace book culture facilitated the words of God through the everyday experience of comfort or fear. The physical nature of the book, as opposed to the priest as mediator, promised its faithful a private recognition of the words of God, and as an icon it could overwrite the images of the Church as a narrative and pre-text. In his use of the book of heaven, Richard, like Mowbray and Gaunt, imagines the trajectory of man's life, and, like Carlisle, he augments this image with a faith in the absolute sway of the king as the Lord's anointed. However, in his scene of deposition, Richard further complicates the pre-history of his book in translating his iconic self into a material mirror. Richard begins by making himself visible through the blazoning of his body onto his self-imposed de-crowning, and in setting his body against the requisites of the king, Richard will go on to invoke his soul. In Richard's self-image and emphasis on show, the play confronts the extent to which re-interpretation exposes failure. The deposition scene highlights a fissure in the order of the king's image of authority.[28] From the initial power of the word, 'the breath of kings' and the book of life, Richard had projected an idea of his authority in response to his unknowable and invisible communion with God. Here, however, in recognition of his powerlessness in the face of Bolingbroke's preference of action over words ('What my tongue

[27] Foxe's 'root out' is a significant choice of rhetoric, since Shakespeare often uses the phrase in relation to sedition or regicide in the History plays, including the three parts of *Henry VI*, *Henry VIII*, *Richard III*, and *Henry V*.

[28] This scene was not published until the fourth Quarto of 1608 and provides the basis for the Folio.

speaks my right-drawn sword may prove' (1.1.46)), he tries to become a self-generated idol. Much of the dramatic power of Richard's deposition emerges when he chooses to portray the moment as visible, and in doing so moves from the metaphor to the image. Since there is no precedent or efficacy in Richard's de-crowning of himself, the moment is usually considered as Richard's tragic attempt to wrest some form of 'symbolic initiative' from Bolingbroke. In grasping the language of ceremony from the 'silent king', Richard shows himself to 'play many persons in one part'. However, in Richard's particular attention to his body, his image and the inherent power he believes to be supported by that image, he uses his theatre of power to portray himself an idol – as a visible and effective image that Bolingbroke can re-define but not destroy:

Now mark me how I will undo myself.
I give this heavy weight from off my head,
And this unwieldy sceptre from my hand,
The pride of kingly sway from out my heart.
With mine own tears I wash away my balm,
With mine own hands I give away my crown,
With mine own tongue deny my sacred state,
With mine own breath release all duteous oaths.
All pomp and majesty I do forswear.
My manors, rents, revenues I forgo.
My acts, decrees, and statues I deny (IV.1.202-212).

Richard's use of the singular 'I' rather than the royal 'we' recognises that he has already lost the crown but, in recalling the language of a coronation ceremony, Richard stages a theory of power, in which he reasserts not only his divine or 'chosen' right but also the very body that stands before them. The acute attention to his body in collaboration with the physical sacraments of ceremony define Richard's space as controlled by his presence — his body and hands, heart, head, tongue, breath, and tears — at once 'both character

and actor'. As Michael O'Connell explains, 'art' and the visual aesthetics were 'bound up in the hermeneutics of religious culture', as was '*particularity*': 'At the centre of the iconoclast case that the image itself is worshipped has always been the charge that a particular image commands more devotion than another'.[29] Richard's ecphrastic rendition of his self animates only the particular parts of his body associated with sacred power; where the hands, tongue, and breath denote his monarchical and religious authority (to pronounce sentence or pray), the tears are often associated with the worshipping and justification of images (we need only think of the many instances in which graven images were reported to have wept in proof of their apotropaic value). Equally, Richard's sense of '*particularity*' has informed his self-image throughout the play, not only in his elegiac characterisation but here in his self-reflexive ability to appropriate initiative — symbolic or otherwise — from out of Bolingbroke's hands. In elaborately and specifically performing the 'un-doing' of himself Richard foregrounds his visible body to affect in 'complex layers of cultural meaning' himself as idol and image. As O'Connell explains, both the majesty and mystery associated with the veneration of idols and ceremony may invoke a sense of magic but 'rather than magic, what is at work is a response to multivocality, response to the complex layers of cultural meaning bound up in the object of devotion and its site'.[30] Richard suggests that he may be divorced from his signifying crown but he remains within a multivocal process of image and response. Re-instating the complexity of the divine king, Richard believes he can transcend

---

[29] O'Connell, *The Idolatrous Eye*, p. 58; p. 59.
[30] Ibid., pp. 59-60.

systematic processes of reading through laying claim to an interpretive value beyond the bounds of signification.

Richard's shift from the figurative to the visual is developed through an application to his face. Reminding his subjects of his imprint on coinage, he moves that face into a double perspective.

> An if my word be sterling yet in England
> Let it command a mirror hither straight
> That it may show me what a face I have
> Since it is bankrupt of his majesty (4.1.263-66).

Richard's play on currency not only marks the authority of the king's stamp as it runs through the daily transactions of his subjects, but it reaffirms his face and image as an efficacious sign of his reign. Richard's attempt to re-appropriate power is practiced through his application to 'things'. But even as he turns his word into a currency, Richard cannot relinquish his idea of symbolic majesty and moves his body into a position wherein he will show – by virtue of a mirror — the dual aspect of a king. Consciously working within terms that Bolingbroke neither understands nor recognises, Richard tries to re-instate an image of his self within the anamorphic perspective of visible and un-visible. Applying at first to the invisible and ubiquitous book of heaven, Richard traces the signifier — by virtue of himself — to the sign of the mirror:

> They shall be satisfied. I'll read enough
> When I do see the very book indeed
> Where all my sins are writ; and that's myself.
> *Enter one with a glass*
> Give me that glass, and therein will I read.

No deeper wrinkles yet? Hath sorrow struck
So many blows upon this face of mine
And made no deeper wounds? (4.1.272-278).

Although the 'very book', or the book of books, in isolated semantic terms is the Bible, Richard invokes this image within the immediate context of himself and the visible body through which he stands on the stage and in front of his deposers. The book of self is often used by Shakespeare to imaginatively support the idea of a (in)discernable being, wherein, for a moment, the soul or body may be read by the observer, whether it is for love, conscience, secrets or lies. Almost always this book emerges to engage with a process of reading, to offer the observer, if only briefly, a possible revelation of feeling. For Richard, however, the image is powerful because it cannot present him to his observers. Despite calling upon processes of reading — and reflecting — Richard denies the appropriate potential of such processes to accommodate either history or truth. It would seem, therefore, that in consciously offering the potential of seeing Richard seeks only to highlight the inadequacy of the visual. Paradoxically, in order to amplify the absolute intelligibility of his bodily relationship to heaven and himself Richard translates the book into the mirror; two signs that, are here, dependent upon their transparency.

The mirror appears on stage as a direct manifestation of the semantic shift from the image of the book in which Richard will 'read' his self. The divine right Richard had tried to invoke in the book is manipulated into show through a twofold relationship to the mirror. On the one hand, the mirror is reflective of man's microcosmic image of God and world, on the other, the

mirror plays out Richard's dialectic on stage between the icon and the interior. Richard's insistence in the play that he must be both seen and not seen refers his internal state to an idea of transcendental and ordained authority. The book of heaven, blotted by Richard's deposition, is re-orientated by the mirror and its shards.[31] Richard's iconoclastic act, and his verbal representation of it, is extremely complex; on one level we must look at how the mirror (as opposed to the stage or painting) reflects, and on another, how, in terms of that reflection, the body is defined.[32] Alongside questions of reflection or depiction is the nature of the icon, and what substance, symbolic or literal, is attached to the image, and where, if at all, does its power lie. Jonathan Miller, in his discussion of the mirror in painting, makes an important distinction between depiction and representation; the painting, he explains, depicts something or someone because it acknowledges its own surface area, the mirror, however, denies that surface area and transparently images an image; it both depends on that transparency and denies it:

[31] The mirror in itself has a complex and arcane history. The relationship between the mirror and God may be understood, for example, in the depiction of the mirror and our visual absorption of the requisites of *seeing* as reflective of God's eye (Jan van Eyck's 'Arnolfini Marriage', for example), and in the fifteenth century 'word spread that a convex mirror, by capturing a wide-angle view, would absorb the healing radiance of holy relics…. Once you had your mirror, you found some suitable vantage point – even the city walls were crowded – where you could hold the mirror aloft, the longer the better, as if it were a third eye, allowing it to be imbued with the rays of holiness', John Man, *The Gutenberg Revolution: the story of a genius and an invention that changed the world* (London: Review, 2002), p. 63.

[32] There are many possible ways in which the hermeneutic potential of the mirror can inform this scene, however, although I am trying to avoid over-interpretation, in '"The Student of Prague", unforgettably realised in Conrad Veidt's 1929 film version,' 'Baldwin, an impoverished student, falls in love with an unnaturally rich countess and enters into a pact with the devil who promises to furnish him with limitless funds in exchange for whatever he, the devil, might care to take from the student's lodgings. Baldwin agrees to the deal – at which point the disguised mischief-maker leads him to a full-length mirror and summons his reflection to step through the glass. The duplicate … departs and begins to enjoy an independent existence perpetrating misdeeds for which the real Baldwin is understandably blamed. In a frenzy of guilty despair, Baldwin returns to the apartment, fires a pistol at the vacant mirror and is briefly relieved to discover that his absconded reflection has magically reappeared in the shattered glass. But in doing away with his delinquent double, Baldwin turns out to have fatally injured himself and he perishes among the broken shards of his dying mirror image', see below, p. 204.

> But when the reflective surface is smooth, flat and colourless, the images which appear in it are qualitatively indistinguishable from the real thing, so that the only way of telling that they are or might be reflections is purely circumstantial. That is to say it depends on something other than the quality of the imagery itself.[33]

What Richard is or might be depends upon the circumstances he creates around self-reflexive articles of representation or reflection. The stability of the referent is important only in as much as Richard locates the mirror's presence on stage, what becomes much more significant is the way in which the mirror will circumstantially perform. We know that the mirror provides both his reflection and yet not his representation because of the imagery through which he builds and rejects the vision.

The 'something other' that denotes the mirror is the imaginative preparation through which Richard advances his self-image. The problem of perspective, acutely drawn by Bushy in his interview with the queen ('Like perspectives, which, rightly gazed upon, / Show nothing but confusion; eyed awry, / Distinguish form', 2.2.18-20), is here translated into a language of representation. Icons were flat images, although often wrought into ivory or mosaic, which were painted onto wood surfaces. As I have suggested, in Richard's un-doing of himself he uses language to paint his body onto the surface of a scene that has been established to deny him: 'that in the common view / He may surrender'. Having created an image of himself he commands a mirror in which to observe the 'truth' of that image. On looking at his reflection, Richard claims he does not see what he expects to see: 'Hath

sorrow struck / So many blows upon this face of mine / And made no deeper wounds?' (IV.276-8) yet Richard is in control of this image for it is his reading that turns our eyes to his reflection. Richard portrays his reflection as flat, as showing only the surface rather than the 'deeper' wounds of the soul, and it is through his disengagement with his reflection as well as its apparent one-dimensional nature that, paradoxically, we recognise the status of the object. When he shatters the mirror he does so for its material inadequacy, because it is merely a symbol of his body not a representation of it. Richard thus divorces his symbolic self from his bodily self, and in doing so plays out the final stages of his own deposition. In an attempt to re-deploy his royal mystery he turns all symbols out with the King and all representations in with the subject; representation itself becomes the desired state. Up until now Richard had amplified the symbolic value of the king through the book of heaven and the divine right of God's ordination; in translating this symbolism into the shattered mirror he dreadfully destroys everything that had once held him together. When Bolingbroke replies to the broken mirror, he declares: 'The shadow of your sorrow hath destroyed / The shadow of your face' (IV.1.291-2). The 'shadow', like the imprint on the coin, or the crown or 'kingly sway', was only ever an image that applied itself to Richard in his state as King. Bolingbroke, too, recognises that Richard's symbolic role is over and only the substance of a subject remains.

[33] Jonathan Miller, *On Reflection* (London: National Gallery Publications Limited, Yale University Press, 1998), p. 86.

Yet, prior to his deposition Richard had begun to imagine himself as both the King and the subject. Despite the disparity between them 'all this while' Richard has lived as a king yet needed as a subject.

> Throw away respect,
> Tradition, form, and ceremonious duty;
> For you have but mistook me all this while.
> I live with bread, like you; feel want,
> Taste grief, need friends. Subjected thus,
> How can you say to me I am a king? (III.2.172-177.)

And yet the disparity arises because tradition, form, respect and ceremonious duty are presented as incompatible with 'want', 'grief' and 'friends'; thus, the idea of king and its incumbent ceremony, like theatre, appears to deny inwardness whilst at the same time acknowledging the very fragility of those structures to be representative. Richard's destruction of the mirror violently acknowledges his status as existing always and only within the boundaries of the symbolic. Richard is spectacularly denied a claim for authenticity outside his own structures of value; the book of life, the crown, the mirror or the stage will not retain an inherent power beyond the strains of the visible. Richard's contest between symbol and representation are complicated by the nature of the theatre or show through which he exists. In order to apprehend not only an appearance of 'reality' but also a faith in the relationship between sign and signifier certain conditions need to remain stable. But as Richard sanctions his identity between the icon and the image we lose faith — like his subjects — in what he represents and what he believes represents him. Despite his powerful collaboration with his authorised book, body and mirror, the ultimately transparent nature of these images deny any signification beyond

the instant in which they are formed. Tragically — even pathetically — it is an image York knows only to well:

> As in a theatre the eyes of men,
> After a well graced actor leaves the stage,
> Are idly bent on him that enters next,
> Thinking his prattle to be tedious (V.2.23-6).

However 'well graced' such an actor may be, when his image is no longer central to the show his 'prattle' simply becomes 'tedious'. Yet, part of the theatre of Richard's reign is to invoke his symbols of being even in his absence. Alongside his bodily presence Richard projects his transparent icons to suggest his un-visible — yet powerfully authoritative — interior self. Richard tries to affect an alternative potential in constantly suggesting the possible self that cannot be defined in 'these external manner of laments', nor represented in the 'tradition', 'form', and 'ceremony' of King. This sense of potential is predominantly linked to God and the mysterious ways in which faith can sanction an authentic self. However, Richard's relationship to his idols of being and meaning are — despite the play's many Scriptural allusions — not responsive to a consistent Church.[34]

The Elizabethan emphasis on *The Homily of Disobedience* holds it a sin to overthrow a monarch or commit any act of treason, upon which the perpetrator 'will never enter the kingdom of heaven'. However, Calvinist doctrine states that the 'sword is given into the people's hand when tyranny takes over'. Although the Elizabethan state did in no way absorb a Calvinist

codicil on tyranny, within the shifting religious context of the play, the relationship between the book of heaven and the monarch can only be absolutely harnessed by a belief in the righteousness of their reign.[35] The pre-history of the book of heaven in the History plays is often translated into a more humane discourse on the composite nature of history and effect. Yet Henry IV's book of fate, in which may be recorded the 'revolutions of the times', is a conventional poetic image and in this way serves to highlight the dramatic significance of an apparently similar image in *Richard II.* Whilst in *2 Henry IV* the book of fate is present to attune our sympathies to the nature of responsibility and fortune in the unfolding of events, in *Richard II*, the image of the book serves, on the one hand, to highlight an 'old world' picture in contest with the emerging 'new', whilst on the other, to offer a symbol of individual and subjective power. Yet, the sign and the idea chart a process of cognitive and dramatic development in the king in which we witness the semantic and ideological field through which Richard determines action. Yet, Richard's action is markedly distinguished by Bolingbroke's 'action'. The significance of the book of heaven in his deposition scene is the way in which it traces metonymic values of representation in search of an idol. Apart from its historical pre-text the book here has no form; if it has pages or parchment, binding or text they are born from the figurative potential of the imagination to harness symbolic authority. But the idea of God as the ultimate repository of devolved power shadows the play in the single conscience as much as the divine king. When Bolingbroke ends the play determined to absolve himself

[34] Although intertextually most allusions can be referred to the Geneva Bible, the complex religious ideologies at work within the play would make it a mistake, I believe, to interpret this play in terms of Calvinism or, what has become known as, Presbyterianism.

from the stain of Richard's murder he decides on a spiritual journey to make his peace with himself through God. But this is not Richard's God, or even a God who determines the place and power of kings (since if it were, how could Bolingbroke have deposed 'God's chosen'?),[36] but rather a private resurrection of his faith and purpose with distinctly individual aims. The figurative potential of the book then emerges from itself and generates its own semantic and representative scope.

However, part of the complexity of this scope is consciously imposed through Richard's attention to his own unrepresentable self. The relationship we might make in the translation of the spiritual into the dramatic is often available through the idea of the invisible and indefinable soul in search of expression. Katherine Eisaman Maus makes the point that the very stage and space of theatre makes this an ineluctable task. Maus argues that the theatre both plays with and problematises the interior self through its attempts at representing both silence and subjectivity in an arena dependent on visual and audible presence.[37] However, this sense of the interior in communion with God was a particular product and impetus of the Reformers as well as central to the opportunities made available by the Bible in English. In Tyndale's preparation and privileging of the vernacular New Testament he urges the 'plain text' and 'literal sense' as 'the unselfconscious language of the inner

[35] It is interesting to remember that in *Henry VI*, all three parts written before *Richard II*, Richard's deposition by Henry's grand-father, Henry IV, dreadfully dogs the validity of his reign.
[36] See above.
[37] Katherine Eisaman Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995). Maus refers to Hamlet's grief stricken response to his mother's marriage, in which Hamlet specifically sets up the opposition between the outward, articulate self and the inward, ineffable self, within the conditions and requisites of theatre. This dialectic between the performed, ritualised social-self and the inward, absent self positions 'truth' at an oblique

man'. Although Tyndale's task here is to affect an uncomplicated narrative and lift the veil of dogmatic Catholic mystification, the sense of 'plain' and 'literal' is that it is not mediated by complex taxonomic or cultural imperatives. Thus, the plainer and more literal the language the more likely it is to not only reach the truth of the 'inner man' but also express that 'truth'. Within these terms the dramatic book can often emerge as a text dependent on its reading, in which the 'inner man' can only be revealed in his twofold relationship to the book; he must define the potential reading in order to suggests its absence. Reading the soul through the body can be compared to the Reformer's project of retrieving the plain text from ceremonial illusion, since the body often represents the 'actions a man might play' through which one must pass to find the 'true' and 'inner man'. Shakespeare often describes the soul or conscience in bookish terms wherein processes of reading and mis-reading expose the possibilities of the private self in conversation with others. Equally, however, the plight of Everyman on stage within his Christian narrative and moral responsibility to a faithful life began the public history of theatre within a Christian domain. Where the spiritual and the secular, the effable and the esoteric merge, or even begin in theatre is always a site of contention – particularly in a period in which negotiations of power consensual or personal became central to the relationship between Church and Monarch. Despite the synthesis of the body and the soul in the rhetoric of Evangelism — Bunyan's description of how 'Texts "tear and rend" his soul, "touch him", "seize" him, [and] "fall like a hot thunder-bolt" upon his conscience', or Tyndale's instruction to 'suck out the pith' and feel the impact

angle to reality, since reality is contained within the collective, communicable matrix of a society in

of Scripture upon the heart — Richard's bodily awareness accompanies, even directs, his kingly performance rather than his 'private self'. Yet, according to David Daniell, 'Shakespeare's theory of drama is of bodily presence.... That body is in interior, human, conflict'.[38] For Daniell, Shakespeare's animated dramatisation of human conflict is tantamount to rendering the Gospels both visible *and* subjective. However, Richard's animated human conflict is always dramatically referred to a performative image – heaven's book, Richard's mirror, and, finally, the sermon of the prison.

The prison is the first and only time we see Richard alone on stage; unlike many of Shakespeare's dramatic soliloquies or single performances the place only serves to highlight his ignominy rather than his potential. The notion of 'privacy' interior or physical appears complex, since despite the possibility of individual potential, the very notion images the alien: 'If privacy as we think of it existed at all, it was regarded as a negative — as the absence of station, of authority, of the divinely bestowed right or ability to lead a nation. Being a public person, on the other hand, seemed automatically to confer these qualities on individual persons, whether priests, kings or prelates'.[39] In *Richard II*, the private space is manifest as a prison explicitly constructed for the removal from society, for the outsider who has deviated from the consensual vision. However, rather than imagine his own interior conflict in the disjunction of himself outside of recognised conditions, Richard tries to recreate them:

---

which 'art' verifies life.

[38] David Daniell, 'Shakespeare and the Protestant Mind', *Shakespeare Survey* 54 (2001), 10-11.

[39] Cecile M. Jagodzinski, *Privacy and Print: reading and writing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1999), pp. 23-4.

> I have been studying how I may compare
> This prison where I live unto the world;
> And for because the world is populous,
> And here is not a creature but myself,
> I cannot do it (V.5.1-5).

In 'studying' Richard has tried to apply his normal conditions of reality and being to the situation — both alien and alienating — in which he finds himself. And because he cannot reconcile the world in which he exists with the world in which he finds himself, he turns to the 'word':

> As thoughts of things divine, are intermixed
> With scruples, and do set the word itself
> Against the word; as thus: 'Come, little ones';
> And then again,
> 'It is as hard to come as for a camel
> To thread the postern of a small needle's eye.' (V.5.12-17).

As Richard 'studies' and turns to 'thoughts of things divine', imagining a peopled world and the text of Saint Mark he becomes almost entirely caught up within a cerebral process of orientation. The only manifest or material authority to which Richard now applies himself is a quotation from the Gospels, which sets the word of God against the scruples of man. Richard's dramatic centrality, rendition of the frailty of man in relation to the imperatives of faith, allusions to the Gospels, and the projection of his sentiment into an abstract presence of listeners combine to suggest a Protestant sermon. O'Connell explains that despite Reformation emphasis on the disjunction between Protestantism and theatre, 'The preacher, ... assumed a prophetic role and aimed at an actorly delivery, [but] did not portray another with his physical body'. However, 'The sermon can be understood perhaps as

the quintessential form of Protestant drama, one in which a solitary figure assumes the role of conveying and interpreting God's word'.[40] This may be the only time in the play that Richard 'does not portray another with his physical body'; bereft of his icons of authority, of his populous, and even his awareness of the physical self, Richard stands alone on the stage to face both himself and the audience within man's abjection and God's word. Richard ends his life in the prison with the comfort of a love that notices his idea of redemption; as the bells combine with the music, sounding both his madness and his healing, he translates the dwindling noise of his life into a reciprocal voice of love:

> Yet blessing on his heart that gives it me;
> For 'tis a sign of love, and love to Richard
> Is a strange brooch in this all-hating world (V.5.64-6).

In imaging the love of him as an ornate or exquisite jewel Richard once again makes visual contact with his sense of self. When he finally dies, Richard sees his body fall to the earth upon which he sat to tell sad stories of the death of Kings, and, as he does so, he once more observes the ineluctability of his divine condition:

> Exton, thy fierce hand
> Hath with the King's blood stained the King's own land.
> Mount, mount, my soul. Thy seat is up on high,
> Whilst my gross flesh sinks downward here to die (V.5.109-112).

I do not pretend to answer any questions as to the particular religious direction of either the play or Shakespeare; rather, through the image of the

[40] O'Connell, *The Idolatrous Eye*, p. 90.

book, I suggest that *Richard II* tackles a perspective on the way faith and authority create, in search of infallibility and recognition, icons in language and language in icons, and, in doing so, seek to uphold the role of interpretation in representations of power — private or public — through which we constantly seek a reflection of the ways in which we live.

V

'Minding true things by what their mockeries be': forgetting and remembering in *Hamlet*

When Horatio apprehends Hamlet, shortly after the spectacle of his mother's marriage, Hamlet suddenly declares: 'My father — methinks I see my father', 'Where, my lord?' asks the trepid Horatio; 'In my mind's eye' replies Hamlet.[1] The dramatic irony of this moment is in our prior awareness and vision of Hamlet's father, stalking the battlements, silently and fully clad for war. The internal vision that Hamlet lays claim to will shortly be followed by a discernible image of his father as a ghost. Hamlet, in his 'mind's eye', recalls an image of his father, the stage projects another; together the image and the thought culminate in the Ghost's central injunction to Hamlet: 'Remember me'. Hamlet's response to this request begins the play's search for truth, a search and a truth that are predicated upon processes of remembering and forgetting:

> Remember thee?
> Ay, thou poor ghost, while memory holds a seat
> In this distracted globe. Remember thee?
> Yea, from the table of memory
> I'll wipe away all trivial fond records,
> All saws of books, all forms, all pressures past,
> That youth and observation copied there,
> And thy commandment all alone shall live
> Within the book and volume of my brain,
> Unmixed with baser matter (1.5.95-104).

Hamlet apprehends this confrontation with the ghost of his murdered father in terms that negotiate the classical and humanist art of memory. Yet, the ancient

art of memory, as set down in the central humanist text of *Ad herennium*, and explored through Cicero and Quintilian, establishes a mental order of *loci,* places, in which to write and overwrite images on the brain, as though it were a wax tablet, for the purpose of creating a system of mnemonics that allows for the storing and recall of a great deal of information. Hamlet, however, prepares himself to remember only one thing: 'thy commandment all alone shall live / Within the book and volume of my brain '. In order to commit himself to the Ghost's command, and the revenge inherent in it, Hamlet decides to terminate and erase all relationships with his past and recently present self. Hamlet's commitment to memory begins in forgetting — books, humanism, history and study are worthless companions to the new book and volume of his brain — a book, singularly inscribed, pure and 'Unmixed with baser matter'. Hamlet's rejection of the current 'table' of his 'memory' sets in motion a drive for truth, a truth, I shall argue, that has become contaminated by learning, the type of learning from which 'seeming' and mimesis ('Nay, it is, I know not seems') derive and deception thrives. The theatre will take up the challenge for truth; a theatre that, like the art of memory, seeks to establish a relationship between truth and perception grounded in the observed confrontation between imagination and memory; or, as the Chorus in *Henry V* declares, 'minding [remembering] true things by what their mockeries be'.[2]

[1] William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. G. R. Hibbard (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), I.2.184-5. All references are to this edition, which uses the Folio as 'the control text'. Relevant departures from the Folio will be noted.
[2] *Henry V*, Chorus, 4.0.53. Although the Norton edition glosses 'minding' as 'imagining', the *OED* cites 'the action of remembering, regarding, paying attention to, caring for' as the earliest extension of the verb 'to mind', substantiating this definition with quotations from the fifteenth and sixteenth century.

Of all of the characters that Shakespeare presents us with, Hamlet stands alone as the icon of the scholar-self; fresh from the Protestant academy of Wittenberg, to which his mother begs him not to return, fiercely intellectual and self-scrutinising, he epitomises the humanist dialectic between knowledge and self-knowledge, individual aspiration and social harmony. In modern terms, 'to be or not to be' has entered the language as the aphorism of the existential intellectual, and Hamlet persists as the bookish icon of the restless mind. Yet, in terms of Shakespeare's play, this iconic Hamlet is a retroactive construction, for, early on in the play, he denounces all that humanism prized — the book, the academy, and the past. The 'table of memory' from which Hamlet wipes away 'all trivial fond records, /All saws, of books, all forms, pressures past/That youth and observation copied there' is both his material commonplace book and his mental storehouse of thought and learning. Hamlet's violent rejection, in response to the Ghost's command, indicates a relationship between his books and his task, also understood as a relationship between the past and the future, which is no longer tenable. The commonplace book into which Hamlet may have copied such youthful observations would have been predicated upon a scholarly attitude to humanist endeavour, synthesised with corporate and courtly aspirations. The substance of a commonplace book expresses the relationship between education and intellectual integrity, tracing the projections of the mind through the vagaries of experience and aspiration. Importantly, as Mary Carruthers explains, the notion of a commonplace book supported an "ethical rhetoric", or as P. K. Ayers elaborates, 'the shared texts, shared experience, shared culture, and shared ideological assumptions of Medieval and

early Tudor humanism…'.[3] In erasing his education within the context of his commonplace book Hamlet simultaneously censures the pressures, forms and inscriptions that have made and represented him until now, as well as rejecting the 'ethical rhetoric' of a shared culture, which may evolve from shared texts but does not produce shared values. Yet, the concept of the book is not thrown out with its contents or form, for Hamlet makes the space available for a new book, written, as it were, with the eternal memory of his father's living death, a memory and imperative that has no pre-text in his previous experience.

The relationship between the printed book and memory was an unstable one. Although the Quintilian, and, to a lesser extent, Ciceronian, arts of memory became absorbed into the visual fabric of manuscript and medieval practices of memory and Prudence, the printed book made the traditional arts of memory seem 'old fashioned'. Erasmus, for example, simply advocated 'study, order, and care' for the retention and decorous retrieval of information rather than the more complex art of *loci* and *summa*. The classical art of memory gradually became replaced by an independent and more empirical relationship between the book and the body, no longer reliant upon the 'art' but simply an awareness of how the mind could engage with the material: 'the human body as itself a sort of book, or rather as a support for cognitive memory work'.[4] Hamlet turns away from material aid to the recesses of his individual intellectual capacity. In storing the image of his father in his 'mind's eye', Hamlet makes way for a new

[3] P. K. Ayers, 'Reading, writing, and Hamlet', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 44, (1993), 430. I quote Mary Carruthers from this article.
[4] Mary Carruthers, 'Reading with Attitude, Remembering the Book', in *The Book and The Body*, ed. Dolores Warwick Frese and Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe (Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), p. 1.

and profound relationship between image and action that is symptomatic of his conscious move into a self-referential and isolated space of being.

Yet, having rejected the material volume, including its observations, only a few lines later Hamlet declares:

> My tables,
> My tables – meet it is I set it down.
> That one may smile, and smile, and be a villain! (1.5.107-9).

Although most modern editors[5] include a stage direction here: '*He writes*', this does not appear in the Folio, and, since Hamlet intends only to include acute and apposite information in the book and volume of his brain, such an injunction to himself – 'meet it is I set it down' – appears to be both a trenchant response to his previous rejection of 'all saws of books' and a mental note to the new cognitive work predicated on the murder of his father. It is, however, an entirely cerebral activity, since, as we will soon discover, the disjunction Hamlet makes here between the external and the internal — the book and the brain — carries him into his first encounter with the court having learned of his father's murder. The two 'books' that Hamlet isolates, the material and the metaphorical, become his companions to the ways in which he will begin to negotiate his two versions of being and seeming, creating — for the audience, at least — two possible sites of interpretation. If we understand Hamlet, according to his own imperatives, to have noted the awesome dissimulation of a smiling villain in his developing mental repertoire, we might also notice, that the next time we see Hamlet he is

reading a book. Yet, as Hamlet throws out his learning and attends to his tables, we begin to wonder whether this alternative commonplace book, based on the evolving book and volume of his brain, records advice or admonishment: 'That one may smile, and smile, and be a villain!'. Is this Hamlet's final and ironic repulsion of the book, sending it out of his mind with the text of duplicity and turpitude, thereby rejecting the mark of the book in its appallingly inadequate — even static — relationship to the reality of experience? Or does Hamlet earnestly copy this maxim into his new book, the one in which only a few lines ago he had determined to keep 'alone' the Ghost and his commandment? Yet, whether Hamlet does or does not write down his maxim on the smiling villain, and whether it is or is not in earnest, it is construed textually. Once Hamlet renders his thoughts as text the problem arises as to whether those thoughts remain personal or whether they are now subject to the problems of the book; does writing sanitise or socialise the self? Montaigne, in his search for and presentation of the self within his writing, is acutely aware of this dialectic, and it is one that he tries to confront through synthesising the physical, cerebral and continuous 'I'. Terence Cave explores the impasse between the writing and experiencing self in Montaigne:

> The writer reflects on writing, it seems, in order better to reflect the total self; the book of essais separates itself like a mirror so that it may represent a living being. Yet, on the other hand, this duality is unstable because it can never be fully resolved either in unity or in antithesis; also because it is generated wholly by the writing process itself.[6]

---

[5] Including the most popular editions of the Oxford, Arden, Norton and Cambridge.
[6] Terence Cave, *The Cornucopian Text: problems of writing in the French Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. 273.

Hamlet, however, seems to contain himself within the cerebral 'book and volume' of his brain, building a cognitive commonplace book designed entirely by the trajectory of his task; ultimately, it is the theatre that will 'separate itself like a mirror so that it may represent a living being'. The idea of the book provides the metaphorical space for dissimulation, projecting both a shared rhetoric and isolated imperative.[7] Later, Hamlet, Polonius and Ophelia will perform this capacity for dissimulation through the book, but first Hamlet must erase its consensual authority.

In the light of Hamlet's fierce rejection of his learning against the discovery of his father's murder, the book – in all its forms and representations of pressures past – appears as blindingly incompatible with experience. Hamlet's reaction seems to present his task as a contest between experience and the book, for which the book makes him radically ill equipped. Yet, Protestant humanism, of which his education at Wittenberg makes him an example, determined its course of learning on a decorous synthesis between intellectual endeavour and worldly demands. The book, at times, became either superior to, or a synecdoche for experience; whilst Roger Ascham, in *The Schoolmaster*, claimed that 'learning teacheth you more in one year than experience in twenty', Juvenal's Satire, no. 1, states: 'Everything mankind does, their hope, fear, rage, pleasure, joys, business, are the hotchpotch of my little book'. Similarly, in *Othello*, written only a year or two after *Hamlet*, Iago says of Othello that

[7] Within a different context, we might remember that in *Cymbeline* Posthumus distrusts the book he

> ... his unbookish jealousy must construe
> Poor Cassio's smiles, gestures and light behaviour,
> Quite in the wrong (4.1.99-101).

According to Iago, to be 'unbookish' is to be inexperienced, to misconstrue – which here, quite literally, means to mis-read or mis-translate. Whilst for Iago to be bookish is to understand things as they really are — to rightly 'construe' — for Hamlet it is contrary to the right relationship between observation and action, appearance and understanding. Montaigne, however, appears to note a tension in the relationship between learning and experience when he writes: 'There is no desire more natural than the desire for knowledge. We try every means that may lead us to it. When reason fails us we make use of experience'.[8] Experience seems to rescue knowledge in the absence of reason, and is therefore acquired through an entirely different process; yet, equally, Montaigne's expression supports experience as a continuum that is not excluded by knowledge. Leonard Barkan, however, distinctly locates 'reading', in Shakespeare, as 'part of a textual alternative to actual experience'; he explains that 'the texts of grammar, rhetoric, and literature, when rendered *as* texts, are in a profound sense bracketed – as are, of course, the characters who import them. Brilliant or foolish, these individuals speak of that which is external, unlived, or, at best, exemplary rather than real'.[9] Barkan is referring to intertextual references or allusion, and not necessarily the presence or invocation of the book on stage. What he notices is that 'imported' texts appear to create bridges out of the immediately dramatic into

finds when he wakes from his dream, suspecting it to be deceptive: 'A book? O rare one,/Be not, as is our fangled world, a garment/Nobler than that it covers' (V.IV.133-5).

[8] Michel de Montaigne, *Essays*, trans. J. M. Cohen (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983), p. 343.

[9] Leonard Barkan, 'What did Shakespeare Read?', in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. Margreta de Grazia and Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 39.

the abstract or commonplace world of generality. Knowledge when rendered textual affects a shared space which seems 'external, unlived' or 'exemplary', by virtue of its graphic invitation to a common site. Although Hamlet, alone, reacting to the Ghost, rejects the book for precisely the observations Barkan makes, when he re-enters the world of the court he manipulates these same observations for the ways in which they suggest integration. Here however, Hamlet excludes the book from his reality by shifting its status and significance from shared text to private imperative. But as Hamlet turns away from his books to experience, he cannot help but render that experience textual, setting it down in his mental or literal commonplace book. Unlike Titus, who finds Lavinia's experience 'patterned by the poet' in Young Lucius's book, Hamlet finds no such precedent. Yet, as the play develops, Hamlet will extract patterns from poets to explore a voice he cannot make particular. The confusion that Hamlet suffers, the shock of discovery, the fear of ignorance, is manifest in the way he moves from the literal to the figurative, from education to experience, the past to the present and the ways in which he tries to re-deploy his now suspended emblems of authority into a meaningful relationship with the moment.

To some extent Hamlet's creation of a reciprocal relationship between the figurative and material book complicates the role of either in the formation of his consciousness, since, on the one hand, the table of memory and the book and volume of his brain form an imaginative wax tablet on which he may seek to inscribe only the information he requires irrespective of present forms or pressures past; on the other hand, the material book, particularly in response to

his scholarship at Wittenberg, denotes a particular textual fabric of transmission that is external to Hamlet. Hamlet rejects the material book according to the shared context in which it has hitherto existed. Instead, developing his own metaphorical control, he ushers in a cognitive and mnemonic image in which he may define and accommodate a singular existence. The table of memory, tables, book and volume of the brain all begin to share a shaping semantic force, which is ultimately realised in 'The Mousetrap'. The purpose of this play is to provoke memory, harnessed and articulated by 'the conscience of the king', which involves the same process of remembering forced by Hamlet from Gertrude in the picture of the brothers and the mirror of words of truth. The powerful link Hamlet makes between the literal and imaginative book, and the way in which it will begin to forge his direction — and dissimulation — begins the play's confrontation with mnemonic triggers and visual truth, 'minding' and 'mockeries'.

However, the performative potential of the book to control appearance and obscure 'reality' shifts its status out of the particular humanist fabric of Hamlet's education and into the role of a theatrical object. Hamlet both rejects and appropriates the book according to its ability to 'perform' within a theatrical context. Whilst, on one hand, such performative potential re-emphasises the passive ideological role the book takes in shared spaces, on the other such passivity and ideology provides potential for subversion. A little later, anxious to discover the cause of Hamlet's madness, Polonius manipulates a relationship between his daughter and the book in order to observe Ophelia and Hamlet 'alone'. Having already established that he and Claudius, 'seeing

unseen', will spy on the couple, Polonius sends Ophelia into an apparently isolated space under the guise of private devotion:

> Read on this book,
> That show of such an exercise may colour
> Your loneliness (3.1.45-7).

Polonius uses the book to create an idea of privacy, one that will 'colour' his and Claudius's presence as much as Ophelia's solitude. Polonius refers the responsibility of his plan onto the religious nature of Ophelia's book. Protestantism has long been held by historians to be responsible for the cultural shift from the collective to the individual.[10] The autonomous relationship to scripture made available by the devolution of worship from the priest to the patriarch, the shift from the icon to the word, and the encouragement of private reading outside of the church all have emphasised the Protestant impetus to interiority.[11] Under the auspices of Protestantism, 'privacy' moves away from its medieval associations of suspiciousness and duplicity and achieves a respectable status as a condition of deeply personal introspection, self-awareness and integrity.[12] Yet, in 'show', 'colour' and 'loneliness [aloneness]', Polonius, unwittingly, returns Ophelia's seclusion to a state of anxiety, amplified by the duplicitous conditions of seeming and being that support

[10] Although I refer specifically to Protestantism, if Ophelia is carrying a book of hours it is, of course, a medieval production and therefore Catholic. However, whilst the book itself may be a Roman Catholic article, the nature of both privacy and independence in her association with the book are more responsive to Reformed ideas of individual worship.

[11] This is a crude summary of the seminal impact of sectarianism on the reading and book-buying public, and, although, under the authority of Protestantism, the book is a habitable space for the private self and individual communion with God, this should not be taken in antithesis to Catholicism since reading remained an equally important part of the denomination. Cecile M. Jagodzinsk, in *Privacy and Print: reading and writing in seventeenth-century England* (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1999), explains that private reading became increasingly important within the Catholic faith as the Reformation made it impossible for Catholics to worship publicly: ' English

Elsinore. Claudius, noticing this irony, augments the moment with an aside: 'The harlot's cheek, beautied with plast'ring art, / Is not more ugly to the thing that helps it / Than is my deed to my most painted word' (3.1.52-4). The 'painted word' begins to emerge here in both its material and metaphorical capacity. Ophelia's status and 'solitary' female space suggest her to be carrying a book of devotion, possibly a Book of Hours, which may contribute to Hamlet's 'nunnery' comment, since such a book directed the time and prayers of a nun's daily worship, as well as the laywoman.[13] A Book of Hours is also a literal testimony to the painted or illuminated word; equally, however, the kind of 'plast'ring art' that Claudius refers to locates the ability of the word, like appearance, to deceive and colour. The severance of the word from meaning and dramatic resonance of Claudius's response are later suggested far more profoundly in their religious implications when Claudius admits that 'words without thoughts never to heaven go', but, here, we observe the book in its ability to superficially inform and contain a social space. The book, as held by Ophelia, and positioned by Polonius, is used for its capacity to enable processes of dissimulation. Although a book of hours may also perform some sort of apotropaic role, standing between Ophelia and Hamlet's potentially threatening madness, the object itself is only a mere accessory to the ideological context it supports. The practice of reading signified by a woman and book denote a private space of devotion, which socially accepts the observed or encountered

Catholics borrowed devotional techniques from the continent; with the suppression of Catholic writing and the liturgy in England, translations of prayer manuals and other devotional works abounded', p. 28.

[12] See above, pp. 3 – 12.

[13] Like Hamlet, Ophelia could in fact be carrying any book, since its performance in this scene is strictly 'theatrical', in other words it is a prop or disguise to facilitate a dialogue or an effect. However, Polonius's direction suggests a devotional book, which within this period could be anything from Psalms, Book of Common Prayer, Homilies, or a book about devotion. Structurally, it is also possible that Ophelia and Hamlet in fact use the same book to 'colour' the real purpose of their presence.

single female. Through Ophelia we are shown visually and textually how the book enables dissimulation and enters into the world of 'seeming' predicated on appearances. The moment of 'reading', which allowed the presence of Ophelia to accept the entrance of Hamlet, is referred back to the hidden observers in an apparently endless process of misreading. The dramatic space abounds with misinterpretations that are symbolically reflected by the role of the original object; as Polonius and Claudius watch and misread the lovers' conversation, the lovers equally condemn their space to confusion as Hamlet makes increasingly obtuse and cryptic responses, which develop a momentum toward annihilating Ophelia: 'you jig, you amble, and you lisp, and nickname God's creatures, and make your wantonness your ignorance. Go to, I'll no more on't, it hath made me mad' (3.1.145-7). It is also possible that Hamlet's famous vitriol 'Get thee to a nunnery', is, in part, a response to the gross deception he knows Ophelia to be playing with a book of devotion.[14] When Polonius sends his daughter out to trap Hamlet, book in hand, he comments that 'with devotion's visage / And pious action we do sugar o'er / The devil himself' (3.1.48-50). The book in this scene synthesises both the duplicity of Claudius, the devil himself, and the sexual and spiritual betrayal of Gertrude — her visage of devotion toward her dead husband's brother. The violence with which Hamlet casts Ophelia into his repulsion of women, sinners and 'breeders of sinners' may be augmented by her entrapment 'with devotion's visage'. Finally,

[14] Although the text is somewhat ambiguous as to whether Hamlet knows he is being observed, most directors seem to read his question to Ophelia, 'Where's your father' as an indication that he knows Polonius is there. Carol Rutter, in *Enter the body: women and representation on Shakespeare's stage*, draws attention to Olivier's film version when, in this scene, 'As Hamlet quizzes Ophelia, they move around a stone prie-dieu, which stands between them like a desecrated sacrament. She hears her mistake as soon as she answers "At home my lord", for both of them know Polonius is behind the arras. As her betrayal catches in her throat, she reaches out her arms to Hamlet, but the shot cuts them off, making the appeal grotesque. Hamlet, savage, throws her on her knees to resume her fake attitude of prayer...', p. 34.

Ophelia's comment that Hamlet was 'Th' observed of all observers', and cry 'O woe is me / T'have seen what I have seen, see what I see' (3.1.155; 161-2) condemns the scene's dependence on seeing to dreadful irony. Yet, even before finding Ophelia 'read[ing] on this book', Hamlet has manipulated his own relationship to reading and seeing.

When Hamlet enters, half way through 2.2, reading a book, the king and queen have been discussing, with Polonius, the state and cause of Hamlet's madness. Polonius, believing Hamlet to be mad for the love of Ophelia, chastises himself for having instructed her to repel him. In hindsight, he wishes he had 'played the desk or table-book' or 'looked upon this love with idle sight' (2.2.135; 137). Here, within the context of his relationship with Ophelia and indeed the book itself, Polonius's comment returns us to Hamlet's initial erasing of such forms. In the 'desk or table-book' Polonius would have positioned himself as the text between the lovers, conveying words of love or 'remembrances'; the phrase is an image of all that Hamlet appears to now detest about the book, its ability to suggest a public bridge into a private world, and practice order in a duplicitous context. Hamlet's second 'public' appearance on stage is announced by Gertrude's exclamation, 'But look where sadly the poor wretch comes reading' (2.2.168). Among the eleven definitions the *OED* gives for 'sadly', eight are now obsolete, however both 'in earnest, gravely' (†7) and 'steadfastly, fixedly' (†5) were last used to a similar effect as Gertrude in the early seventeenth century and may cast Hamlet within a more precise visual context than the modern understanding of 'sorrowfully' often implied by 'sadly's' conjunction with 'wretch'. Both 'gravely' and 'steadfastly' direct Hamlet to an intense

relationship with the book as he enters the scene; and yet we know he has also assumed an 'antic' disposition, committed himself to the revenge of his father's murder and abdicated from his role as the scholar, son, lover and prince. Like Polonius's decision for Ophelia to 'colour' her presence by virtue of the book, Hamlet refers to the book for a similar confusion of appearance and motive. Yet, whilst Ophelia's text allows for the single woman of status to be found alone in a social space, how does Hamlet's book perform? [15] Hamlet's concerted attention to the book, as noticed by Gertrude, is clearly an assumed posture and presumably works to one of two ends; either Hamlet aims to be ignored because he is thought to be so involved in his book, or he knows an appearance of studiousness will elicit the kind of response he gets from Polonius. Since the latter seems more likely (given that if Hamlet wanted to be ignored, he surely would not have entered a space so committed to observing), the book emerges as Hamlet's platform for performance; it enables his 'madness' to emerge and stands between him and his observers. Immediately, however, what the book seems to provide is a space of anamorphis, where characters, according to their practices of reading observe a peculiar angle in the representation of Hamlet and the book. Initially, however, like Ophelia's, Hamlet's book provides a mutual point of contact for the characters on stage, yet, where Hamlet will ignore Ophelia's text, here both Gertrude and Polonius notice the book in direct relationship to Hamlet. Hamlet's entrance 'reading'

[15] Technically there are various different books referred to in *Hamlet*; these include the 'tablet' or commonplace book, the devotional work, the metaphorical book of the mind, memory and soul, and the generic book of education. However, each of these books function in opposition to or as a confrontation with experience. Whatever the original and literal status of the books they tend to shift into a figurative and metaphysical context that encompasses multiple meanings. It should also be pointed out that at the heart of this chapter is the conceptual paradox between absence and presence in the role of the written word and the incapacity of language to accommodate experience as it inevitably precedes it. I cannot attempt to answer or fully embrace this impasse, except in adumbrating an

immediately locates him within a self-referential or solitary space of thought. Ophelia has already reported the state of Hamlet's madness: 'with his doublet all unbraced, / No hat upon his head, his stockings fouled, / Ungartered, and down-gyvèd to his ankle' (2.1.79-81), and, to some extent, we might hear Gertrude's comment as one of relief; that the 'sad wretch' is 'reading' signifies a hopeful return to the scholarly status with which she is familiar. Equally, Polonius's attempt to engage with Hamlet through his reading material signifies the book as providing an access to the Hamlet he recognises.

The Folio's stage direction '*Enter Hamlet reading on a book*' positions the scholar holding a book, probably open, with his head bowed. Yet, the text is neither specifically identified nor intertextually supported. Scholarship has variously tried to identify this book, T. W. Baldwin suggest Cicero, Leonard Barkan, noticing 'the satirical slave' postulates Juvenal, others have implicated Montaigne.[16] However, although we might more easily identify Hamlet's object as his own commonplace book, following on from his tables, his recent observation set down of the smiling villain and new commitment to a blank tablet from which his erased memory may proceed, his garbled deferral of any precise interaction with the text shows Hamlet to keenly obfuscate any specific identification. It is simply Hamlet's book and one that he de-constructs to support his madness and make a subterfuge for sanity.

---

awareness of both the problems and possibilities it presents to Hamlet's confrontation with the book and experience.

[16] T. W. Baldwin, *William Shakespeare's 'Small Latine & Lesses Greeke': volume one* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944); Leonard Barkan, 'What did Shakespeare read?', in *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. Margreta de Grazia and Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 39. I have extrapolated the suggestion that Hamlet may be reading Montaigne's *Essais* from the work of Terence Cave, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), and Eric Auerbach, *Mimesis: the Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Princeton, New jersey: Princeton University press, 1979).

Initially, it appears that Hamlet chooses to enter reading in order to defer his presence, his book as a companion allows him to enter the space of his mother and uncle without the absolute responsibility of interaction, for it allows him a certain privacy associated with reading, as well as providing a brief stability in the recognition of him as a scholar. However, although the book may begin as a refuge from public interaction, it is quickly appropriated as a vantage point by the other characters. Polonius's question, 'What do you read, my lord?', far from initiating the discourse he expects, in which he too believes the book to stand as a refuge between himself and Hamlet's 'madness', releases a display of the very condition he feared. Hamlet's response, 'Words, words, words' instantly devalues any role that the book had as a meaningful or social sign. Hamlet's description of the matter he reads falls as a stricture on not only the humanist enterprise of imitation or copia, but also on the signification of meaning. When Hamlet declares the 'words, words, words' of his book he instantly severs any relationship that Polonius may try to make through the referent as well as emphasising the vast gulf between his matter and his meaning. In Hamlet's 'obliteration' of 'referentiality', Ayers marks this moment as 'anticipating Derrida by some three and a half centuries, and announcing nothing less than a radical reformation of conventional ways of looking at words, texts, and the process of reading itself'.[17] However, Hamlet's reaction, rather than anticipate a profound post-structuralist fissure in the order of signification, seeks to establish an isolated and independent space from the order of communication. Hamlet's response to Polonius uses the book and its

[17] Ayers, 'Reading, writing, and Hamlet', *SQ* 44 (1993), 424.

'words' in both defence and attack to sever himself from shared lines of meaning, not to re-negotiate them. Hamlet's response makes no attempt to include his companions in a discourse on signification, rather he simply replies to Polonius's question literally and turns Polonius back to the bare sign — the 'word' — and not away from it. For the audience, however, Hamlet's response returns us to the erasing of his books, which he acts out for his spectators, on one hand divorcing the 'matter' from any signification and, on the other gambolling through a seething mishmash of proverbial wisdom (the 'dead dog' 'kissing carrion', 'backward crab'), classical satire ('satirical rogue' who 'says here that old men have grey beards'), and contention with the written word, since:

> all which, sir, though I most powerfully and potently believe, yet I hold it not honesty to have it thus set down (2.2.200-202).

Although Hamlet may 'powerfully and potently' believe something, it is not honourable to have it written down, for truth cannot be honoured by the written word. In 'words, words, words' Hamlet condemns the idea of meaning as it is reflected by the book. Hamlet's violent reappraisal of the book excludes him from precisely the kind of assumptions Polonius makes between meaning and matter.

The relationship between meaning and matter was often explicitly emblematised in the book. Much of sixteenth-century discourse saw the book as not only representative of meaning but also its precedent; the book visually and textually promised knowledge. Both in Gregor Reisch's *Margarita*

Philosophica (1503) and Francis Bacon's *The Great Instauration* (1620), for example, a virtue is made of blazoning knowledge. The former depicts Grammar opening the gate to the 'castle of knowledge' with a key in one hand and an alphabet in the other,[18] and the latter shows an image of a ship sailing toward the two pillars of learning beyond which stretches an endless horizon of knowledge. Humanist endeavour is entirely supported by the trading of knowledge as both a cognitive and literal commodity, and the printed book became emblematic of the material and metaphorical journey that knowledge and the reader could make. In contrast, in Montaigne's *Essais*, a retreat from the public life becomes synonymous with a sceptical and thorough examination on how the 'self' achieves and recognises meaning within an order of its own making. In declaring words as empty transactions that only replicate the gulf between expression and experience, Montaigne observed something similar to Hamlet when he said:

> Our disputes are about words. I ask what is Nature, Pleasure, a Circle, and a Substitution. The question is couched in words, and is answered in the same coin.[19]

Although the subjective 'author' and singular 'I' increasingly began to find a voice towards the end of the sixteenth century,[20] Montaigne appears to be doing

[18] As described by Anthony Grafton, *New Worlds, Ancient Texts: The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery* (Cambridge Massachusetts and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University press, 1995), p. 16.
[19] Montaigne, *Essays*, p. 349.
[20] Alongside the more generally recognised inflection of the 'individual' in the sixteenth century famously discussed by Jacob Burckhardt in *The Civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Row, 1958), and explored more anecdotally in the work of New Historicism, Douglas Bruster draws attention to an equally important emergence of the 'personal', that is 'embodied writing': 'a kind of text and textual practice that, increasingly during the 1590s, put resonant identities and physical forms on the printed page'. Bruster specifically locates the rise of satire, particularly the Marprelate tracts, *à clef* and erotic writing, the increasingly powerful relationship between the author's death and the popularity of his works (suggesting a celebration of the 'author') and, of course, the

something different; in contrast to Robert Burton, for example, who like Montaigne appears to explore 'la condition humaine', when he declares: 'Thou thyself art the subject of my discourse',[21] Burton contains his 'I' within a consensual academic fabric of recognised values that seeks only to reaffirm those values in reflecting — and creating — an image of himself:

> Concerning myself, I can peradventure affirm with Marius in Sallust, 'That which others hear or read of, I felt and practised myself; they get their knowledge by books, I mine by learning'.[22]

Burton scrutinises and recognises himself within terms and conditions that are already set down, Hamlet, however, wrenches himself from those terms, words, or matter which contain an order of communication not predicated on independent experience. Hamlet's determined misconstruing of Polonius amplifies both the arbitrary nature of language to represent meaning – brilliantly exposed in Hamlet's perfect misinterpretation of 'matter' – and the necessity of meaning to reflect relationships. Polonius's observation that 'Though this be madness, yet there is method in't' sanctions Hamlet's oblique drive for truth beyond the 'painted word', 'suits of woe' or smiling perfidy that supports the deceit of Elsinore. However, both Polonius and Claudius suggest in their reading of Hamlet's madness that the possibility of meaning lurks behind his 'antic' and 'divided' self, particularly in contrast to the outright alienation of mad Ophelia. Truth prowls as the enemy to seeming.

---

embodied presence of writing on stage: 'Granting bodily presence to fictional characters, and a fictional identity to real bodies, this writing mediated the imaginary and the actual in its bodily address', *Shakespeare and The Question of Culture: Early Modern Literature and the Cultural Turn*, (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 65-93.

[21] Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. Holbrook Jackson (New York: The New York Review of Books, 2001), p. 20.

The auspicious entrance of the players into Hamlet's world enables him to advance upon his developing practices of meaning. Hamlet casts himself into the world of theatre and theories of playing within the murky space between naturalism and realism. Caught between the potential reality of the play and the effects of a player's reality Hamlet is confronted by his own theories of representation and truth:

> What would he do,
> Had he the motive and the cue for passion
> That I have? He would drown the stage with tears
> And cleave the general ear with horrid speech,
> Make mad the guilty and appal the free,
> Confound the ignorant and amaze indeed
> The very faculties of eyes and ears. Yet I,
> A dull and muddy-mettled rascal, peak
> Like John-a-dreams, unpregnant of my cause,
> And can say nothing (2.2.548-557).

Hamlet adumbrates the representational difference between the appearance and reality of truth; whilst truth should behave with horrid speech to amaze both the eyes and ears, in reality, it says nothing. Yet, where, for Hamlet, the book afforded no outlet for the expression of life, the theatre in enclosing life, will leave reality the opportunity to disclose itself on the margins of apparent containment. From the outset Hamlet enters into questions of truth bound up in the vagaries of 'seeming'. Yet, condemning his books, erasing his memory and living only with the commandment of the Ghost, Hamlet finds truth in the battlements, cellar and shadows of Elsinore. Truth emerges as the obverse to art and, in confronting what art has come to mean, subjects reality to the pressure of perception. According to Francis Bacon, 'the nature of things

[22] Ibid., p. 22.

betrays itself more readily under the vexations of art than in its natural freedom'.[23] Bacon's contention is that man's mind is as 'an uneven mirror', which in receiving impressions, 'distorts the rays of objects according to its own figure and section' and therefore 'cannot be trusted to report them truly, but in forming its notions mixes up its own with the nature of things'.[24] Although the mirror was a commonplace conceit for the mind of man as much as it was for the theatre, Bacon's observation recalls Hamlet's play as it subjects the nature of things to the dual process of vexation and observation. Hamlet, like Bacon, seeks to enforce a linear perception, understood in terms of the objectivity of truth, through pressurising nature into an even space of reflection. The art itself is nature according to where the mirror, as it were, is placed:

> Suit the action to the word, the word to the action, with this special observance, that you o'erstep not the modesty of nature. For anything so overdone is from the purpose of playing, whose end, both at the first and now, was and is to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature: to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure (3.2.16-23).

The mirror stage must reflect nature in its art, and yet the auditorium must betray its art in the modesty of nature on stage; ultimately it is the mirror of nature on stage that will vex the art of the auditorium into reporting itself truly. For Hamlet, the vexations of art, construed as theatre, perform the function of what Foucault calls a 'man-made sign', which not only derives its power from its 'fidelity to natural signs', but also 'draws the dividing-line between man and animal; that transforms imagination into voluntary

[23] Francis Bacon, *New Atlantis, and The Great Instauration*, revised edition, ed. Jerry Weinburger (1620; Illinois: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1989), p. 28.
[24] Ibid., p. 25.

memory'.[25] The language with which Hamlet negotiates his theatre recalls his rejection of the book; the 'form and pressure' so essential to the effect and purpose of playing were also contingents of his learning but erased for the memory of his father. However, where 'all saws of books' simply re-presented the pressures past as natural signs of the known and knowing world, uncontested by the man-made relationship between experience and meaning, the theatre confronts memory in the embodied imagination of reflection and remembering. Hamlet ushers in the theatre to affect the manner of a man-made sign, transforming what appears to be imagination into the voluntary memory of Claudius. Where Hamlet's books took him only into the terrain of a shared ethical rhetoric condemned by their form to transform memory into matter, his theatre projects the spectator into a site of inner struggle.

Antonin Artaud, in his extraordinary work, *The Theatre and its Double*, develops an analogy between the plague and the theatre that begins in the imaginative relationship between violence and memory: 'like the plague, theatre is a powerful appeal through illustration to those powers which return the mind to the origins of its inner struggles'.[26] The relationship Artaud makes between the plague and the actor is symptomatic of the relationship between Claudius and the stage:

> The condition of a plague victim, who dies without any material destruction, yet with all the stigmata of an absolute, almost abstract disease upon him, is in the

[25] Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London: Routledge, 2000), p. 62.
[26] Antonin Artaud, *The Theatre and its Double*, trans. Victor Corti (Montreuil, London, and New York: Calder, 1999), p. 20.

> same condition as an actor totally penetrated by feelings without any benefit or relation to reality. Everything in the actor's physical aspect, just as in the plague victim, shows life has reacted to a paroxysm, yet nothing has happened.[27]

Hamlet's theatre turns Claudius into the actor, 'totally penetrated by feelings without any benefit or relation to reality', suffering the paroxysms of memory, 'yet, nothing has happened'. Or, rather, nothing has apparently happened since the theatre pretends to contain its action within the body and stage. Yet, Hamlet's ostensible attention to both decorum and text, warning the actors against improvisation and excess, allows the extended space for imitation to occur outside of the playing space. The play is presented as a contained text, devoid of 'the motive and the cue for action' of real experience or feeling, what occurs outside the play, in the audience, is the potential mimetic space. Hamlet 'set[s] down' a 'speech of some dozen or sixteen lines' (2.2.529) and performs it for the players as he will have it performed: 'Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you' (3.2.1). Despite his original injunction, Hamlet returns to his humanist roots, providing both text and imitation in order to affect action and response. Yet, the play itself is a copy or imitation of an event, so that reality, text, performance and mimesis converge as a recursive process, ultimately finding their point of completion in the bodies of the audience.

Theatre, however, captures a sense of immediacy associated with the direct relationship between thought and action, feeling and response; such an immediacy lies at the heart of retrieving the self from its textual precedent:

> Both improvisation and inspiration are concepts which seek to erase the wealth of pre- existing written materials and represent discourse as arising immediately from the mind, breath, or voice of the speaker.[28]

Hamlet began the play erasing a wealth of pre-existing discourse in order to determine a way of retrieving truth from the underside of appearance. He, like truth, stands in the dimness of the play, its performance and text: truth dramatically emerges on the spectator-stage in the desperate call for 'lights, lights, lights'.[29] Despite the rejection of the book, the idea of text, as it pre-empts memory or precipitates performance, shadows Hamlet's progress. Returning to his classical learning, he extracts moments which corroborate or articulate his emotions; in recalling Pyrrhus's revenge of his father's, Achilles', death – 'One speech' which he 'chiefly loved, 'twas Aeneas' tale to Dido, and thereabout of it especially where he speaks of Priam's slaughter' (2.2.437-439) – Hamlet asks theatre to regain the moment of contact between text and experience, condemned by the book.

Hamlet's relationship to the book is transformed by theatre from reader to 'author', or, rather, what in post-structuralist terms might be called 'scriptor':

> Succeeding the Author, the scriptor no longer bears within him passions, humours, feelings, halts, impressions, but rather this immense dictionary from which he draws a writing that can know no halt: life never does more than imitate the book, and the book itself is only a tissue of signs, an imitation that is lost, infinitely deferred.[30]

---

[27] Ibid., pp. 15-16.
[28] Terence Cave, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing in the French Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. xii.
[29] SD] F (*All*); Q2 *Pol[onius]*
[30] Roland Barthes, 'The Death of The Author', in *The Book History Reader*, ed. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 223.

Hamlet, is forced by his own predicament, like a 'dull and muddy-mettled rascal' to deny his 'passions' and 'humours', in saying 'nothing'; instead, drafting his own play through the pre-text of 'The Murder of Gonzago', Pyrrhus, Priam or Hecuba, he draws from 'an immense dictionary' a 'tissue of signs' setting up a process of imitation that moves through art to find life in the spectator. The bridge from art to life is forged by the transformation of the imagination into memory. The processes of remembering and forgetting that drive so much of the play become enmeshed in ideas of the book that seem to strain for relief in theatre. Later, when Hamlet recounts his discovery of Claudius's plot to kill him as he sails for England, he tells Horatio:

> Being thus benetted round with villains –
> Ere I could make a prologue to my brains,
> They had begun the play – I sat me down,
> Devised a new commission, wrote it fair.
> I once did hold it, as our statists do,
> A baseness to write fair, and laboured much
> How to forget that learning (5.2.30-36).

Hamlet recalls this moment through a conflation of theatrical and clerical terms which chart a process of learning forged by forgetting and remembering. Although a 'commission' is an 'order' or a 'command' to implement action, and an official document, not only does Hamlet devise a 'new' one, challenging both the authority and immutability of such a document, but he couches his response in theatrical terms. 'Villains', 'prologue', and 'play' all suggest a performance, and Hamlet reconstructs the image and event for Horatio through the effective language of theatre. Yet, in contrast, for Hamlet, learning has simply become utilitarian, retrieving from the book and volume of his brain that which serves the moment. Barthes's

contention that the book is simply a configuration of signs imitating something that is 'infinitely deferred', registers the possibility of a once authentic, but now lost, relationship between experience and representation. The book, in this context, seems only to remind us of a lost authenticity. When Hamlet rejects the book he does so for its flat representation of deferred experience; when he appropriates the theatre, however, he issues it with a metaphorical mirror, sending out the image as dynamic and reflective of an inner truth that has been consumed by forgetting. Where 'The Mousetrap' offers Claudius an image of himself — or as Cassius says to Brutus, 'you cannot see yourself / So well as by reflection'- [31] Hamlet's words, as he advances on his mother, become a mirror to memory:

> You go not till I set you up a glass
> Where you may see the inmost part of you (3.4.20-21).

Where the actual mirror in *Richard II* failed to represent his 'inmost part', reflecting merely the 'external manner of laments' signifying nothing, Hamlet's mirror, fabricated by a language of truth, hitherto denied by Gertrude, reflects her very soul. Gertrude, terrified of Hamlet's vitriol and responding to his being 'thought-sick at the act' asks:

> Ay me, what act,
> That roars so loud and thunders in the index? (3.4.53-4).

Gertrude's reference to 'the index' forces the image of the book back into contest with its representative potential. Gertrude is probably specifically

[31] *Julius Caesar* (1.2.69-70).

referring to 'a table of contents prefixed to a book' or 'a sign, token, indication *of* something' (*OED*, 4. b., 5. †a), suggesting that Hamlet's accusations have yet to reveal the argument or 'act'. However, Gertrude's exclamation may also glance at the *Index librorum prohibitorum*, a book issued by the Catholic Church listing forbidden books, or the *Expurgatory index*, a sub-volume of the *Index* listing passages to be excised or altered, which amplifies the image of the book within the context of sin.[32] In *The Cardinal* (1641), James Shirley has Antonio advise his companion on how to approach his love for a woman with 'a little stain' on her honour:

> First I would marry her, that's a verb material;
> Then I would print her with an *index*
> *Expurgatoris*; a table drawn
> Of her court heresies; and when she's read,
> *Cum privilegia*, who dares call her whore?[33]

Despite Antonio's context of exoneration, the idea of the *'index'* is clearly associated with sexual transgression and sin. On one hand, Gertrude's response declares that she understands Hamlet's accusations to be condemning her not only graphically, but before the act has either occurred or been understood; on the other, however, if we accept a possible reference to the *Index*, Hamlet's condemnation is not simply private or domestic, but within a public moral fabric of absolute judgement, indelibly set down. Having set himself up as the mirror to Gertrude's soul, Hamlet forces her eye to the image of her husbands:

---

[32] Although the *Index librorum prohibitorum* was formulated under the Council of Trent and published by Pius IV in 1564, the *OED* does not cite the first reference in English until 1613. Equally, the *Expurgatory index*, although published under Phillip II in 1571 in Antwerp, is not cited in English until 1611.

Look here upon this picture, and on this,
The counterfeit presentment of two brothers (3.4.55-6)

The relationship between the word and image is brought together by Hamlet's initial injunction that he will set his accusations against her as a mirror to her 'inmost part'; the metaphorical mirror appears in Gertrude's forced confrontation with an image of herself, as set down by Hamlet, and an image of her betrayal as pictured by her husbands. The literally visual (the picture) and the materially inscribed (the Index) are conflated with the metaphorically visual (mirror) and imaginatively inscribed (soul). Again, it is the imagination that forces the link to memory. Faced by the profundity of Hamlet's behaviour, Gertrude extends her image of the index, a material, written record of argument and censorship, into her soul, marked with the black ink of sin:

O Hamlet, speak no more.
Thou turn'st mine eyes into my very soul,
And there I see such black and grainèd spots
As will not leave their tinct (3.4.80-3).

From Hamlet's mirror of words Gertrude configures her individual book of sin, although condemned in the eyes of God and the Church, stained to her private soul. Yet, contrary to the prohibited passages or books in the Index, the black spots of Gertrude's soul cannot be excised. The soul as a tablet upon which words or images may be impressed was central to the art of memory, and in devising their systems of memory both Plato and Cicero attach a value system to the soul. Where Cicero identified Prudence as a central tenet to the

[33] James Shirley, *The Dramatic Works and Poems* (London: John Murray, Albemarle St, 1833), V.II/p. 337.

right understanding and application of memory, which was later powerfully appropriated and amplified in the works of Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, Plato, through the idea of the, literally, impressionable soul, develops a relationship between memory and the soul as a temporal reminder of Ideal Form.

> In *Phaedrus*, in which Plato expounds his view of the true function of rhetoric — which is to persuade men to the knowledge of truth — he again develops the theme that knowledge of the truth and of the soul consists in remembering, in the recollection of the Ideas once seen by all souls of which all earthly things are confused copies.[34]

Equally, Plato's use of 'the seal imprint metaphor in the famous passage in the *Theaetetus* in which Socrates assumes that there is a block of wax in our souls — varying quality in different individuals — and that is "the gift of memory, the Mother of the Muses"', [35] presents the wax tablet of the soul in terms that recognise its value according to its mnemonic imprint. The soul is a repository for truth in relation to its seal of imprint. Hamlet, before he enters his mother's closet, ascertains that his soul will not 'seal' — receive the impressions of — the words he will use against her:

> I will speak daggers to her, but use none.
> My tongue and soul in this be hypocrites –
> How in my words somever she be shent,
> To give them seals never my soul consent (3.2.379-82).

[34] Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: Pimlico, 2001), p. 51.
[35] Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: Pimlico, 2001), p. 50.

Although Hamlet will disgrace his mother and rebuke her actions he cannot 'seal' them with a belief that she is truly profane.[36] The entrance of the Ghost corroborates Hamlet's decision not to 'seal' his words in his soul. Old Hamlet appears to warn Hamlet of his anger toward his mother, to 'step between her and her fighting soul!', and to re-engage Hamlet, since 'the soul never thinks without a mental picture'.[37] The Ghost returns us to Hamlet's conviction for truth in the command 'Remember me'. *Ad herennium* propounded the use of 'active' or 'dramatic' human figures for recall, which is not only exemplified in 'The Mousetrap', but also here, when the sudden entrance of the Ghost, at this apparently unnecessary moment, amplifies the role of visual memory in action.[38] Although Quintilian preferred the art of memorising whole passages of books, often in visualising the said passages or pages, he notices a particular relationship whereby the image becomes the word:

> Images are as words by which we note things we have to learn, so that as Cicero says, 'we use places as wax and images as letters'.[39]

Aristotle, in 'De anima', claims that memory 'belongs to the same part of the soul as the imagination' and that 'Imagination is the intermediary between perception and thought'. In Aristotle's 'imagination' we can observe how Foucault's man-made sign is indicative of the cognitive process that occurs

---

[36] Although I accept that 'seal' can equally refer to the mark of a legal document, implying that Hamlet will not set down his words in jurisdiction, given the scene's emphasis on the soul, and the play's emphasis on memory, I think it more likely that Hamlet uses 'seal' in the context of the wax tablet of the soul.

[37] Yates, referring to Aristotle's 'De anima', *The Art of Memory*, p. 47.

[38] I suggest that the entrance of the Ghost here seems unnecessary because even within his own imperatives he has no significant impact. Although he reminds Hamlet of his task, we might expect a more efficacious entrance as Hamlet stands on the brink of murder over the praying Claudius, or perhaps, as Hamlet stands in the graveyard on his return from England.

[39] Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London: Pimlico, 2001), p. 40; p, 38.

when the mind negotiates sign and meaning through both the familiar and the strange.[40] When Hamlet rejected 'all saws of books' in favour of the 'book and volume' of his 'brain', he began a process of forgetting and remembering based on subjecting forms of representation to pressures normally on the margins of their meaning; hence the book to experience, words to matter, the stage to the spectator. Yet, when Hamlet re-introduces the words of his play, or classical allusions onto the stage, he re-engages the sign with its lost journey — to transform imagination into memory by way of 'truth'.

Hamlet begins his journey to truth through a double process of reflection; the metaphorical mirror in his play and confrontation with Gertrude apparently starts with linear representation but then, as 'A natural perspective, that is and is not' moves the soul toward her bias and turns the 'inmost' out.[41] The mirror works when it both represents and engages the seeing eye; 'the eye sees not itself but by reflection'. Under Hamlet's authority, neither the mirror nor the stage represents 'the exterior' but transform their surfaces to reflect 'the inmost part', but they are only capable of this when they hold the eye in the imagination's journey to memory. Yet, according to William Baldwin in *The Mirror for Magistrates*, and Lady Percy in *2 Henry IV*, the metaphorical mirror is the imitative and reflective article to educate and gentle the human soul. For Lady Percy, her husband 'was the mark and glass, copy and book, /

---

[40] Although I choose to develop Foucault's comment in the context of Aristotle's 'De anima', I do not mean to suggest an ideological relationship between the philosophers. I am aware that Aristotle refers to 'things past' within the context of, what Plato would develop into Ideal Forms, but here I simply observe the cognitive process which affects its own system of meaning.

[41] I have taken the quotation and idea from *Twelfth Night*, V.I.214; 257, wherein Orsino sees Cesario's transformation into Viola as an optical trick 'making one image into two', and Sebastian comments on his marriage to Olivia (as she thought Cesario) as nature ultimately, even inexorably, bending toward the 'right' — straight — course.

That fashioned others' (2.3.31-3). The book and the mirror in this context are interchangeable artefacts of material and metaphorical signification in and through which men may aspire though imitation. The humanist paradigm is thus amplified within a metaphysical, even Platonic, aspect of becoming what you see or read. But Hamlet reverses the aspirational and the benign; the theatre, which is the devolved site of the mirror, must reveal the evil rather than inspire the good. It is no longer a site to teach but to punish. The theatre was both born from, and often justified by, a didactic imperative, but Hamlet's play cannot redress evil by virtue of the virtuous mirror it can only re-present things as they already are: 'to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure'. Theatre interacts with life as a parallel image, but, crucially, according to Hamlet's remark that men may 'declare' themselves at plays in response to the imaged self, it has the capacity, in that image, to verify life and to ascertain truth.

The mirror brings together the word and the image to overturn reflection and reveal the soul. In isolation, the image is always in a state of flux the 'seeming', 'observed', 'seen unseen' world of Elsinore undermines any sense of even perspective; something Hamlet suddenly remembers in his treatment of Laertes: 'That to Laertes I forgot myself; /For by the image of my cause I see / The portraiture of his' (5.2.77-9). By contrast, the 'mind's eye' takes the shape of truth: 'O my prophetic soul'. The book and volume of Hamlet's brain ushers in memory as it erases all pressures past for the mnemonic tablet of the mind's eye.

In 1550, Guilio Camillo's treatise for the construction of a memory theatre was published. *L'idea del Theatro* quite literally reflects the synthetic relationship between word and image and the potential memory holds for a temporal and celestial order. Out of the Platonic idea of 'copies' Guilio Camillo designed a 'Theatre of Memory'. Camillo's fame was partly due to his ingenuity and partly to his eccentricity. His elaborate appropriation of the ancient art of memory, its ascent (or descent) into the occult and its theatrical presentation won no favours with the humanists, who preferred the more rational, methodological treatment of Quintillian. However, Viglius Zuichemus visited Camillo's Theatre and wrote to Erasmus concerning what he saw:

> He calls this theatre of his by many names, saying now that it is built or constructed mind and soul, and now that it is a windowed one. He pretends that all things that the human mind can conceive and which we cannot see with the corporeal eye, after being collected together by diligent meditation may be expressed by certain corporeal signs in such a way that the beholder may at once perceive with his eyes everything that is otherwise hidden in the depths of the human mind. And it is because of this corporeal looking that he calls it a theatre.[42]

Camillo's Theatre is important, not for its Platonic or arcane implications but simply because it overtly synthesises the theatre and the unconscious. The Theatre aims to retrieve the spectator's hidden mind and make it visible —

[42] Yates, *The Art of Memory*, pp. 136-7.

corporeal. This process involves reversing the traditional layout of a theatre by making the observer also the observed. 'There is no audience sitting in the seats watching a play on stage. The 'solitary' spectator of the Theatre stands where the stage would be and looks toward the auditorium…'.[43] By reversing the relationship between spectator and representation, the Theatre overturns the linear relationship between observation and outward form. The Theatre projects the unconscious in 'certain corporeal signs', and retrieves the hidden depths of the human mind. When Hamlet devises the play for the king and queen he devises a theatre of memory, a projection of corporeal signs that reflect the hidden depths of his spectator's minds. Yet, although we may notice structural similarities between these theatres of memory, both Hamlet and Camillo project their spectator imaginatively or literally onto the stage, both devise 'corporeal signs' supported by text, for Hamlet inserts 'some dozen or sixteen lines' and Camillo puts scraps of Cicero into drawers beneath the stage; and, although they may both work toward hidden truths, what they reveal — and what they want to reveal — is very different. Camillo's memory theatre is strictly committed to retrieving the Ideal forms of the fallen mind, and aims, in triggering and recovering memory, to return the mind to its perfect origins. Hamlet's theatre however, although striving for truth, will remove a veneer of concord to reveal the evil that lies beneath. As Hamlet fulfils the command of the Ghost to 'Remember me', he projects his spectator onto this mirror stage and holds up a glass to the mnemonic soul.

[43] Ibid., p. 141.

When Thomas Heywood, in *An Apology for Actors*, claims that 'All men have parts, and each must act his own', the metaphorical scope of the world as a stage and the moral discourse in which the plays are assumed to engage, suggest that both on the stage and in the world it is a matter of each man finding his part — and acting it: 'The World's a Theatre, the earth a Stage,/Which God, and nature doth with Actors fill'.[44] When Hamlet hauls Claudius's life onto the stage he re-engages with the relationship between the theatre and the world, showing Claudius the part he played, in nature, and before God; or, as Jonson claimed, 'all Repraesentations ... eyther have bene, or ought to be the mirror of mans life...'.[45] The 'true transparent crystal mirror' of the stage does not simply reflect the world but re-orientates 'each man [to] act his own' part. Where the book cluttered Hamlet's mind with 'trivial fond records', and, in its oblique and static forms and pressures past, re-presented apocryphal channels of communication, or enabled dissimulation and entrapment, madness and meaninglessness, the theatre affects a reconciliation of the art itself as nature. Heywood, recalls an incident with 'a company of our *English* Comedians', in which, a woman, watching the performance of a particular method of murder, became 'with great gravity strangely amazed' and 'with a distracted and troubled brain oft sighed these words: Oh my husband, my husband!' A few days later, the sexton, having discovered the skull of a man similarly murdered to the man in the play, makes it known to the church-warden and 'the woman, out of the trouble of her afflicted conscience discovered a former murder'.[46] The play, it seems

---

[44] Thomas Heywood, *An Apology For Actors* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1612), A4v.
[45] Jonson's prefatory note to *Love's Triumph* as quoted by Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*, third edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 2003), p. 25.
[46] Thomas Heywood, *An Apology for Actors*, G2v, G2r.

catches both the conscience and the memory of the guilty spectator. From Hamlet's original task, 'Remember me', he traces the art of memory through the mind's eye, the mirror and ultimately the stage, so that as 'Cicero sayeth, a Comedy is the imitation of life, the glass of custom, and the image of truth'; [47] or, a tragedy, as Horatio returns Hamlet to the 'stage' to 'truly deliver' the story:

> give order that these bodies
> High on a stage be placèd to the view;
> And let me speak to th' yet unknowing world
> How these things came about (5.2.330-333).

[47] Heywood, *An Apology for Actors*, third book, 'Of Actors and their True Quality', Fv.

VI

'Rather like a dream than an assurance': *The Tempest* and The Book of Illusions

When Peter Greenaway entitled his adaptation of *The Tempest* 'Prospero's Books' (1991) he foregrounded the magus and his material as the iconic authority through which the film moved. During the course of the film Greenaway puts twenty four books into the hands of Prospero, each one a testimony to the independent power of the book to both create and reflect its subject; in *The Book of Water*, for example, 'As the pages are turned, the watery elements are often animated. There are rippling waves and slanting storms' or, *The Book of Languages*, where 'Words, sentences, paragraphs and chapters gather like tadpoles in a pond in April or starlings in a November evening sky'.[1] For Greenaway, these books belong to an arcane corpus synthesising humanist aspiration and the self-fulfilling agencies of the natural and cosmic world. They appear to belong to Prospero, as their pages unfold in sympathy with the magus offering the depths of their illusions to the strength of his desires. The visual impact of Greenaway's imagination and the lengths to which his cinematic licence goes are evidence of the power of the book in this play. In Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, however, no single book is named nor do any appear on stage.[2]

[1] Peter Greenaway, *Prospero's Books: A Film of Shakespeare's The Tempest* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1991), p. 17; 21.

[2] It is possible that when Prospero talks of drowning his books he performs the act on stage. However, not only does his speech of abjuration anticipate rather than direct the act, but it is unlikely that the characters are standing on the shoreline at this point, as well as the fact that since the book is to be buried 'deeper than did ever plummet sound', Prospero would need to be quite far out to sea.

The Tempest, unlike any other play discussed in this thesis, does not develop an intellectual relationship to the book. In Shakespeare's plays, the book, material or metaphorical, is, almost always, manifest in relationship to the character or narrative, drama or expression of the moment, often developing a cognitive presence beyond the requisites of dialogue. Prospero's books, however, do not. Although they enter the play almost immediately, they begin within a passive narrative of the past, standing as an adjunct to the main stage, alongside the 'stuffs and necessaries' of Prospero's 'tale'. Prospero's books reside, like nearly everything ideological in the play, within the realms of the imagination; they do not unfold with the characters, or develop a language independent of their conceptual presence; these books do not expose modes of thought or examine precepts. Prospero's books, and his relationship to them, begin and remain in the hinterland of the play; yet, like Caliban, we are always aware of their power and their place, wherever that place may be and whatever that power may represent. Critical theory often recognises the importance of Prospero's books, but almost always within the realms of post-colonial discourse, so that the book, like Prospero's art, becomes enmeshed in Foucaudian or cultural materialist theories of authority and surveillance.[3] Equally, the book often surfaces within the hermeneutics of intertextuality or source parallels.[4] Francis Barker and Peter Hulme broadened these

---

[3] See, for example, Paul Brown, '"This thing of darkness I acknowledge mine"', in *Political Shakespeare: Essays in cultural materialism*, second edition, ed. Jonathan Dolimore and Alan Sinfield (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), who suggests that *The Tempest* 'serves as a limit text in which the characteristic operations of colonialist discourse may be discerned – as an instrument of exploitation, a register of beleaguerment and a site of radical ambivalence', p. 68. Aimé Césaire's *Une tempête* is a significant contribution to the relationship between *The Tempest* and colonialism, since, in this play we see Caliban 'fight back', exposing 'how colonisation decivilises the coloniser'; as Césaire's Caliban reclaims his island, he translates the underside of *The Tempest* into a fight against the ignorance of Protestant White oppression.

[4] Donna B. Hamilton, in 'Re-Engineering Virgil: *The Tempest* and The Printed English *Aeneid*', '*The Tempest* and Its Travels', ed. Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman (London: Reaktion Books Ltd,

interpretive scopes by focusing on what they term 'con-texts', which, like much post-structuralism, seeks to break away from the 'autotelic' text and 'from the inequality of the usual text/context relationship'. The relationship between text and context is read as a text, and not something that 'simply make[s] up the background'.[5] Equally, however, although Barbara Mowat, for example, may claim that 'No play by Shakespeare gestures toward the book as pervasively and as importantly as does *The Tempest*', she goes on to discuss what she calls 'infratexts' or a system of intertextual interpretation.[6] Yet, in *The Tempest*, there is no language of the book, no semantic landscape through which the book devolves signification, reveals thought or signs the way the drama moves. The book is an object of possession for Prospero and destruction for Caliban and does not appear to question the contingencies of these realms. However, as Peter Hulme and Francis Barker suggest, there are two plays in performance — 'Prospero's play' and 'The Tempest' — which 'are not necessarily the same thing'.[7] Like Prospero's theatre, Prospero's books are illusions, constructed through his narrative and part of the 'fabric of this vision'. This is not to say that they do not exist but, rather, that they are part of the art of 'any god of power' that will, with his 'insubstantial pageant' fade, and 'leave not a rack behind'. Prospero's books are absent objects that appear to demarcate the shoreline of the isle, standing on the tide between his

---

2000), shows how the *Aeneid* was a commonplace text for appropriation; it was published and republished, translated and retranslated as a polemical model for both propaganda and public expression. Hamilton gives examples of the varying translations, dedications and interpolations that accompanied the publication of the text during the reformation, counter-reformation, and intermediate union with the Habsburgs, pp. 114-120.

[5] Francis Barker and Peter Hulme, 'Nymphs and reapers heavily vanish: the discursive con-texts of *The Tempest*', John Drakakis (ed.), *Alternative Shakespeares*, pp. 192-195; n. 7.

[6] Barbara Mowat, '"Knowing I loved my books": Reading The Tempest intertextually', *'The Tempest' and Its Travels*, n. 275.

[7] Francis Barker and Peter Hulme, 'Nymphs and reapers heavily vanish: the discursive con-texts of *The Tempest*', *Alternative Shakespeares*, p. 199.

dukedom and his magic, Milan and exile, and yet they trace the shadows of the island, chart the trajectory of the play, harness Prospero's magic, his reward and nemesis, Miranda's tuition and Caliban's sedition. How?

As the play opens and the tempest subsides, Prospero takes Miranda through 'the dark backward and abysm of time' of her own history, and recalls the great service Gonzalo did to them on their expulsion from Milan:

> Out of his charity – who, being then appointed
> Master of this design – did give us, with
> Rich garments, linens, stuffs and necessaries,
> Which since have steaded much; so of his gentleness,
> Knowing I loved my books, he furnished me
> From mine own library with volumes that
> I prize above my dukedom.[8]

As Prospero recalls his and Miranda's dramatic escape, the corruption of his brother and the life-threatening conditions through which they travelled, he remembers his books and his library; amidst 'stuffs and necessaries', Gonzalo also remembers Prospero's library and knowing both Prospero and his books he manages to find and transport those volumes that he prized above his dukedom. Yet these books are not 'necessaries', but come from the 'gentleness' of Gonzalo, a mark of his kindness and nobility in recognising Prospero's desires as well as his needs. The journey that Prospero makes with Miranda is redeemed by his books, bringing with them some of that 'gentleness' or nobility through which they were exchanged and translating the island, not into a barren exile of subsistence but into a developing microcosm of authority and mutability. Yet, despite the significance

[8] William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, ed. Virginia Mason Vaughn and Alden T. Vaughan, The Arden Shakespeare, third series (Walton-on-Thames: Thomas Nelson, 1999), 1.2.162-168. All subsequent references, unless otherwise stated, are to this edition.

of these books the public relationship Prospero makes with them is ambiguous; although we later learn of Caliban's profound antagonism towards Prospero's books and that Prospero has schooled Miranda and practised his magic conspicuously; initially he admits that he appears to her as 'thy no greater father', 'master of a full poor cell', and that she is 'naught knowing / Of whence I am, nor that I am more better / Than Prospero' (1.2.21,20, 18-20).

Although Prospero claims to have prized his books above his dukedom, he assumes a distinction between the way they functioned in Milan and on the island. The analogy Prospero makes between his dukedom and his library in Milan suggests an intellectual network befitting his ducal status. Irrespective of Prospero's neglect of his state, simply the position he has defines his access; Anthony Grafton describes how the library functioned in fifteenth-century Italy:

> The serious humanist's library not only mapped the intellectual territory he knew best but provided in its notes of acquisition and marginal annotations a record of the social and intellectual networks that sustained him.[9]

Yet, exiled from the social and intellectual networks of recognition, Prospero does not try to recreate them. He does not tell Miranda of his renown and appears to offer her no connection between the book and status; despite his learning and his art, to Miranda he is 'thy no greater father'. Once Gonzalo lifts those prized volumes they become independent entities, personal possessions that Prospero must redefine according to their use and his authority. His private relationship to his books appears distinct from his magic, since Miranda notices them only in

[9] Anthony Grafton, *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers*: Jerome Lectures, 20 (U.S.A: University of Michigan Press, 1997), p. 104.

connection with Prospero's routine, when she tells Ferdinand that he will be 'hard at study' and therefore 'safe for these three hours' (3.1.20, 21). These books are clearly linked to Prospero's art and yet also distinct from the personal relationship he makes with his daughter, since Miranda is, until now, ignorant of their history, or the intellectual and social world that lies beyond the shores of the island. Amidst the story of her past, Prospero reminds Miranda that

> Here in this island we arrived, and here
> Have I, thy schoolmaster, made thee more profit
> Than other princes can that have more time
> For vainer hours, and tutors not so careful (1.2.171-174).

Although Miranda has been taught by her father, perhaps schooled in at least the *trivium* as would befit 'princes', she clearly has no idea of the significance or prestige of learning. It is difficult to imagine what Prospero has taught Miranda, since the humanism he makes so much of requires not only knowledge of the classics but an intellectual and spatial awareness of the relationship between the past and the present. As Prospero recounts his past for Miranda, tracing a particular image of his endeavours and aspirations, moving from the 'liberal arts' to being 'rapt in secret studies' dedicated to the 'closeness and bettering of my mind' and being 'reputed' 'without a parallel' for his study, we become aware of the profound transition Prospero's books have made when they left Milan and entered the island. Where in Milan they are given a library, a discipline, a reputation and a caveat, here, on the island, they lose any cultural or material identity — Prospero does not have a 'house' to 'deck withal', the books do not have names and Miranda is unaware of the price that they have both had to pay:

> And Prospero the prime Duke, being so reputed
> In dignity, and for the liberal arts
> Without a parallel; those being all my study,
> The government I cast upon my brother (1.2.71-75).

In tracing that 'dark backward and abysm of time', Prospero tells his daughter the story of his usurpation as it becomes the story of his books; Antonio, who 'made such a sinner of his memory/To credit his own lie',

> To have no screen between this part he played
> And him he played it for, he needs will be
> Absolute Milan. Me, poor man, my library
> Was dukedom large enough. Of temporal royalties
> He thinks me now incapable (1.2.107-111).

In contrast to the limitless trust Prospero had put in Antonio as well as his boundless appropriation of power, the library, like the 'closeness', appears as a private and contained space, apparently divorced not only from 'temporal royalties' but also from the time and place of the polity and populous that surrounded him.

> I thus neglecting worldly ends, all dedicated
> To closeness and the bettering of my mind
> With that which, but by being so retired,
> O'er prized all popular rate (1.2.89-92).

Like the library and the 'popular rate', 'worldly ends' are in antithesis to his books and their reading. Knowledge appears not in economic or empirical terms, proffering a sensible development of the known world, but as something distinct, esoteric and spiritual. However, when Prospero transports and translates such volumes as he prized above his dukedom onto the island he appears to do so in an attempt to recoup a relationship between himself

and the 'prince of power' that he could and should have been. Volumes replace the library, and temporal royalties are superseded by arcane ones. Prospero replicates his Milanese seclusion on the island but rather than exclude him from the rites of power, his books form the infrastructure of his mini-state, tutoring his daughter, his erstwhile companion, now slave, Caliban, and his attachment to Ariel. However, the fifteenth and sixteenth century idea of a library often privileged the volumes and their authors as companions on an intellectual journey. Montaigne discussed in some detail the location and precepts of the library-space, and, a century earlier, Leonello d'Este describes a similar imaginary place, in which books are ordered, among other things, in categories 'to be read rather than reread', and 'the paving, the wall, the beams' are to be 'polished' and 'elegant'. For Leonello the library is the imagined place that enables the mental leap into perfection, a structure that is well-governed and ordered, aesthetic, both animated and suspended to be discovered and assembled at will. For Giovanni Gualengo, who was one of Leonello's 'circle', the intellectual colony is the intertextual companionship of the authors:

> When I look at and study the ranks of my books – for I have put the name of each author on the binding – I feel as if I am looking at the holy graves of those who wrote them.[10]

Although Prospero harnesses himself to humanism through the liberal arts — and disengages himself through private seclusion — he makes no attempt to bring other voices or 'holy graves' onto the island. Yet, although the island is not

[10] Ibid., p.33.

capable of producing the temporal royalties of Milan, Prospero creates a humanist two-fold structure of knowledge and government, contemplation and action, which he had previously been incapable of. Jonathan Bate, in his essay 'The Humanist *Tempest*', sees the play as an exercise in humanism, wherein good and bad humanism emerge in their relationship to good government and, ultimately, Christianity. As Bate claims, despite the wealth of critical discourse dedicated to the play's relationship to colonialism:

> Throughout the first act ... there is persistent recourse to the lexicon of learning and education: this, surely, is a more dominant con-textual discourse than that of colonialism, which is barely mentioned in the seed-bed act, save in the passing references to the 'still-vexed Bermudas' and the Patagonian deity Setebos.[11]

Our first encounter with Prospero and Miranda unfolds as if it were the schoolroom, as Prospero the tutor checks Miranda's attention, rebukes her apparent lack of concentration and compliments her line of questioning: 'Well demanded, wench: / My tale provokes that question' (1.2.139-40). Prospero appears to continue in this attitude for most of the play, until the moment when he tells Ariel, 'The rarer action is / In virtue than in vengeance' (5.1.27-8) replacing trial with patience. Prospero's anagnorisis illuminates not simply his driving quest for vengeance but his punitive methods of teaching that begin, not in example but, in fear. As Prospero tests Miranda's concentration he also tests Ariel, threatening him with his own memory into obedience: 'I must /Once in a month recount what thou hast been, / Which thou forget'st' (1.2.261-3). As in *Hamlet*, memory and theatre become central to the play's processes of rectitude and signification, yet, for Prospero, and despite the humanist emphasis on memory in the five parts of

rhetoric, it is linked to neither his learning nor his books. Prospero holds memory as he holds illusion — in the wings of his theatre — to manipulate anxiety and to teach. [12] Although the play traces vengeance and punishment through a sense of moral reward which imagines the pedagogue as superiorly enlightened, the book develops an ambivalent relationship to the virtue of that power. Ideas and practices of teaching seem to occur on the periphery of traditional modes of thought. Miranda reminds Caliban that she

> Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
> One thing or other. When thou didst not, savage,
> Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like
> A thing most brutish, I endowed thy purposes
> With words that made them known (1.2.355-359).

But Caliban admits 'You taught me language, and my profit on't / Is I know how to curse' (1.2.364-5). In explaining that his only 'profit' is to curse, Caliban takes a fundamental precept of humanist teaching, associated with Horace's famous dictum of 'profit and delight', and travesties it. The very foundation of good learning, for Caliban, is to curse, and this he learns outside of Miranda's educational boundaries. Caliban takes delight and profit in the subversion of what Miranda teaches him and his awareness that Prospero's 'art is of such power' (1.2.373) draws him into a relationship with both art and power that seeks to destroy rather than emulate it.

---

[11] Jonathan Bate, 'The Humanist *Tempest*', ed. Claude Peltrault, *Shakespeare: La Tempête Etudes Critiques* (Besançon Cedex: Université de Franche-Comté, 1993), p. 13.

[12] Bate picks up an interesting link within the play's treatment of theatre and humanism: 'The education of Ferdinand and Miranda into virtue, which in their case Prospero makes synonymous with chastity, continues, through the masque. This introduces the possibility that theatre can do what humanism traditionally relied on books to do ...', ibid., p. 17.

When Stephano and Trinculo find Caliban amidst the stench of another storm, the identity of all three characters is thrown into doubt: 'In a poor isle' 'When no man was his own' (5.1.212, 213). Caliban's status as a monster is confirmed rather than questioned by his ability to speak 'our language', and Stephano — the 'drunken butler' — becomes a god. When Caliban recalls the beginnings of his relationship with Prospero he remembers being given 'Water with berries in't', and how Prospero 'strok'st' him and 'made much of ' him, teaching him

> To name the bigger light and how the less
> That burn by day and night. And then I loved thee
> And showed thee all the qualities o'th' isle: (1.2.336-338).

In remembering both the loving and reciprocal relationship he once shared with Prospero, Caliban recollects a drink that is probably alcoholic, either some sort of wine or possibly a version of the spirit Gin, made from juniper berries, which although it was not first produced as such until the seventeenth century in the Netherlands, possibly existed in some form before then. There is perhaps also some quibbling on the word 'spirit' in the play, which not only refers to Ariel, the ethereal and incorporeal spirits, those things that are held in higher esteem than the body, but also alcohol. Ben Jonson in *The Alchemist* used the word 'spirit' in the context of some sort of process of distillation: 'He's busy with his spirits, but we'll upon him' (II.vi.1.). When Stephano first uncovers Caliban, he exclaims: 'The spirits torment me! O!' (2.2.63), although on an immediate level he speaks of the tormenting sprites of Prospero's magic, Stephano responds to give Caliban a 'taste of my bottle' and there may be a play on both the nature of spirits to falsely empower a man and to transform him into a mockery. Although this is only a possible interpretation, it becomes clear that Caliban associates both affection and

servitude with 'Water with berries in't' as well as 'celestial liquor'. Caliban's relationship with Stephano begins in associating his 'celestial liquor' with the power of a god: 'That's a brave god and bears celestial liquor. / I will kneel to him' (2.2.115-116). The drink becomes an object of idolatry and exchange, and as both a commodity and an article, it acquires a power and a use-value. To Stephano and Trinculo it may be a valuable commodity because, not only do they like being drunk but it also gives them some sort of status on the island. Stephano has a 'whole butt' of sack, giving him both a possession and a home: 'My cellar is in a rock by th'seaside, where my wine is hid' (2.2.131-2). When Stephano describes his escape he synthesises his rescue with a place on the island and the butt of sack itself. Using the bottle to harness Trinculo's right to his survival, he asks:

> Swear by this bottle how thou cam'st hither. I escaped upon a butt of sack, which the sailors heaved o'erboard – by this bottle, which I made of the bark of a tree with mine own hands since I was cast ashore (2.2.118-121).

Stephano, in using the bottle as an oath and the means of his escape, brings some kind of apotropaic value into play, which is amplified by Caliban's reaction. Caliban immediately responds to the bottle, and Stephano's bearing of it, in servitude: 'I'll swear upon that bottle to be thy true subject, for the liquor is not earthly' (2.2.122-3). Here again, in Caliban's antithesis between the earth and liquor we might be tempted to read it as a 'spirit', its celestial nature opposed to that of the earth. When Stephano calls to Trinculo to 'kiss the book' he brings in tavern humour for a pledge of loyalty and a celebration of their survival. The phrase is a direct travesty of the pledge of the faithful who, in kissing the bible, commit not only to God but also to truth. Kissing the bible is an iconic gesture associated with a public commitment and a

private faith, famously employed by Elizabeth I in her pre-coronation procession through London. As the progress reached its climax in a conduit in Cheapside, the Queen was presented with a book:

> But as soon as she had received the book, kissed it, and with both her hands held the same, and so laid it upon her breast, with great thanks to the city therefore.[13]

Elizabeth's gesture images her authority as both defender of the faith and governor of the Church, yet it is also an act of servitude to God.[14] Kissing the book, therefore is a pledge of faith to an existing authority; Stephano, capitalising on the value of the sack, his own survival, possession and 'cellar' brings his new comrades to heel with the command of a tapster. For Caliban, however, Stephano's call may signify more authority than he realises. The act of kissing the book not only travesties the Bible, but it also replicates the relationship between sin and servitude signified by the Faithful's response to and atonement in religious dogma. Prospero's god-like status is notoriously ambiguous; whilst, on one hand the island offers a space of independent authority, a no-place upon which music, howling, 'sounds and sweet airs', 'a thousand twangling instruments', 'open', 'rich' 'clouds' and dreams suggest a pantheic harmony of self-generating agencies; on the other hand, the profusion of languages, cursing, wonder, vengeance and ubiquitous authority signifies an ambiguous place of pre- and post-lapsarian ground, where Ariel

---

[13] *The Quenes Maisties passage through the Citie of London to Westminster the day before her coronacion* (facsimile of the publication on January 23rd, 1559), James M. Osborn (ed.), (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), p. 48. I have modernised orthography and typography.

[14] Although the title 'Defender of the Faith' was awarded to Henry VIII by the Pope in 1521, and revoked in 1534 when Henry broke with Rome, Henry claimed it back in 1544 in accordance with being Defender of the True Faith of the Reformed Church. Elizabeth I was not crowned Supreme Head of The Church, like her father, because Mary revoked the Act of Supremacy during her reign, however, about six months after her coronation in 1559, Elizabeth became the Supreme Governor of the Church.

can tell his terrified diners that the storm was created by 'powers' who 'not forgetting, have / Incensed the seas and shores — yes, all the creatures — /Against your peace' (3.3.73-5). Against Caliban's avenging angel Prospero stands as a 'god of power': 'so rare a wondered father and a wise /Makes this place paradise' (4.1.123-4).[15] Gonzalo's attempt to make his own vision of heaven, his utopian commonwealth and perception of Prospero's banquet, over which Ariel presides as a harpy: 'Who, though they are of monstrous shape, yet note / Their manners are more gentle, kind, than of /Our human generation you shall find /Many, nay, almost any' (3.3.31-4), claims a particular vision of the island as beautiful and kind against Prospero's rendition of hell: 'Thou hast said well, for some of you there present /Are worse than devils' (3.3.35-6).

Behind the heaven and hell of the island the 'books' shift status between the arcane, the humanist and the biblical. In Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, written twenty years earlier, a similar exploration of humanism and magic through the juxtaposition of heaven and hell is explored.[16] For Faustus, however, the material drive beyond the limits of allowed knowledge becomes internalised, as the soul and its consciousness become the site of turmoil. Here, Marlowe makes an

[15] There is some editorial contention over the word 'wise', which in Rowe's 1709 folio was printed as 'wife' and continued to be so until the nineteenth century. However, I would disagree with the current editors of the Arden Edition and suggest that 'wife' is the more likely reading within the context of Ferdinand's sentiments. Ferdinand imagines a 'paradise' in which they are the pre-lapsarian trinity: father, Adam and Eve.

[16] Cosmo Corfield sees Ariel and Caliban as fulfilling analogous roles to that of Faustus's Good and Bad angels: 'Caliban externalises Prospero's propensity to evil just as Ariel represents his aspiration toward good. Marlowe, of course, does something similar when he situates Faustus' conscience between a good and bad angel – in other words, a Holy Guardian Angel and a Malevolent Demon', *SQ* 36 (1985), 34. Although Prospero's comment, 'this thing of darkness I acknowledge mine' often situates Caliban as the demon in Prospero, it is difficult to claim this as a consistent reading within the play. Caliban's shifting status from loved companion, to abhorrent slave, to freed individual in search of grace is not consistent with a demonic reading. Caliban's responses of affection, vengeance,

ambiguous journey from the book to damnation, setting Faustus first within the study of humanist enquiry and then in the devil's library, by way of necromancy. Although the book is central to Faustus's path to hell, the responsibility lies within the choices he makes and the attitude with which he makes them. However, Marlowe continues to pave the way to the devil with books, and it becomes clear that the objects themselves both reflect and indicate profane transgression. Marlowe's attention to the book leaves no doubt as to their role in the evolution of the play, and like Prospero's books they begin and end a personal journey. The problem of Prospero's books — what are they? — might to some extent be explored through Marlowe's play, since he makes explicit the role they play in the transition from humanism to the occult; yet, we must be careful, since in *Faustus* the heavy-handed exploration of moral integrity makes a sharp distinction between the good and bad pursuit of individual aspiration and desire, whereas in *The Tempest* the book becomes enmeshed in a broader discourse of personal power complicated by illusion and the performance of the imagination.[17] Although Prospero was 'all dedicated' to study, without parallel in the 'liberal arts', his 'library / Was dukedom large enough', and full of books he in fact 'prize[d] above' his dukedom, the play makes no attempt to present or expose what these books might be. Rather, the books trace the play's journey from Prospero's expulsion with his books to his return to Milan without them. Like Marlowe's Doctor Faustus, Prospero is a man caught between the humanist and the magus — between the 'liberal arts' and the occult. Both men, Faustus and Prospero, are

violence, and penitence are too closely paralleled with Prospero to recognise an inner or ulterior 'darkness' under suppression.

[17] Although Marlowe makes the moral dialectic explicit in his use of Christian emblems, our response to Faustus is not as clear-cut. Despite the didactic nature of the play, Faustus is and remains an alluring character, and his pursuit of the profane is often exciting and seductive, complicating a righteous reading of his performance.

dedicated to their books, yet whilst Marlowe consciously explores Faustus's education, celebrating him as 'the flowering pride of Wittenberg', whose journey into the damnable arises from his frustration with the limits and rewards of knowledge, neither the trajectory nor the motivation of Prospero's education is so clear. That both men begin as humanists and move into magic, and that both plays celebrate the power and destruction of the book often create a critical relationship between the two. Where Peter Greenaway may put books into his film, which are themselves a conceptual testimony to the imagination, mystery and magic of the play, visually synthesising humanism and the underworld, Faustus's books are a more literal abstraction of the epistemological discourse of the late sixteenth century. There is no clear point at which we become aware of Prospero's move from the liberal arts to the occult, although we might imagine that such a practical transition occurred when he arrived on the island, for, as he admits, in Milan those were 'all' his 'study', and as soon as he arrives he releases Ariel from Sycorax's spell, showing his skill in magic, the result, perhaps of these 'secret studies'.

In *Faustus*, however, as the doctor turns his back on the depths of his learning toward a profane desire for the knowledge of power, we learn what books have contributed to the 'flowering pride of Wittenberg'. Whilst Faustus refers to Aristotle, Galen, Justinian and Jerome's Bible, Valdes talks of '[Roger] Bacon's and Abanus' works, / The Hebrew Psalter, and New Testament' (i.153-4).[18] Despite Faustus's pact of power and omnipotence with the devil, he still pursues knowledge through the book, asking for 'a book wherein I might behold all spells and incantations, that I might raise up spirits when I

please' (v. 166-168), or 'a book where I might see all characters of planets of the heavens, that I might know their motions and dispositions' (v. 170-172). Despite having the devil at his beck and call, Faustus continues to want books, pleading 'for one book more, and then I have done' (v.174). Yet Faustus feels cheated, thinking the devil's books do not contain all he wants, to which Mephostophilis replies, 'Tut, I warrant thee', assuring Faustus of the material. This is a moment of profound irony, since there is a sense in which Faustus may recognise that he could have acquired the books themselves, without committing his soul to damnation. Their material quality, unlike Helen of Troy, sets them on stage as things within the realms of the temporal or earthly world. His need for knowledge within the bound volume of a book continues to reinscribe the process by which Faustus arrived at both his aspirations and limits, and consistently returns us to his position as a scholar. Yet how the books themselves function within this process is not always clear, since their independent status as objects is always compromised by the context in which they are desired and read. Envy, for example, during the parade of the Seven Deadly Sins, declares: 'I cannot read and therefore wish all books burned' (vi. 131-2). The sin of envy is focused on the book, ironically looking forward to Faustus's last and desperate plea before the devil takes him; yet, Faustus does not suffer from Envy his frustration and arrogance may lead him into Pride or Greed, but he wishes to usurp temporal limits rather than compete with or destroy them. Envy's relationship to the book tinges its status with the stain of the devil and we begin to see an independent tension between the temporal and damned world. Equally,

[18] Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, ed. John D. Jump (London and New York: Routledge, 1988).

Envy's antagonism toward the book suggests its positive ability to combat the type of ignorance that this sin betrays. Throughout Marlowe's play the book undergoes a trial; on one hand, the reader must take responsibility for the content and, on the other, the book itself is an independent and powerful entity. When Robin finds one of Faustus's books we know the potential danger that lies in misuse: 'I have gotten one of Doctor Faustus' conjuring books, and now we'll have such knavery as 't passes' (vii. 1-3), yet it is the book itself and not Robin that threatens chaos. When Faustus finds 'that damned book' however, it is his desire that unleashes sin. Towards the end of the play, when Faustus, terrified of his fate, declares, 'O, would I had never seen Wittenberg, never read a book', (xix. 45-6), Mephostophilis returns him to the critical moment when he mentioned 'Jerome's Bible':

> When thou took'st the book/ To view the Scripture, then I turn'd the leaves/And led thine eye (xix. 94-6).

In turning the leaves, Mephostophilis turns Faustus away from the pages and, for a moment, all our attention is turned to the book and the way in which the devil holds Faustus between two books of sin and salvation. Despite Faustus's self-aggrandising pride, and lust for 'wealth, power and omnipotence', it was his rejection of God's text that made him prey to the devil, and, emblematically, both books visually dramatise this choice. Although the book in all its vagaries appears consistently throughout Marlowe's play, tracing Faustus's wants and the intellectual scope through which his hunger moves, it ultimately remains an emblem of Christian humanism which furnishes and expands the mind alongside the right

---

This edition is based on the B text. All subsequent references are to this edition.

application of prudence and virtue. As Faustus becomes increasingly seduced by the delights of the devil, begging for 'one book more, and then I have done, wherein I might see all plants, herbs, and trees that grow upon the earth' (v.174-6), and the Good and Bad angels increasingly image the turmoil of a sinning soul, we become aware how the play's Christian dialectic is emblematised in the book. Faustus's frenzied cry, 'Come not, Lucifer ;/ I'll burn my books!' (xix.189-90), theatrically realises the role of the book, as Faustus is also consumed, suggesting the trial and execution of a condemned heretic. The book performs alongside Faustus, playing out of the shadows of his part. However, where in *Doctor Faustus* the play navigates a direct juxtaposition between 'Jerome's Bible' and 'that damned book' of necromancy, the role of the book in *The Tempest* is extremely ambiguous. Whilst Prospero may chart his own moral crusade, exacting vengeance, manifesting Ariel as a harpy, fabricating and interfering in the fates of others and shaping the island as a place of rectitude and grace, both his books and his reading remain in the metaphysical hinterland of the play.[19] When Faustus declares 'Is to dispute well logic's chiefest end? / Affords this art no greater miracle?' (i. 8-9), or laments 'Yet art thou still Faustus, and a man' (i. 23) we know that Faustus wants to make an explicit leap beyond the mortal boundaries of temporal knowledge. Yet, when Prospero describes his renown in the liberal arts, the closeness and bettering of his mind, and his oblivion to

[19] Frank Kermode, in the Arden edition of *The Tempest* (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd, 1954), notices the ambivalence between demon and dæmon: 'The relationship between Prospero and Ariel is perhaps not theurgically pure, since it appears to contain elements of black magic – Ariel is bound by pact, like his namesake of the Faust-books, and it is sometimes possible to see him as a "familiar". "Come with a thought," orders Prospero; and though this was well within Ariel's powers ... the ability to arrive "as quick as thought" was sometimes required by goetists of their demons. Theses traces are no doubt due to the element of popular demonology in the play, and it would be foolish to expect absolute lucidity and constancy in the treatment of these ideas', Appendix B, 'Ariel as Dæmon and Fairy', p. 143.

worldly matters being 'rapt in secret studies', we do not know the extent to which he has or will betray the ethical limits of power.

Part of the problem of Prospero's power and its ethical limits is the extent to which it relies on illusion, and one of the overriding contingents of *The Tempest* is its use of illusion to manipulate the reception of power. Within this process we are taught to judge the means by the outcome, and shown, ultimately, that not only was such power merely an illusion, but that we did indeed have a 'hand' in its performance:

> Let me not,
> Since I have my dukedom got
> And pardoned the deceiver, dwell
> In this bare island by your spell;
> But release me from my bands
> With the help of your good hands (Ep.5-10).

Prospero's epilogue imposes on our minds a wonder in the transience of things, and since our 'good hands' and 'gentle breath' are left with the responsibility of the play's close, the materiality of the play fades like an 'insubstantial pageant'. What demands our attention is the metaphorical hinterland through which we chart both our understanding and recognition of the role of the imagination. Despite a link between his books and his art, and despite the role of the book in plotting the play's progress, it is often the play's metaphorical scope that forms the shaping power in our imaginations. The idea and location of Prospero's books, their place in the library, on the boat, his attention to them at critical moments, his lack of house with which 'to deck withal' and the very physical means of destruction, burning or

drowning, all point to our imaginations apprehending the book as a material presence. Although we might never see these books, often in *The Tempest* illusion, imagination and the metaphysical projection of conscience and consciousness acquire the most visual and dramatic power. When the play opens, it is with a vivid and emotional rendition of fear and frenzy, a frantic scrabbling for life through an idea of hell; Miranda tells us that

> The sky, it seems, would pour down stinking pitch
> But that the sea, mounting to th' welkin's cheek,
> Dashes the fire out (1.2.3-5).

Miranda's powerful synesthesia tells us how to see and feel the illusory storm. Similarly, Ariel (although delighting in the fulfilment of his task) describes the desperate bid the men made for their lives in leaving the tormented ship:

> All but mariners
> Plunged in the foaming brine and quit the vessel;
> Then all afire with me, the King's son Ferdinand,
> With hair up-staring (then like reeds, not hair),
> Was the first man that leapt, cried 'Hell is empty,
> And all the devils are here' (1.2.210-15).[20]

Our first encounter with Prospero's art is its ability to imagine disorder our first encounter with the book, however, is its potential order — the walls of the library, the seven parts of the liberal arts, the confined body and the rapt mind. And although Prospero's neglect of the state enables the chaos of Antonio's usurpation, it is Prospero and not his books that precipitate the breakdown of good government. Prospero's storm begins the play's journey

through the imagination to urge into play the figurative field of illusion. The dream-like substance of Prospero's magic, or theatre, lends the island a figurative landscape, where metaphor and illusion begin to share a space, creating symbols which pertain to an idea or emotion, event or effect that is not contained by rational expectation. Ultimately, Prospero's peroration will celebrate and dispel the role of illusion within the play, but it must begin as though in control of a powerful imaginative authority.

Challenging the three men of sin through a visual image — appearance and disappearance — Ariel works to disorientate their sense of judgement and perspective, which in turn will challenge their personal sense of right and action. Ariel's performance as a harpy re-invokes the storm, guiding the diners through their sins: 'Which here, in this most desolate isle, else falls / Upon your heads – is nothing but heart's sorrow /And a clear life ensuing' (3.3.80-82). Ariel's role turns the men inside out and forces them to visually confront a semblance of conscience long buried by their ambitions and achievements. This tempest could be the work of God or the devil, or, as Miranda says 'any god of power'.[21] Martin Luther, in his 'Preface to the Psalms' (German Bible, 1528), used a storm as a metaphor in which the heart is vexed into truth:

> The human heart is like a ship on a stormy sea driven about by winds blowing from all four corners of heaven. In one man, there is fear and anxiety about impending disaster; another groans and moans at all the surrounding evil. One

[20] The air drawn vision of horror glances at *Macbeth* and the similarly strange relationship between witchcraft and desires in the projection of both fear and ambition.
[21] A tempest may, of course, function at many levels and is clearly recognised as a structural emblem of prose romance; it may also recall certain historical encounters in contemporary travels including, among others, Hakluyt's voyage to the Bermudas, and possibly the fortuitous storm of 1588.

> man mingles hope and presumption out of the good fortune to which he is looking forward; and another is puffed up with a confidence and pleasure in his present possessions. Such storms, however, teach us to speak sincerely and frankly, and make a clean breast.[22]

For Luther, a tempest is both analogous to and a reflection of the journey a man's heart makes from himself to God. The tempest here is life and the capricious sea reflects the ways in which we realise and respond to anxieties and desires; as the heart travels on the stormy sea it is, faced with its own illusions, forced into a confrontation with the kind of troubles that seek solace in truth. Under the conditions of extremity, each man brings an idea of himself to bear on a situation in which both his instincts and delusions are challenged. Yet, when the heart is tested by the 'winds from the four corners of heaven' new beginnings and self-knowledge become possible. Prospero's tempests seem to usher in a similar path to resolution through anxiety to 'a clear life ensuing' or a 'clean breast'. By virtue of this analogy the sea becomes a cognitive link to the unconscious, in which exposure imagines truth. However, after Faustus has been contracted to Lucifer one of the things Mephostophilis does is give him a book on which 'iterating of these lines brings gold/The framing of this circle on the ground/Brings thunder, whirlwinds, storm, and lightening' (v.160-162). Later in the play Prospero will frame a circle, but here in his 'art', his magic, he shipwrecks the party for justice and for 'truth', precipitating the tale for Miranda in which Prospero will 'make a clean breast'. Like Luther's storm, Prospero's is a metaphor or

[22] Cited by John Martin, 'Inventing Sincerity, Refashioning Prudence: The Discovery of the Individual in Renaissance Europe', in Keith Whitlock (ed.), *The Renaissance in Europe* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press in association with The Open University, 2000), p. 23. Martin examines the shift in the idea and application of 'sincerity' in the context of a changing climate of self-expression, from the collective ideology of predetermination to the conflicting sense of belonging and displacement that found expression in both emotional honesty and expedient dissimulation.

rather an idea through which the returning wedding party must be confronted by their own human hearts and, like Lucifer's storm, it is conjured from the art of reading.

More than any other play by Shakespeare *The Tempest* challenges the meaning of the book. Faustus's devilish books are clearly associated with transgressing temporal epistemological boundaries and an understanding of Pride that Milton later explored in his Satan. Although ultimately we see Caliban seeking 'grace' and Prospero union and humility — most acutely epitomised in the drowning of his books — the iconic role of the book is never explicitly good or bad, devilish or heavenly. The book most clearly signals authority, but that authority is both oppressive and enlightening. Prospero recognises the power of his 'art' to invoke fear, observing his enemies 'distractions': 'My high charms work, /And these, mine enemies, are all knit up / In their distractions. They are now in my power' (3.3.88-90). Yet, when he employs his 'high charms' later for the marriage masque of Miranda and Ferdinand, it is different; the sinister, punitive aspect has gone and even Prospero recognises the illusory and ephemeral condition of his power: 'These our actors, /As I foretold you, were all spirits and /Are melted into air, thin air;' (4.1.148-50). Yet, the nature of his control remains, and, for celebration or rectitude, Prospero's art lies in the mystery of his books, and it is that mystery that supports his oppression.

When Stephano asks Caliban to 'kiss the book', he does so in honour of Caliban's adoration and servitude. To mark his supplication Caliban declares,

'I'll show thee every fertile inch o'th' island, /And I will kiss thy foot. I prithee, be my god' (2.2.145-6). That he 'will kiss thy foot', is not only in itself a mark of subservience, but, in Prospero's terms, a sign of the pupil's relationship to the master; when Miranda tries to tell her father how to treat Ferdinand, Prospero indignantly replies: 'What, I say, / My foot my tutor?' (1.2.469-70). Caliban falls unquestionably into his role as servant and pupil to Stephano the demagogue. Yet, despite Caliban's developing sedition, he almost directly reflects his early supplication to Prospero, calling Stephano a 'wondrous man' and declaring:

> I'll show thee the best springs; I'll pluck thee berries;
> I'll fish for thee, and get thee wood enough (2.2.157-8)

Although Caliban pledges his servitude before Stephano asks him to 'kiss the book', there is a profound irony in Stephano's choice of phrasing which seals Caliban's commitment and draws from him a strangely recursive response. Together, the book, the god, wonder and delirium confirm Caliban's commitment to service. Yet, almost immediately Caliban's servitude becomes 'ridiculous' to Stephano and ridiculed by Trinculo, who 'will laugh' himself 'to death' at the sight. They make a mockery of his iconophilic response to the bottle, not knowing that for Caliban it may resemble the book. Caliban's immediate recognition of his own role as one of servitude, his feelings of love and awe, and keenness to show the fruits of the island are reminiscent of his original relationship with Prospero and the ease with which Caliban transfers these feelings to Stephano suggest that he is directly responding in recognition of icons of power. This recognition triggers the memory of Prospero who, within the frame of the master/servant, is

now a 'tyrant', just as the notion of 'wonder', so particularly associated with Miranda, is foregrounded in Caliban's naming Stephano a 'wondrous man' and Trinculo's ironic repetition: 'A most ridiculous monster – to make a wonder of a poor drunkard!' (2.2.162-3). Yet, despite Caliban's transferral of one authority for another, he strangely translates his new servitude into freedom: 'Ca-caliban, / Has a new master, get a new man. / Freedom, high-day; high-day freedom; freedom high-day, freedom' (2.2.180-182). Caliban is still a servant and Prospero a master, for he must 'get a new man', and 'freedom high-day' celebrates the drunken servitude into which Caliban has fallen, hailing every day as a 'high-day' or holiday. Caliban anticipates misrule replacing rule, yet both conditions require his servitude:

> Caliban expresses his freedom by deconstructing the name that Prospero has given him; the vigorous rhythm of his song is an affront to Prospero's rod-like pentameter world.... For Shakespeare's Caliban "Freedom, high-day!" is an illusion: he has merely exchanged one master, one god, for another.[23]

Although Bate sees Caliban's self-referential song as a direct affront to Prospero's rule, Caliban is still operating within the terms of Prospero's rule. Caliban does not want to pervert the lines of power, only transliterate them. 'Freedom high-day' is an illusion because Stephano's authority is a drunken dream, just as his bottle is no 'art of such power'. Caliban appears used to recognising art as power, Sycorax's spells, Prospero's books and Stephano's liquor. An uncanny relationship between art and alcohol is later suggested when Trinculo exclaims:

> The folly of this island! They say there's but five upon this isle; we are three of them. If th' other two be brained like us, the state totters (3.2.4-6).

The irony is, of course, that the state indeed 'totters', not only Antonio's 'state' as Prospero plots his revenge, or Alonso's 'state' as Sebastian contemplates his murder, but if 'th' other two' are Miranda and Prospero, one is 'brained' by love and the other, having lost his state, compelled by magic to revenge. Recalling how Prospero lost his dukedom through the book, we return to Stephano's image of the book and the bottle to see the state 'totter' on the island — and Milan — toward Prospero's reclamation. However, Caliban, despite his pledged servitude, begins to assume authority in alliance with Stephano over Trinculo, encouraging Trinculo to be beaten for insulting them:

> Beat him enough; after a little time,
> I'll beat him too (3.2.83-4).

Caliban again asserts an authority in the knowledge of the island, and the power of Prospero's books:

> Why, as I told thee, 'tis a custom with him
> I' th' afternoon to sleep. There thou mayst brain him,
> Having first seized his books (3.2.87-9).

He goes on to delegate the coup d'état:

> Remember
> First to possess his books, for without them
> He's but a sot, as I am, nor hath not
> One spirit to command. They all do hate him
> As rootedly as I. Burn but his books (3.2.91-96).

Caliban specifically associates Prospero's authority and person with his books. By taking his books before he kills Prospero, Caliban not only disarms him but hails

---

[23] Jonathan Bate, 'Caliban and Ariel Write Back', *Shakespeare Survey* 48 (1995), 158.

the books as icons, talismans of power that lie distinct from the man himself. Without his books Prospero is not only a 'sot' — an idiot or dull-witted person, or, interestingly, one who 'drinks too much' (*OED*) — but also only a body to be 'brained', 'batter[ed]', 'paunch[ed] with a stake' or cut with a knife. Caliban distinctly locates Prospero's power, spirit and art in the books themselves, rejecting any sense that Prospero's magic may stand in independent authority. Or, at least, everything that Caliban despises about Prospero's art he associates with his books, for he appears to want to destroy '*but* his books' and retain his 'brave utensils', '(for so he calls them) / Which, when he has a house, he'll deck withal' 3.2.96-7). Caliban's intensely visceral and violent desires for Prospero's death renders his body distinctly earthly, unlike the spirits of his books. Yet, at the same time, if Caliban merely saw Prospero's authority in his books, he would not necessarily feel such a violent compulsion to kill him; the act of killing suggests an intensity of feeling associated with vengeance and absolute annihilation. Caliban's need to destroy Prospero entirely is particularly suggestive in the fact that he chooses not to appropriate his books, his art or his power but have them consumed by fire. Although Caliban's idea of 'freedom' may still be supported by servitude, he does not anticipate the power he might have or the island he might recoup. Prospero's books are emblems of something repellent to Caliban. In mentally murdering Prospero, Caliban takes possession of Miranda only to offer her, and some idea of imperial power, to Stephano, telling him how Miranda will 'become thy bed' 'And bring thee forth brave brood' (3.2.104, 105). Under Caliban's instruction, the island becomes available for Stephano to be 'king' of taking Miranda as his 'queen', and 'Trinculo and thyself will be viceroys' (3.2.108). Yet, despite his eagerness, Caliban does not take the task upon himself, telling

Stephano: 'Within this half hour will he be asleep. /Wilt thou destroy him then?' (3.2.113-114).

Whilst Caliban finds 'freedom' with Stephano, Ferdinand is in bondage, performing the task Caliban rejected, of collecting wood. As Miranda watches her lover, she reassures him that Prospero is 'hard at study', 'safe for these three hours' suggesting that this is Prospero's routine, even though he is watching them 'unseen'. Despite the apparently impassioned and candid responses of the lovers to each other, there is a strong sense that Prospero has created this love through his art. Observing the initial meeting between his daughter and Ferdinand, Prospero exclaims: 'It goes on, I see, /As my soul prompts it' (1.2.420-421). 'Soul' here, according to the Arden note's citation of the *OED* means 'an intellectual or spiritual power, distinguished from physical'; spiritual power, with the nuance of wish or desire suggests the inclination of Prospero's magic. After observing Miranda's proposal, and Ferdinand's acceptance, Prospero declares:

> So glad of this as they I cannot be,
> Who are surprised withal, but my rejoicing
> At nothing can be more. I'll to my book,
> For yet ere suppertime must I perform
> Much business appertaining (3.1.92-6).

Prospero returns to his books, presumably to make arrangements, not only for the revenge of Sebastian, but also for the marriage of his daughter and Ferdinand. Although on one level we are made to believe through the strength of the lovers' feelings that their attraction is independent of Prospero's art, Prospero's direction of and desires for the union, as well as his presence and organisation strongly link the couple's love to his performance with the book, amplified by the marriage

masque which calls the spirits from their airy confines. The magical, spellbound love is reminiscent of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, where Lysander, waking from Puck's spell, and seeing Helena declares: 'lead me to your eyes, where I o'er look/Love's stories written in love's richest book' (II.2.126-8). Although, as I have explored in *Love's Labour's Lost* and *The Taming of The Shrew*, Shakespeare often forms a relationship between the book and love through the body, here, the idea of being spellbound or awestruck by love takes on a literal aspect as Prospero's books artfully enchant the couple just as Puck's spell wakes Lysander to the recognition of his desire for Helena as written in 'love's richest book'. In both cases, the lovers' affections unfold within the impassioned instant of wonder and the ethereal context of a dream.

The union between Miranda and Ferdinand appears to reclaim a power for Prospero that replaces those volumes he prized above his dukedom, since it signifies more than a return to the status he lost; for, through Miranda, he looks forward to a version of kingship. A relationship between Prospero's books and a kingdom is also suggested by Alonso, who, remembering the tempest, imagines his son, and places him where Prospero will later place his books:

> The winds did sing it to me, and the thunder –
> That deep and dreadful organpipe – pronounced
> The name of Prosper. It did bass my trespass.
> Therefore my son i'th' ooze is bedded, and
> I'll seek him deeper than e'er plummet sounded,
> And with him there lie mudded (3.3.97-102).

There is something proleptic in Alonso's lament, and the particular language and place in which he sees his son and, in imagining his own death, how, ultimately, he will lie with Prospero's book perhaps signifying the end of an old state and yet the

resurrection of another. Again, later, Alonso, being reminded of Miranda, will reiterate this vision, when he exclaims:

> O heavens, that they were living both in Naples,
> The king and queen there! That they were, I wish
> Myself were mudded in that oozy bed
> Where my son lies (5.1.149-52).

Prospero too seems to look forward to a relinquishing of his power as, making toward the sanctification of Miranda and Ferdinand, he begins to devolve his authority, telling Ariel:

> Go bring the rabble
> (O'er whom I give thee power) here to this place
> Incite them to quick motion, for I must
> Bestow upon the eyes of this young couple
> Some vanity of my art (4.1.37-41).

As Prospero charges Ariel with the control of 'thy meaner fellows', or subordinate spirits, he, for the first time, refers to his art as a trick, an illusion, even a passing entertainment. The 'vanity' of his art, which although might glance at Agrippa's *De vanitate*, is more suggestive of something 'worthless' or 'unprofitable' (*OED* 1.a, b), a trick, presenting his art as nothing more than the 'thin air' of an 'insubstantial pageant', to be enjoyed only within the context of its limits: 'We are such stuff /As dreams are made on, and our little life /Is rounded with a sleep' (4.1.156-8). Prospero sets his mortal perspective alongside the illusion of theatre and magic, accepting with some sanguinity that both life and art will come to an end.

Just after Prospero admits that: 'They being penitent, /The sole drift of my purpose doth extend /Not a frown further' (5.1.28-30), he traces a circle,[24] during which he claims:

> But this rough magic
> I here abjure; and when I have required
> Some heavenly music (which even now I do)
> To work mine end upon their senses that
> This airy charm is for, I'll break my staff,
> Bury it certain fathoms in the earth,
> And deeper than did ever plummet sound
> I'll drown my book (5.1.50-57).

According to the Folio, '*solemne musicke*' begins at the end of this speech, which is when Prospero will fulfil the actions of his promises. It is not clear, however, when the opportunity arises for him to 'bury' his 'staff' or 'drown' his 'book', and these actions are therefore probably meant to happen off stage. However, despite Prospero's abjuration of his magic, the tracing of a 'circle' is particularly associated with both witchcraft and the protection against evil;[25] Thomas More in his *Dialogue of Heresies* (1529), explains: 'Negromancers put their trust in their circles, within which thei thinke them self sure against all ye devils in hel'. Ironically, in *Faustus*, Mephostophilis gives Faustus a book on which 'iterating of these lines brings gold/The framing of this circle on the ground/Brings thunder, whirlwinds, storm, and lightening' (v. 160-162); Mephostophilis's association between the framing of a circle and a storm has particular resonance in *The Tempest*, yet Prospero has abjured his 'rough magic'. Perhaps Prospero finally

[24] Whilst all modern editions state that Prospero '*Traces a circle*' at the beginning of this speech (5.1.33-57), the Folio's direction follows the speech, stating '*They all enter the circle which Prospero had made, and there stand charm'd*'. I have modernised typography.

[25] Shakespeare uses the idea of a circle in a magical way in *Henry V*, when Burgundy says to the king, who is concerned that he cannot 'conjure up the spirit of love' in Catherine: 'If you conjure in her, you must make a circle; if conjure up love in her in his true likeness, he must appear naked and blind' (5.2.271-3).

conjures another figurative sea or storm in which to drown his book 'deeper than did ever plummet sound', for what follows his circle is a kind of peace that the play has not represented before:

> Their understanding
> Begins to swell, and the approaching tide
> Will shortly fill the reasonable shore
> That now lies foul and muddy (5.1 79-82).

With the 'approaching tide' and 'reasonable shore' comes revelation as Prospero reveals himself 'As I was sometime Milan', and the inhabitants are returned to their 'clearer reason', having never seen his staff, robe or book. Patience and grace take over from vengeance and torment. When Prospero tells the company that he 'lost' his daughter 'In this last tempest', 'last' signifies both the most recent one and the final one, putting an end to the art that compelled his enemies into a state of appalling wonder. The sea continues the island's narrative of authority; just before Prospero notices Caliban as 'this thing of darkness I/Acknowledge mine' (5.1.275-6), he returns him to a sense of place in the image of his mother:

> His mother was a witch, and one so strong
> That could control the moon, make flows and ebbs,
> And deal in her command without her power (5.1.269-271).

Sycorax's control of the sea, its shorelines and tides, confirms a sense of power with which the islanders have now become familiar. It explains Caliban's danger and presence on the island where 'The powers delaying, not forgetting, have/Incensed the seas and shores — yea, all the creatures — /Against your peace'. Yet, when Prospero returns to his original status, it is not through a sense

of place, but in the idea of wholeness associated with people rather than possessions:

> My dukedom since you have given me again,
> I will requite you with as good a thing,
> At least bring forth a wonder to content ye
> As much as me my dukedom (5.1.168-171).

Yet, this is Prospero's final wondrous act, revealing two people who were thought, although Miranda only briefly, to be dead. But this is not magic, this is Prospero as Duke of Milan, revealing his 'theatre', asserting his power and staking his claim to the union and the future king. With the book buried deep in the sea and the spirits free, Prospero leaves the island with the promise of 'calm seas' and 'auspicious gales'. Prospero may bury his staff and drown his book, but his authority remains. In the promise of calm seas and auspicious gales, he suggests he will no longer raise storms, but in reasserting a right over those seas Prospero makes a choice to leave his tempest with his drowned book and buried staff.

Why did Peter Greenaway call his film *Prospero's Books*, yet put into the hand of the magus books that belong to themselves, extraordinary, magical self-creating volumes that fulfil their subject as their pages unfold? Greenaway's books are cinematic illusions that, like the theatre, belong only to the moment when the pages are opened or the stage is set. 'Prospero's' last book, *Thirty-Six Plays*, makes a specific link between the author, the theatre and his books:

> This is a thick, printed volume of plays dated 1623. All thirty-six plays are there save one – the first. Nineteen pages are left blank for its inclusion. It is called *The Tempest*. The folio collection is modestly bound in dull green linen with cardboard covers and the author's initials are embossed in gold on the cover – W. S.[26]

[26] Greenaway, *Prospero's Books*, p. 25.

This book suggests, as much post-romantic criticism has done, that *The Tempest* is Shakespeare's valediction, and that he, like Prospero stands in the wings of his own creations, with his 'charms' 'all o'erthrown' to be released from his 'bands'. Yet, Shakespeare biography aside, the relationship here between the book and the stage is a crucial one. *The Tempest* makes much of its illusion, and in that illusion the idea of theatre, 'the great globe itself', becomes part of the ephemerality through which Prospero moves, teaches, creates, destroys and leaves 'not a rack behind'. The book too is part of that illusion that lies deep bedded in the ooze, like Alonso's nightmares and Prospero's once prized dreams. The book in *The Tempest*, like the staff or the robe, projects Prospero's theatre supporting a brief material essence alongside wonder and performance; it upholds story and knowledge, history and human voices, and, like the spirits, contains our imagination in the presence of thought. The book that could command tempests, like Faustus's devils, or Luther's faith, is also the book of the play, part of the theatrical substance of performance that forms Prospero's 'tale' and, 'rather like a dream than an assurance' it disappears as the play ends. Greenaway did not include a *Book of Illusions* in Prospero's library, but if he had it might have been the last book we see in the play, and one which, when opened contains tempests, and monsters, goddesses and lovers, shipwrecks and vengeance, shorelines and stage scaffolds, magicians and kings, and when closed

> shall dissolve,
> And like this insubstantial pageant faded,
> Leave not a rack behind (4.1.154-56).

VII

'We turn'd o'er many books together'

I do not attempt to provide a categorical answer to questions of interpretation, to offer an opinion of William Shakespeare's personal value judgement of the book, or show a clear trajectory of intellectual and dramatic development in the way the plays are written or performed. Nor do I intend to offer up the book as a static emblem of dramatic artistry, to function as a decoration or an object of curiosity. What I hope to have offered is an exploration of the way an article like the book can function, to have exposed the prevalence of the image, object and language and, how, in association with the theatre, it allows questions of interpretation, truth, and representation to emerge. I want to have shown that the book — consciously or unconsciously — was adapting and moving through its cultural production.[1] I have explored how the book in all its vagaries was able to develop a relationship with the body and what this meant for the requisites of theatre and 'corporeal looking'. And I have exposed how objects of language and the language of objects were changing, not through a linear continuum, but within the conditions of the plays and the requisites of the stage. There is no uniform pattern to Shakespeare's idea of the book, nor does he use it to make any specific value judgement on the nature of authorship, sectarianism or personal ambition. The book in its dependence upon the thinking eye and the writing hand not only 'offers theatre an image of itself' but challenges those very conditions through which it moves.

[1] Alongside Douglas Bruster, in *Shakespeare and the Question of Culture: early modern literature and the cultural turn* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), I recognise the assumptions made and the problems inherent in the use of such a complex and ubiquitous word as 'culture'. However, I use the word in its loosest anthropological sense to mean the dynamic interrelations between what is produced on the stage and what goes into that production.

Across the breadth of Shakespeare's plays, the book performs diverse dramatic and semantic roles, which touch on, with varying importance, the representational potential of language as it is conducted through both the sign and the imagination. In *Henry VIII* we can consider whether 'A beggar's book / Outworths a noble's blood';[2] or, in *Hamlet* why does the scholar prince 'reject all saws of books, all forms, all pressures past'; in *The Tempest* what books does Prospero 'prize above his dukedom'; and what is at stake, religion, history or humanism, when war turns 'your books to graves, your ink to blood' (*2 Henry IV*).[3] The Bible or the Book of Common Prayer ostensibly appear most frequently and most consistently through Shakespeare's works and touch the action of such diverse plays as *The Merry Wives of Windsor, Richard III, Measure for Measure, King John* and *The Taming of The Shrew.*[4] Although it is apparent in the Histories and the Comedies, the book as the Bible does not specifically appear in any of the Tragedies.[5] Such references to the Bible are notoriously ambiguous, and the Book, even at its most emblematic, does not sustain a stable image or performative role. In *The Merry Wives*, Mistress Quickly falsely swears 'upon a book' that Fenton is beloved, and, in *Richard III*, Buckingham describes the spectacular entrance of his murderous king:

> Two props of virtue for a Christian prince,
> To stay him from the fall of vanity;
> And see, a book of prayer in his hand –
> True ornaments to know a holy man (3.7.96-9).

The Bible's relationship to 'virtue' as 'a true ornament to know a holy man' increasingly developed a visual and iconic significance during the Reformation, and John Foxe in his

---

[2] II.ii; Buckingham uses the book in an expression meaning, at their time of crisis, tactics are better than fortune.
[3] IV.i; within the context of all the good that had been done, the documents of peace.
[4] The Bible is nominally mentioned only once in a mockery of a French accent as a 'pibble' in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.
[5] Although Polonius refers his daughter to some book of devotion in *Hamlet* the very nature and context of the text is ambivalent.

Book of Martyrs often sensationalises the role of the book in his graphic portraits of persecuted protestants going to their death clutching Tyndale's New Testament or *Obedience of a Christian Man*. In a censored pageant written by Richard Grafton for the entry of Philip II and Mary after her coronation, Henry VIII is depicted holding 'a booke, whereon was written *Verbum Dei*',[6] just as Elizabeth's pre-coronation ceremony is structured around incarnations of Truth and the presentation of the Bible in a conduit in Cheapside. The role of the book in spectacle, the horror of *Titus*, the marvel of *Cymbeline* or the magic of *The Tempest*, alongside our iconic relationship to structures of ceremony, are deeply suggestive about the way in which the book can accommodate a performative role. However, the secularisation of the theatre, in conjunction with its structural and figurative requisites of realism and illusion, allusion and affinity, provides the fabric for the movement of the book between God and life, truth and imagination. Where in *2 Henry IV* the paradigm of the book of life moves into conflict with the abstract notion of fate and the individual confrontation of a possible self, for Richard II the book of life sustains an existence outside of the requisites of seeing. Yet as Henry's book revolves through an image of the world to find both the king and the 'happiest youth' alike, the king is confronted by the magnitude of his metaphor. Henry stands beside the image and the idea both paralysed and personified in its pages. Underlying Shakespeare's historical characters are shadows of an historical past interred by legend, propaganda, spectacle and story. Thus the book of life serves as a transitional article between analepsis, affecting the future of an already chronicled past, and metamorphoses, the material of change, the medium that can re-deploy history, accommodate the imagination and support the subjective. Such a transition is brilliantly exposed in Richard II's deposition scene, where the blotted book of heaven marks a

---

[6] Janette Dillon, *Language and Stage in Medieval and Renaissance England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 106-7.

fissure in the divine order of kings and, by extension, the divine order of things. But as Richard stands before his accusers he becomes that defaced book of ordination, an idea he takes up in the form of the book and then transfers to the object of a mirror.[7] Richard's mirror is apposite because, as much of Shakespeare's use of the book demonstrates, its status is both representative and anamorphic, signifying the dual perspective of 'what is and what is not'. The representational relationship between the mirror and the graphology of text is more clearly explored in the sonnets, where the graphic mark and structure of the lines propose a space in which inked words reciprocate representation; as Cassius says to Brutus, 'you cannot see yourself / So well as by reflection'.[8] Many of the plays, however, are deeply suggestive about the relationship between text and mirror. In *Hamlet*, we begin to see how the book supports various crucial moments of high drama and anagnorisis, which find relief in the theatre of memory or the verbal mirror of Gertrude's soul.

The sheer representational scope of the book frequently enables discernible processes of translation to occur on stage. In *As You Like It*, for example, the Forest becomes a natural repository for an idea of loving liberty in textual contrast to the court; where the Duke may find 'tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, / Sermons in stones, and good in everything' (2.1.16-17); Orlando impresses his words upon the wood: 'O Rosalind, these trees shall be my books, /And in their barks my thoughts I'll character' (3.2.5-6). Orlando configures his landscape in support of a reciprocal relationship between the text and the eye, which affirms as it sees: 'That every eye which in this

[7] The mirror was a protean metaphor during this period and was as frequently applied to the book as it was to the stage. The mind of man as mirror facilitates the mapping of knowledge from the sensory and sensible reflection of the world onto the page: Bacon declares that 'God hath framed the mind of man as a mirror or glass capable of the image of the universal world, and joyful to receive the impression thereof', *Advancement of Learning*, Book One, Brian Vickers (ed.), *Francis Bacon: A critical edition of the major works* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 123.
[8] *Julius Caesar* (1.2.69-70).

forest looks / Shall see thy virtue witnessed everywhere' (3.2.7-8). The book of Rosalind's virtue looks out from the trees in order to be seen. Yet, how far the book can support virtue or goodness is always in contention; when Othello exclaims 'Was this fair paper, this most goodly book, / Made to write 'whore' upon?' accusing his wife of adultery, his fatal mistake contaminates the very image he preserves as good. Othello misreads; his wife, the handkerchief, Iago, Cassio, and the image of the book becomes involved, even complicit, in this terrible process. Although the language of the book may turn us to other things — the play within or the mirror — it also embraces, by virtue of material contingents, the physical body.[9] The book binds its pages as the flesh binds the soul. But where in *Love's Labour's* the idea of the book developed an underside to accommodate desire, in *The Shrew* the book merely supports a dynamic between subject and object to sanction possession. The imperative is reading and the body is shown to be capable of unfolding in sympathy or under duress within the presence of the reader.

'He reads much, / He is a great observer'.

What is the idea of the book? Sometimes it is story, 'A pattern, precedent, and lively warrant', for us, 'to perform the like'; it unfolds myths and tales through which we recognise both action and reaction in the 'history in all men's lives'. Sometimes it is more like 'a dream than an assurance', tracing the insubstantial or 'airy nothing' of fantasy, fear, magic or theatre. Or perhaps the book is love, offering its image as analogue to the body, gesturing at the discovery of touch or the secrets of the heart, promising the possibility of reading the beloved and of holding the soul. Or is the book

[9] Carol Rutter discusses the contest between the 'performative' and 'discursive' body, where the body of the actor and the body of the text 'requires us to read double, both discursively and theatrically, as 'the text puts the ideological reading into play and at the same time engages it with a theatrical one'', *Enter the body*, pp. 3-4 [quoting Anthon Dawson].

just another actor on stage, like 'our fangled world' showing things not as they really are, 'a garment/ Nobler than it covers', reminding us 'that show of such an exercise may colour' anything? Perhaps the book is a talisman, an icon of faith, a companion for death or a ledger of life, or even an icon of something substantial beyond the precarious order of state and commonwealth, a hopeful reminder of justice and righteousness amidst the vagaries of human behaviour. Or simply a mark of education, Henry VI's bookishness, Young Lucius's study, Saye's book 'which preferred' him 'to the king', or the drudge from which Romeo's schoolboy flies in his metaphor for love. Whatever Shakespeare's idea of the book it unfurls on his stage to be read through the eyes or words of the speaker as something 'more than that tongue that more hath more expressed'. The book demands our attention because it asks us to engage with the vicariousness of thought in conjunction with the vicissitudes of seeing. Theatre is a place of seeing; as Antony Munday so feared, the eye has a powerful capacity for recall and impression, and as the theatre begins to accommodate ways of thinking it moves beyond the requisites of the scaffold to signify 'senseless speaking' in the dynamic relationship between the corporeal and the cognitive.

If, as Lukas Erne argues, Shakespeare wrote differently for the stage and the page, including in the text to be read such things as would normally be performed (mannerism, entrances, exits, physical behaviour, expressions), then we might assume that the book supports what the stage cannot describe and the stage performs what the book does not show us.[10] Where, in written drama the page must explain what the eye cannot see, in performed drama does the book support what the ear cannot hear? The journey through the 'mind's eye' that Hamlet travels from

[10] Lukas Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), see particularly, pp. 220-225.

the pre-emptory vision of his father to the theatrical disclosure of Claudius simulates the relationship between thinking and seeing. Memory is the locus upon which this journey depends and, from the Ghost's injunction to Claudius's visible guilt, we follow Hamlet's 'mind's eye' in the rejection of 'all saws of books', through 'some dozen or sixteen lines' to his theatre of memory.[11] The radical relationship between seeing and thinking is central to *Hamlet,* to the vagaries of Elsinore, madness, dissimulation, the theatre and the book. The book, as we have seen, may offer the past as a narrative in which 'sad stories chanced in the times of old' proffer their pages to the present ushering in history as a recursive context for communication, sanctioning action and restoring the disorder of silence. Here the book forces us to think beyond the visible requisites of the stage; it forces us to move outside the playing space, the language and the narrative into further discursive fields: 'the eloquence and dumb presagers of my speaking breast'. But we have also seen how the book traces the body, 'every married lineament', which 'in many's eyes doth share the glory / That in gold clasps locks in the golden story', or how 'love's stories written in love's richest book' may serve the construction of sexual dynamics, or disclose 'what obscured in this fair volume lies'. We have seen how the soul can move through a metaphorical landscape between the book and the mirror, imagining the stained conscience or the unmarked victim of treason. Where we cannot see Gertrude's sin, Hamlet's brain, Richard II's soul, or Imogen's nightmare, we must learn to read 'what silent' pen 'hath writ' and, in 'minding true things by what their mockeries be', recognise the 'revolutions of the times'. Yet, as we travel to the corners of Shakespeare's stage reading in the shadows of theatre the things we cannot see, the secrets, lies,

[11] There is, of course, an irony in Hamlet's journey from the book to the theatre through the memory, since the book is both material memory and the death of memory, staging the graphic tension between old and new learning, loci and print.

thoughts, precedents, histories and desires of the space between thinking and showing we also learn that 'the purpose of playing, whose end, both at the first and now, was and is to hold as 'twere the mirror up to nature'. If theatre is to reflect nature, indeed if 'the art itself is nature', then is the book part of that nature if it begins to challenge the representational space in which it lies? What the book explores on stage is precisely this process of making the imagination, the soul, the mind performable, making it accountable to the very art it represents. When the soothsayer in *Antony and Cleopatra* describes his skills: 'In nature's infinite book of secrecy /A little I can read' he claims to read the body for its fortune seeing the lineaments, the margin and the pen in the brows, palms and proportions of his companions. 'I make not', he claims, 'but foresee' (1.2.7-8, 14). Perhaps this is the closest we come to a single image of Shakespeare's books, wherein the body and nature come together under the auspice of some secret in motion.

When Montaigne claimed of his book and himself that they go 'hand in hand together, and keep one apace' he supported an indefatigable relationship between the body and the book claiming for both an authentic voice in the essence of presence. He also claimed, however, that this voice would change, move, develop and adjust its pace over time and thought. When Shakespeare puts books on stage or in the semantic range of his plays he confines those books to the theatre that makes them speak. Although allusions, stories, and a semiotic of epistemology may draw con-texts and discourses into the plays' range, Shakespeare's books are and remain dependent upon the stage that supports them. Although Erne makes a compelling argument as to the nature of Shakespeare's relationship to the text and the stage, whether the play is read or performed it remains a dramatic text and the

stage directions, gestured language and speech-acts refer back to the playing space whether that is on stage or in the mind's eye. The book is part of that playing space and part of the illusion of history, movement and thought that supports the reciprocal relationship between nature and art. When, at the beginning of Shakespeare's dramatic career, we see Lavinia fly after her nephew in pursuit of the book of her story, or at the end when Prospero drowns the books he once prized above his dukedom, we realise that the relationship between the book and the stage has come full circle. Where it was once the site of theatre's limitations, condensing history, adumbrating order and accommodating performative silence, the book ends up as part of the very illusion it once tried to suppress. Tracing the shoreline of Prospero's island or trammelling up the consequences of Posthumus's errors the book, like 'Bottom's dream', challenges the stage to imagine what 'The eye of man hath not heard, [and] the ear of man hath not seen'.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Alighieri, Dante, *The Divine Comedy: Paradiso*, trans. John D. Sinclair (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1939).

Anonymous, *A Curious Paper of the Time of Queen Elizabeth respecting the Office of the Revels* (London: Thomas Richards, MDCCCLXXII).

Bacon, Francis, *New Atlantis, and The Great Instauration*, revised edition, ed. Jerry Weinberger (Illinois: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1989).

Baldwin, William, *The Mirror for Magistrates*, edited from original texts, The Huntingdon Library, Lily B. Campbell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938).

Behn, Aphra, *Oroonoko and Other Writings*, ed. Paul Salzman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Bickersteth, Rev. E. (ed.), *The Testimony of The Reformers: selected from the writings of Cranmer, Jewell, Tindal, Ridley, Becon, Bradford, etc.* (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, MDCCCXXXVI).

Booth, Stephen (ed.), *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (New Haven and London: Yale Nota Bene, Yale University Press, 2000).

Bowers, Fredson (ed.), *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, Volume II (Cambridge: at The University Press, 1955).

Burton, Robert, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. Holbrook Jackson (New York: The New York Review of Books, 2001).

Campbell, Gordon (ed.), *John Milton: Complete English poems, of Education, Areopagitica* (London: Everyman, J.M. Dent, 2000).

Castiglione, Baldesar, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. George Bull (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976).

Caxton, William, *The Game of Chess*, ed. Vincent Figgins (London: John Russel Smith, MDCCCLX).

Césaire, Aimé, *A Tempest*, trans. Philip Crispin (London: Oberon Books, 2000).

Cunliffe, John W. (ed.), *Supposes and Jocasta*, two plays translated from the Italian, the first by Geo. Gascoigne, the second by Geo. Gascoigne and F. Kinwelmersh 1575 (Boston and London: D.C. Heath and Co., 1906).

Descartes, René, *Discourses on Method and the Meditations* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968).

Dolan, Frances (ed.), *William Shakespeare's The Taming of The Shrew: Texts and Contexts* (Boston and New York: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1996).

Erasmus, Desiderius, *The Praise of Folly and Other Writings*, ed. Robert M. Adams (London and New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1989).

Erasmus, Desiderius, *The Education of a Christian Prince*, trans. Lester K. Born (New York: Morningside Heights: Columbia University Press, MCMXXXVI).

Fenton, Geoffrey (trans.), *The History of Guicciardin, conteining the Warres of Italie and Other Partes continued for many yeares vunder sundry kings and princes, together with the variations and accidents of the same, diuided into twenty bookes* (London: Richard Field, 1599).

Fletcher, John, *The Tamer Tamed*, ed. Gordon McMullen (London: Nick Hern Books, 2003).

Florio, John, *Queen Anna's New World of Words*; facsimile of 1611 (Menston, Yorkshire: Scolar Press Ltd., 1968).

Foakes, R.A. and R.T. Ricket (eds), *Henslowe's Diary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961).

Foakes, R. A. (ed.), *Henslowe's Diary*, second edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Foxe, John, *Acts and Monuments* (London: John Day, 1576).

The Geneva Bible: A facsimile of the 1560 edition, ed. Lloyd E. Berry (Madison, Milwaukee and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1969).

Gosson, Stephen, *The School of Abuse and A Short Apology for the School of Abuse*, ed. Edward Arber (London: Alex . Murray & Son, 1868).

Greenblatt, Stephen, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard and Katherine Eisaman Maus (eds), *The Norton Shakespeare* (London and New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997).

Greene, Donald (ed.), *Samuel Johnson: The Oxford Authors* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

Heywood, Thomas, *An Apology for Actors Containing Three Brief Treatises* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1612).

Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan*, ed. C.B. MacPherson (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995).

Innes, Mary M. (trans.), *Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955).

Johnson, Samuel, *A Dictionary of the English Language; in which the words are deduced from their originals, explained in their different meanings and authorized by the names of the writers in whose work they are found*, the fifth edition, corrected and revised (Montrose: Mundel, Doig, and Stevenson; bell and Bradfute Ednr. W. Anderson, Stirling, and J. and A. Duncan, Glasgow 1809).

Johnson, John, *The Academy of Love* (London: For H. Blunden, 1641).

Jones, Andrew, *The Black Book of Conscience: or, God's High Court of Justice The Soul of Man* (London: W.O., 1607).

Jonson, Ben, *Five Plays*, ed. G.A. Wilkes (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

Kyd, Thomas, *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. J.R. Mulryne (London: A & C Black, 1989).

Machiavelli, Niccolò, *The Prince,* trans. Peter Bondanella and Mark Musa (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Man, John, *The Guttenberg Revolution: The Story of a Genius and an Invention that Changed the World* (London: Review, 2002).

Mann Phillips, Margaret, *The Adages of Erasmus: A Study with Translations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964).

Marcus, Leah S., Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (eds), *Elizabeth I Collected Works* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

Marlowe, Christopher, *The Complete Plays*, ed. J.B. Steane (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986).

Marlowe, Christopher, *Doctor Faustus*, ed. John Jump (London and New York: Routledge, 1988).

Marston, John, *The Scourge of Villanie*, ed. G. B. Harrison (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966).

Maynard Hutchins, Robert (ed.), *Great Books of the Western World: Augustine: The Confessions, the City of God, On Christian Doctrine, Saint Augustine* (Chicago, London, Toronto, Geneva: William Benton, 1952).

McNutty, Robert (ed.), *Ludovico Ariosto's 'Orlando Furioso', translated into English Heroical verse by Sir John Harrington* (1591), (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972),

'Preface, or rather, a Briefe Aplogie of Poetrie and of the Author and Translator of this Poem', pp. 1-15.

Milton, John, 'Areopagitica', in *Complete English Poems, of Education, Areopagitica*, ed. Gordon Campbell (London: Everyman, J.M. Dent, 2000), pp. 575-618.

Milton, John, 'Comus', in *Complete English Poems*, pp. 59-91.

Montaigne, Michel de, *Essays*, trans. J.M. Cohen (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983).

More, Thomas, *Utopia*, trans. Paul Turner (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965).

Morrison, Blake, *The Justification of Johann Guttenberg: A Novel* (London: Vintage, 2000).

Osborn, James M. (ed.)[now attributed to Richard Mulcaster], *The Quenes Maisties passage through the Citie of London to Westiminster the day before her coronacion* (facsimile of the publication on January 23rd, 1559) (New Haven: Tale University Press, 1960).

Pascal, Blaise, *Pensées*, trans. A.J. Krailsheimer (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1995).

Peacham, Henry, *The Garden of Eloquence* (London: H. Iackson, 1577).

Plato, *Phaedo*, trans. David Gallop (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Salgādo, Gāmini (ed.), *Four Jacobean City Comedies* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975).

Shakespeare, William, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. Stanley Wells (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986).

Shakespeare, William, *Cymbeline*, ed. J.M. Nosworthy, The Arden Shakespeare, third series (London: Thomas Learning, 2000).

Shakespeare, William, *Hamlet*, ed. T. J. B. Spencer (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1996).

Shakespeare, William, *Hamlet*, ed. G. R. Hibbard (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Shakespeare, William, *Love's Labour's Lost*, ed. H. R. Woudhuysen (Walton-On-Thames: Thomas Nelson, 1998).

Shakespeare, William, *Richard II*, ed. Stanley Wells (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1997).

Shakespeare, William, *The Narrative Poems*, ed. Maurice Evans (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989).

Shakespeare, William, *The Taming of The Shrew*, ed. Robert B. Heilman (London: The New English Library Limited, 1966).

Shakespeare, William, *The Taming of The Shrew*, ed. G. R. Hibbard (London: Penguin, 1995).

Shakespeare, William, *Titus Andronicus*, ed. Jonathan Bate, The Arden Shakespeare, third series (London: Thomas Learning, 2000).

Shakespeare, William, *The Tempest*, eds. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan, The Arden Shakespeare, third series (Walton-On-Thames: Thomas Nelson, 1999).

Shakespeare, William, *The Tempest*, ed. Frank Kermode (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1954).

Shakespeare, William, *Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies: A Facsimile of the First Folio, 1623*, introduced by Doug Moston (London and New York: Routledge, 1998).

Shirley, James, *Dramatic Works and Poems* (London: John Murray, Albermarle St, MDCCCXXXIII).

Sidney, Sir Philip, *Selected Writings*, ed. Richard Dutton (Manchester: Carcanet Press, 1987).

Spenser, Edmund, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. Thomas P. Roche Jr. (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978).

Tilly, Morris Palmer, *A Dictionary of The Proverbs in England The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: a collection of the proverbs found in English literature and the dictionaries of the period* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950).

Vickers, Brian (ed.), *Francis Bacon: A Critical Edition of the Major Works* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

Watson, Foster (ed.), 'J. L. Vives: Instruction of a Christian Woman, translated into English by Richard Hyrde in 1540', *Vives and the Renascence Education of Women* (London: Edward Arnold, 1912).

Secondary Sources

Ackroyd, Peter, *The Life of Thomas More* (London: Vintage, 1999).

Anderson, Randall, 'The Rhetoric of Paratext in early printed Books', in *The Cambridge History of The Book, Volume IV 1557-1695*, eds John Barnard, D. F. McKenzie, and Maureen Bell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 636-647.

Appert, Lucile G., 'Towards a British Academy: The Poet, The King and The Commonwealth of Learning', *Renaissance Papers* (1998), 115-124.

Artaud, Antonin, *The Theatre and Its Double*, trans. Victor Corti (Montreuil, London, and New York: Calder, 1999).

Ashley, Robert and Edwin M. Moseley, *Elizabethan Fiction* (New York and Toronto: Rinehart & Co. Inc., 1953).

Atkyns, Richard, *The Original and Growth of Printing collected out of History, and the Records of this Kingdome: Wherein is also Demonstrated that Printing*

appertaineth to the Prerogative Royal; and is a Flower of the Crown of England (London: John Streater, for the author, MDCLXIV).

Auerbach, Eric, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974).

Ayers, P. K., 'Reading, Writing, and Hamlet', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 44 (1993), 423-439.

Backhouse, Janet, *The Illuminated Manuscript* (London: Phaidon Press Ltd., 1999).

Baldwin, T. W., *William Shakspere's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke: Volume One* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944).

Barnard, John, D. F. McKenzie, and Maureen Bell (eds), *The Cambridge History of The Book in Britain, Volume IV, 1557-1695* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Barthes, Roland, 'The Death of The Author', in *The Book History Reader*, ed. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 221-224.

Bate, Jonathan, 'The Humanist Tempest', in *Shakespeare, La Tempête: Etudes Critiques*, ed. Claude Peltrault (Actes du Colloque de Besançon, Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines, 1993), pp. 5-20.

Bate, Jonathan, 'Caliban and Ariel Write Back', *Shakespeare Survey*, 48 (1995), 155-162.

Bate, Jonathan, *The Genius of Shakespeare* (Basingstoke and Oxford: Picador, 1997).

Bate, Jonathan, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

Bates, Catherine, *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Bath, Michael, *Speaking Pictures: English Emblem Books and Renaissance Culture* (London and New York: Longman, 1994).

Bell, Maureen, 'Women Writing and Women Written', in *The Cambridge History of The Book, Volume IV*, pp. 431-451.

Benjamin, Walter, *One-Way Street*, trans. Edmund Jephcott and Kingsley Shorter (London and New York: Verso, 2000).

Bennett, H. S., *English Books and Readers 1558-1603: Being a Study The History of the Book Trade The Reign of Elizabeth I* (London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

The Bibliographical Society, *The Bibliographical Society 1892-1942: studies in retrospect* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1945).

Blayney, Peter W. M., 'The Publication of Playbooks', in *A New History of Early English Drama*, eds John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York and Chichester: Columbia University Press, 1997), pp. 383-418.

Bourdieu, Pierre, 'The Field of Cultural Production', in *The Book History Reader*, pp. 77-99.

Bragg, Melvyn, *The Adventure of English: 500AD to 2000, The Biography of a Language* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 2003).

Brewer, John, 'Authors, Publishers and the Making of Literary Culture', in *The Book History Reader*, pp. 241-249.

Brigden, Susan, *New Worlds, Lost Worlds* (London: Penguin, 2000).

Brown, John Russell and Bernard Harris (eds), *Elizabethan Theatre* (London: Edward Arnold, 1966).

Bruster, Douglas, *Shakespeare and the Question of Culture: Early Modern Literature and the Cultural Turn* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

Bruster, Douglas, 'The Structural Transformation of Print in Late Elizabethan England', in *Print, Manuscript and Performance: the changing relations of the media in early modern England*, eds Arthur F. Marotti and Michael D. Bristol (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2000), pp. 49-90.

Calderwood, James L., *Shakespearean Metadrama: the argument of the play in 'Titus Andronicus', 'Love's Labour's Lost', Romeo and Juliet', 'A Midsummer Night's Dream', and 'Richard II'* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1971).

Carroll, William C., 'The Virgin Not: Language and Sexuality in Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Survey* 46 (1993), 107-119.

Carroll, William C., *The Great Feast of Language in 'Love's Labour's Lost'* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976).

Caspari, Fritz, *Humanism and the Social Order in Tudor England* (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1968).

Cave, Terence, *The Cornucopian Text: Problems of Writing The French Renaissance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

Chappell, W., *Popular Music of the Olden Time; a collection of ancient songs, ballads, and dance tunes, illustrative of the national music of England* (London: Cramer, Beale, & Chappell, 1893).

Chartier, Roger, *Publishing Drama in Early Modern Europe* (Panizzi Lectures, 1998).

Chartier, Roger, 'Labourers and Voyagers: from the text to the reader', in *The Book History Reader*, pp. 47-58.

Chartier, Roger, 'The Practical Impact of Writing', in *The Book History Reader*, pp. 118-142.

Cheney, Patrick, *Shakespeare, National Poet-Playwright* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Chillington Rutter, Carol, *Enter the body: Women and Representation on Shakespeare's Stage* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001).

Corfield, Cosmo, 'Why Does prospero Abjure his 'Rough Magic'?, *Shakespeare Quarterly* 36 (1985), 31-48.

Cover, J.A. and Mark Kulstad (eds), *Central Themes in Early Modern Philosophy* (Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1990).

Cox, Nicholas, *An Exact Catalogue of Comedies, Tragedies, Tragi-Comedies, Operas, Masks, Pastorals and Interludes, that were yet printed and published, till this present year 1680* (Oxon: L. Lichfield, Printer to the University, 1680).

Cox, John D. and David Scott Kastan (eds), *A New History of Early English Drama*, (New York and Chichester: Columbia University Press, 1997).

Crane, Nicholas, *Mercator: The Man who Mapped the Planet* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2002).

Cressy, David, *Society and Culture in Early Modern England* (Aldershot and Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2003).

Crystal, David and Ben Crystal, *Shakespeare's Words: A Glossary & Language Companion* (London: Penguin Books, 2002).

Curtius, Ernst Robert, *European Literature and The Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953).

D'Assigny, Marius, *The Art of Memory: A Treatise useful for such as are to Speak in Publick* (London: Bell, 1697).

Danby, John F., *Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature: a study of King Lear* (London: Faber & Faber, MCMLXII).

Daniell, David, 'Shakespeare and the Protestant Mind', *Shakespeare Survey* 54 (2001), 1-12.

Daniell, David, 'The Good Marriage of Katherine and Petruchio', *Shakespeare Survey* 37 (1984), 23-31.

Daniell, David, 'William Tyndale, The English Bible, and The English Language', in *The Bible as Book: The Reformation*, pp. 39-50.

Danson Brown, David and David Johnson (eds), *A Shakespeare Reader: Sources and Criticism* (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 2000).

Darnton, Robert, 'What is the History of Books?', in *The Book History Reader*, pp. 9-26.

Davies, Tony, *Humanism* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997).

Dawson, Anthony B. and Paul Yachnin, *The Culture of Playgoing in Shakespeare's England: a collaborative debate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

De Grazia, Margreta and Peter Stallybrass, 'The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 44 (1993), 255-284.

De Grazia, Margreta and Stanley Wells (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

De Grazia, Margreta, Maureen Quilligan and Peter Stallybrass (eds), *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

De Ricci, Seymour, *A Census of Caxtons* (Oxford: The University Press, The Bibliographical Society, 1909).

Diehl, Huston, *An Index of Icons in English Emblem Books 1500-1700* (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986).

Dillon, Janette, *Language and Stage in Medieval and Renaissance England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Dillon, Janette, *Theatre, Court, and City, 1595-1610: drama and social space in London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Dobson, Michael and Stanley Wells (eds), *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Doebler, John, *Shakespeare's Speaking Pictures: Studies in Iconic Imagery* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1974).

Dollimore, Jonathan and Alan Sinfield (eds), *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994).

Donaldson, Ian, 'The Destruction of the Book', *Book History*, Vol. I (1998), 1-11.

Drakakis, John, *Alternative Shakespeares* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996).

Duffy, Eamon, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1992).

Dutton, Richard, Alison Findlay, and Richard Wilson (eds), *Theatre and Religion – Lancastrian Shakespeare* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2003).

Eagleton, Terry, *William Shakespeare* (Oxford and Manchester: Blackwell, 2000).

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L., *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Eistein, Lewis, *The Italian Renaissance in England: Studies in Comparative Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1907).

Eisaman Maus, Katherine, *Inwardness and Theatre in The English Renaissance* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

Elam, Keir, *Shakespeare's Universe of Discourse: language-games in the Comedies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Early Modern English Dictionary, chass.utoronto.ca/English/emed/emedd.html

Empson, William, *Essays on Renaissance Literature Volume One: Donne and the New Philosophy*, ed. John Haffenden (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Empson, William, *Essays on Shakespeare*, ed. David B. Pirie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Erne, Lukas, *Shakespeare As Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Febvre, Lucien and Henri-Jean Martin, *The Coming of the Book: the impact of printing 1450-1800*, trans. David Gerad (London and New York: Verso, 1997).

Fergerson, F.S., 'English Books before 1640', *The Bibliographical Society 1892-1942: studies in retrospect* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1945), pp. 42-75.

Finkelstein, David, and Alistair McCleery (eds), *The Book History Reader* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002).

Foucault, Michel, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).

Foucault, Michel, 'What is an Author?', in *The Book History Reader*, pp. 225-230.

Fowler, Alistair, *Renaissance Realism: Narrative Images in Literature and Art* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Freeman, Charles, *The Closing of the Western Mind: The Rise of Faith and the Fall of Reason* (London: William Heinemann, 2002).

Frese, Warwick Dolores and Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe, *The Book and The Body* (Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979).

Garber, Marjorie, *Shakespeare's Ghost Writers: Literature as Uncanny Causality* (London and New York: Routledge, 1987).

Gellrich, Jesse M., *The Idea of the Book in The Middle Ages: language, mythology, and fiction* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985).

Goldberg, Jonathan, *Writing Matter: From the Hands of the English Renaissance* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1990).

Grafton, Anthony, *Commerce With The Classics: Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers,* Jerome Lectures, 20 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997).

Grafton, Anthony, *New Worlds, Ancient Texts: The Power of Tradition and the Shock of Discovery* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1995).

Grafton, Anthony and Lisa Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-century Europe* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1986).

Greenaway, Peter, *Prospero's Books: A Film of Shakespeare's The Tempest* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1991).

Greenblatt, Stephen, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

Greenblatt, Stephen, *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Greenblatt, Stephen, *Will in The World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare* (New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 2004).

Greenspan, Ezra and Jonathan Rose (eds), *Book History: Society for the History of Authorship, Reading and Publishing* (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press), Volumes 1 (1998) and 2 (1999).

Gross, John (ed.), *After Shakespeare: Writing Inspired by the World's Greatest Author* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Gurr, Andrew, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*, third edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Hadfield, Andrew, *The English Renaissance 1500-1620* (Oxford and Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2001).

Hadfield, Andrew, 'The Revelation and Early English Colonial Ventures', *The Bible as Book: The Reformation*, pp. 145-156.

Hardison Londré, Felicia (ed.), *Love's Labour's Lost: Critical Essays* (New York and London: Routledge, 2001).

Harrier, Richard, 'Ceremony and Politics in *Richard II*', *Shakespeare: Text, Language, Criticism,* Essays in honour of Marvin Spevack, ed. Bernhaud Fabian and Kurt Tetzeh Von Rosador (Hildesheim, Zurich and New York: Olms-Weidmann, 1987), pp. 80-97.

Hattaway, Michael, 'Fleshing his will, the spoil of her honour: Desire, Misogyny, and the Perils of Chivalry', *Shakespeare Survey 46* (1993), 121-135.

Hill, Christopher, *The English Bible, and the seventeenth-century revolution* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994).

Holden, Anthony, *William Shakespeare: His Life and Work* (London: Abacus, 1999).

Holmes, George, *Renaissance* (London: Phoenix Illustrated, Orion Publishing Groups, 1998).

Honan, Park, *Shakespeare: A Life* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Honigmann, E.A.J., 'The Play of Thomas More and Some Contemporary Events', *Shakespeare Survey* 42 (1990), 77-84.

Howard-Hill, T. H., '"Nor Stage, nor stationers stall can showe": The circulation of plays in manuscripts the early seventeenth century', *Book History*, Vol. 2 (1999), 28-39.

Howard, Maurice, *The Tudor Image* (London: Tate Publishing Ltd., 1995).

Hucks Gibbs, Henry, *A Catalogue of Some Printed Books and Manuscripts at St. Dunstans, Regents Park and Aldenham House, Herts* (London, 1888).

Hull, Suzanne W., *Chaste, Silent and Obedient: English Books for Women 1475-1640* (San Marino: Huntingdon Library, 1982).

Hulme, Peter and William H. Sherman (eds), *The Tempest and Its Travels* (London: Reakiton Books Ltd., 2000).

Iser, Wolfgang, 'Interaction between Text and Reader', in *The Book History Reader*, pp. 291-296.

Jager, Eric, *The Book of The Heart* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

Jagodzinsk, Cecile M., *Privacy and Print: Reading and Writing in Seventeenth-Century England* (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1999).

James, Heather, *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

Jardine, Lisa, *Reading Shakespeare Historically* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996).

Johns, Adrian, *The Nature of The Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

Johns, Adrian, 'The Book of Nature and The Nature of The Book', in *The Book History Reader*, pp. 59-76.

Jones, Marian, 'The Court and The Dramatists', in *Elizabethan Theatre*, pp. 169-195.

Kahn, Coppélia, *Roman Shakespeare* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997).

Kegel, Rosemary, *The Rhetoric of Concealment: figuring gender and class in Renaissance Literature* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1994).

Kermode, Frank, *Shakespeare' Language* (London: Penguin, 2000).

Kerrigan, John, 'Keats and Lucrece', *Shakespeare Survey*, 41 (1989), 103-118.

Kiefer Lewalski, Barabara (ed.), *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press, 1986).

Kingsley-Smith, Jane, 'The Tempest's Forgotten Exile', *Shakespeare Survey* 54 (2001), 223-233.

Knapp, Jeffrey, *Shakespeare's Tribe: Church, Nation and Theatre in Renaissance England* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2002).

Knapp, Robert, *Shakespeare: The Theatre and The Book* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).

Knapp, Robert S., '"Is it appropriate for a man to fear his wife?": John Case on Marriage', *English Literary Renaissance* 28 (1998), 387-415.

Langbaine, Gerard, *An Account of the English Dramatic Poets, 1691* (Menston, Yorkshire: Scolar Press, 1971).

Laven, Mary, *Virgins of Venice: Enclosed Lives and Broken Vows in The Renaissance Convent* (London: Viking, 2002).

Lechner, Sister Joan Marie, O.S.U, *Renaissance Concepts of the Commonplaces* (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1962).

Levi, Peter, *The Life and Times of William Shakespeare* (London: Macmillan, 1998).

Lewis, C.S., *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, excluding Drama* (London, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).

Livingstone, E.A., *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Magnusson, Lynne, *Shakespeare and Social Dialogue: Dramatic Language and Elizabethan Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Maguire, Laurie E., *Shakespearean suspect texts: The 'bad' quartos and their contexts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Maguire, Laurie E., *Studying Shakespeare: A Guide to the Plays* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004).

Manguel, Alberto, *A History of Reading* (London: Flamingo, 1997).

Marotti, Arthur F. and Michael D. Bristol (eds), *Print, Manuscript and Performance: the changing relations of the media in early modern England* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2000).

Margolies, David, *Novel and Society in Elizabethan England* (Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble Books, 1985).

McDonald, Russ, *Shakespeare and the Art of Language* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

McDonald, Russ (ed.), *Shakespeare: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory 1945-2000* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2004).

McGann, Jerome, 'The Socialisation of Texts', in *The Book History Reader*, pp. 39-46.

McKenzie, D. F., 'The Book as an Expressive Form', in *The Book History Reader*, pp. 27-38.

McMullen, Gordon (ed.), *Renaissance Configurations: Voices, Bodies, Spaces, 1580-1690* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2001).

Mead, Philip and Marion Campbell (eds), *Shakespeare's Books: Contemporary Cultural Politics and the Persistence of Empire* (Melbourne: University of Melbourne, 1993).

Miles, Pliny, *Mnemotechny, or art of Memory, Theoretical and Practical with a Mnemotechnic Dictionary* (London: E. Charton, 1850).

Miller, Jonathan, *On Reflection* (London: National Gallery Publications Ltd., Distributed by Yale University Press, 1998).

Miola, Robert S., *Shakespeare's Reading* (Oxford: Oxford University press, 2000).

Miola, Robert S., 'Jesuit drama in early modern England', in *Theatre and Religion – Lancastrian Shakespeare*, pp. 71-86.

Morgan, Paul, 'Frances Wolfreston and "Hor Bouks": A Seventeenth-Century Woman Book Collector', in *Shakespeare: Text, Language Criticism* (Hildesheim, Zurich and New York: Olms-Weidmann, 1987), pp. 193-211.

Morrison, Paul G., *Index of Printers, Publishers and Booksellers in A.W. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave: A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640* (Charlottesville, Virginia: Bibliographical Society of The University of Virginia, 1961).

Moss, Ann, *Printed Commonplace-Books and The Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

Moynahan, Brian, *If God Spare My Life: William Tyndale, the English Bible and Sir Thomas More – A Story of Martyrdom and Betrayal* (London: Little, Brown, 2002).

Muller, Jan-Dirk, 'The Body of the Book: the media transition from manuscript to print', in *The Book History Reader*, pp. 143-150.

Murphy, Andrew (ed.), *The Renaissance Text: Theory, Editing, Textuality* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2000).

Murray, Penelope (trans.), *Classical Literary Criticism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2000).

Myers, Robin, 'The Records of the Worshipful Company of Stationers and Newspaper Makers (1554-1912), *Publishing History: the Social, Economic, and Literary History of the Book, Newspaper and Magazine Publishing*, Vol. XIII (1983), 89-105.

Neu Watkins, Renée (trans.), *Humanism and Liberty: writings on freedom from fifteenth-century Florence* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1978).

Norton, Glyn P. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Volume 3, The Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Nuttall, A. D., *The Alternative Trinity: Gnostic heresy in Marlowe, Milton, and Blake* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

O'Connell, Michael, *The Idolatrous Eye: Iconoclasm and Theatre in Early Modern England* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Olson, David. R., *The World on Paper: the Conceptual and Cognitive implications of Writing and Reading* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Ong, Walter, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologising of The Word* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).

Orgel, Stephen, *Imagining Shakespeare: A History of Texts and Visions* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave, 2003).

Orgel, Stephen, *The Illusion of Power* (California: University of California Press, 1975).

O'Sullivan, Orlaith (ed.), *The Bible as Book: the Reformation* (London and New Castle, Del.: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2000).

Palfrey, Simon, *Late Shakespeare: A New World Of Words* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

Petcher, Edward (ed.), *Textual and Theoretical Shakespeare: Questions of Evidence* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1969).

Picard, Liza, *Elizabeth's London: Everyday Life in Elizabethan England* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2003).

Pitcher, John, 'Literature, the Playhouse and the Public', in *The Cambridge History of The Book in Britain, Volume IV*, pp. 351-375.

Plumb, J.H., *The Penguin Book of The Renaissance* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961).

Ramage, David (ed.), *A Finding-List of English Books to 1640 in Libraries of the British Isles (excluding the National Libraries of Oxford and Cambridge), based on the numbers in Pollard & Redgraves 'Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland & English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640* (Durham: The Council of Durham Colleges, 1958).

Rhodes, Neil and Jonathan Sawday (eds), *The Renaissance Computer* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).

Righter, Anne, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1962).

Rigolot, François, 'The Rhetoric of Presence: Art, Literature, and Illusion', in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Volume 3*, pp. 161-167.

Roesen, Bobbyann (Anne Barton), 'Love's Labour's Lost', in *Love's Labour's Lost: Critical Essays*, ed. Felicia Hardison Londré (New York and London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 125-144.

Rossiter, A.P., *Angel With Horns: Fifteen Lectures on Shakespeare* (London and New York: Longman, 1989).

Rowe, Katherine A., 'Dismembering and Forgetting', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (1994), 279-304.

Rowse, A.L., *The England of Elizabeth: the structure of society* (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1950).

Saunders, Eve Rachele, *Gender and Literacy on Stage in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Schleiner, Louise, *Tudor and Stewart Women Writers* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994).

Scott Kastan, David, *Shakespeare and the Book* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Scruton, Roger, *Modern Philosophy: an introduction and survey* (London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1994).

Schalkwyk, David, *Speech and Performance in Shakespeare's Sonnets and Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Shaheen, Naseeb, *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays* (Newark and London: University of Delaware Press, and Associated University Press, 1999).

Shapiro, Marianne, *De Vulgari Eloquentia: Dante's Book of Exile* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1990).

Sharpe, Kevin, *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000).

Siemon, James R., *Word Against Word: Shakespearean Utterance* (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002).

Smith, Nigel, 'Non-Conformist Voices and Books', in *The Cambridge History of The Book, Volume IV*, pp. 410-430.

Spevack, Marvin, *The Harvard Concordance to Shakespeare* (Hildesheim: George Olms, 1970).

Sponsler, Claire, *Drama and Resistance: Bodies, Goods, and Theatricality in Late Medieval England* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1997).

Spufford, Margaret, *Small Books and Pleasant Histories: Popular Fiction and its Readership in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

Steinburg, S.H., *Five Hundred Years of Printing* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961).

Stone Peters, Julie, *Theatre of the Book 1480-1880, Print, Text, and Performance in Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Syson, Luke and Dillon Gordon, *Pisanello: Painter to the Renaissance Court* (London: National Gallery Company, distributed by Yale University Press, 2001).

Thomas, Keith, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991).

Tillyard, E.M.W., *The Elizabethan World Picture* (London: Pimlico, 1998).

Tracy, James D., *Europe's Reformations 1450-1650* (London, Boulder, New York and Oxford: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 1999).

Tribble, Evelyn B., *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England* (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1993).

Trousdale, Marion, 'Reading and the Early Modern Text', *Shakespeare Survey* 50 (1997), 135-145.

Vandiver, Elizabeth , Ralph Keen and Thomas D. Frazel (eds), *Luther's Lives: Two Contemporary Accounts of Martin Luther* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).

Vendler, Helen, *The Art of Shakespeare's Sonnets* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999).

Walker, Lewis, 'Chaucer's Contribution to *The Tempest*: a reappraisal', *Renaissance Papers* (2000), 119-135.

Waso, Richard, 'Theories of Language', in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Volume 3*, pp. 25-35.

Weimann, Robert, *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Weimann, Robert, 'Playing with Difference. Revising Pen and "Voice" in Shakespeare's Theatre', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 50 (1999), 414-433.

Weir, Alison, *Henry VIII: King and Court* (London: Pimlico, 2002).

Wells, Stanley, Gary Taylor, John Jowett, William Montgomery (eds), *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

West, Grace Starry, 'Going by the Book: Classical Allusions in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 79 (1982), 62-77.

Whitaker, Virgil K., *Shakespeare's Use of Learning: An Inquiry into the Growth of his Mind and Art* (San Marino, California: The Huntingdon Library, 1969).

Whitfield White, Paul, *Theatre and Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage, and Playing in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Whitlock, Keith (ed.), *The Renaissance: A Reader* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press in association with The Open University, 2000).

Williams, Gordon, *Shakespeare, Sex, and The Print Revolution* (London and Atlantic Highlands, NJ, 1996).

Wilson, F.P., *Shakespeare and the New Bibliography*, revised and edited by Helen Gardener (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970).

Wilson, Richard, 'Introduction: a torturing hour – Shakespeare and the martyrs', in *Theatre and Religion – Lancastrian Shakespeare*, pp. 1-39.

Wolley, Benjamin, *The Queen's Conjurer: The Science and Magic of Dr Dee* (London: HarperCollins Publishers, 2001).

Woolf, D. R., *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Yates, Frances, *The Occult Philosophy in The Elizabethan Age* (London and New York: Routledge Classics, 2001).

Yates, Frances, *The Art of Memory* (London: Pimlico, 2001).

Zaehner, R.C., *The Hutchinson Encyclopaedia of Living Faiths* (Oxford: Helicon, 1997).

Appendix

Shakespeare's Book/s[1]

Comedies:

The Two Gentlemen of Verona

And on a love-book pray for my success?, 1.1.19.

Upon some book I love I'll pray for thee, 1.1.20.

The Merry Wives of Windsor

I had rather than forty shillings I had my book of songs and sonnets here, 1.1.165.

You have not the book of riddles about you, have you?, 1.1.168.

Book of riddles?, 1.1.170.

Master Fenton, I'll be sworn on a book she loves you, 1.4.127.

Keep a gamester from the dice and a good student from his book, and it is wonderful, 3.1.32-3.

Sir Hugh, my husband says my son profits nothing in the world at his book, 4.1.11-12.

[1] All line references are to *The Norton Shakespeare*

Measure for Measure

I'll be supposed upon a book his face is the worst thing about him, 2.1.140-1.

Much Ado about Nothing

And tire the hearer with a book of words, 1.1.255.

In my chamber-window lies a book, 2.3.3.

Trust not my reading nor my observations, / Which with experimental seal doth warrant / The tenure of my book, 4.1.164-6.

I see, lady, the gentleman is not in your books, 1.1.62.

Love's Labour's Lost

As painfully to pore upon a book, 1.1.74.

Sir, he hath never fed of the dainties that are bred in a book, 4.2.21.

Study his bias leaves, and makes his book thine eyes, 4.2.103.

Where is a book?, 4.3.246.

And in that vow we have forsworn our books, 4.3.293.

Save base authority from other's books, 1.1.87.

They are the books, the arts, the academes, 4.3.326.

A Midsummer Night's dream

Love's stories written in love's richest book, 2.2.128.

The Merchant of Venice

Wear prayer books in my pocket, look demurely, 2.3.173.

We turn'd o'er many books together, 4.1.153-4.

As You Like It

O sir, we quarrel in print, by the book, as you have books for good manners, 5.4.81-2.

Finds tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, 2.1.16.

O Rosalind, these trees shall be my books, 3.2.5

The Taming of The Shrew

Keep house, and ply his book, welcome his friends, 1.1.190.

That, all amaz'd, the priest let fall the book, 3.3.34.

That down fell priest, and book, and book, and priest, 3.3.37.

My books and instruments shall be my company, 1.1.82.

All books of love, see that at any hand, 1.2.140.

Well read in poetry / And other books, good ones, 1.2.164-5.

And this small packet of Greek and Latin books, 2.1.98.

Take you the lute, and you the set of books, 2.1.104.

A herald, Kate? O, put me in thy books!, 2.1.220.

Mistress, your father prays you leave your books, 3.1.80.

Twelfth Night

He plays o'th' viol-de-gamboys, and speaks three or four languages word for word without book, and hath all the good gifts of nature, 1.3.21-3.

I have unclasped / To thee the book even of my secret soul, 1.4.12-3.

An affectioned ass that cons state without book and utters it by great swathes, 2.3.132-3.

Troilus and Cressida

But I think thy horse will sooner con an oration than thou learn a prayer without book, 2.1.26-7.

O, like a book of sport thou'lt read me o'er, 4.7.123.

Histories

King John

That is Question now; /And then comes Answer like an Absey book, 1.1.195-6.

Can in this book of beauty read "I love", 2.1.486.

Bell, book, and candle shall not drive me back, 3.3.12.

Richard II

My name be blotted from the book of life, 1.3.195.

Marked with a blot, damned in the book of heaven, 4.1.226.

I'll read enough / When I do see the very book indeed / Where all my sins are writ, and that's myself, 4.1.263-5.

Henry IV pt 1.

And now I will unclasp a secret book, 1.3.186.

By that time will our book, I think, be drawn, 3.1.219

By this our book is drawn, we'll but seal, 3.1.260

I'll be sworn upon all the books in England, 2.5.45-6.

Henry IV pt 2.

By this hand, thou thinkest me as far in the devil's book as thou and Falstaff, 2.2.34-5.

O God, that one might read the book of fate, 3.1.44.

Would shut the book and sit him down and die, 3.1.52.4.

That you should seal this lawless bloody book, 4.1.91.

He was the mark and glass, copy and book, /That fashioned others, 2.3.31-32.

Turning your books to graves, your ink to blood, 4.1.50.

How deep you were within the books of God?, 4.1.243.

Henry V

For in the Book of Numbers is it writ, 1.2.98.

O'er this bloody field / To book our dead, 4.7.64-5.

Henry VI pt 1.

I'll note you in my book of memory, 2.4.101.

Unless my study and my books be false, 2.4.56.

Alas, my years are young, /And fitter is my study and books, 5.1.21-2.

Henry VI pt 2.

Such as by God's book are adjudg'd to death, 2.3.4.

He's a book in his pocket with red letters in't, 4.2.80.

Because my book preferred me to the King, 4.7.65.

Blotting your names from books of memory, 1.1.96.

Our forefathers had no other books but the score and the tally, 4.7.28-9.

Henry VI pt 3.

Good day, my lord. What, at your book so hard?, 5.6.1.

Richard III

Made him my book, wherein my soul recorded / The history of all her secret thoughts, 3.5.26-7.

And see, a book of prayer in his hand, 3.7.98.

A book of prayers on their pillow lay, 4.3.14.

For by the book / He should have braved the east, 5.6.8-9

Henry VIII

A beggar's book / Outworths a noble's blood, 1.1.122-3.

Tragedies

Coriolanus

Towards her deservèd children is enrolled / In Jove's own book, 3.1.293-4.

I have been /The book of his own good acts, whence men have read, 5.2.16-17.

Titus Andronicus

Some book there is that she desires to see, 4.1.31.

Lucius, what book is that she tosseth so?, 4.1.41.

Which made me down to throw my books, and fly, 4.1.25.

Romeo and Juliet

Perhaps you have learned it without book, 1.2.59.

This precious book of love, this unbound lover, 1.3.89.

That book in many's eyes doth share the glory, 1.3.93.

You kiss by th' book, 1.5.107.

A braggart, a rogue, a villain, that fights by the book of arithmetic!, 3.1.96-7.

Was ever book containing such vile matter / So fairly bound?, 3.2.83-4.

O, give me thy hand, / One writ with me in sour misfortune's book!, 5.3.81-2.

Love goes toward love as schoolboys from their books, 2.1.201.

Timon of Athens

A picture, sir. When comes your book forth?, 1.1.26.

His land's put to their books, 1.2.195.

Julius Caesar

Look, Lucius, here's the book I sought for so, 4.2.303.

Ay, and that tongue of his that bade the Romans / Mark him, and write his speeches in their books, 1.2.127-8

Macbeth

Your face, my thane, is as a book, where men / May read strange matters, 1.5.61-2.

Hamlet

And thy commandment all alone shall live / Within the book and volume of my brain, 1.5.102-3.

Read on this book, / That show of such an exercise may colour / Your loneliness, 3.1.46-8.

All saws of books, all forms, all pressures past, 1.5.100.

Othello

The bloody book of law / You shall read yourself read in the bitter letter, 1.3.67-8.

Was this fair paper, this most goodly book, /Made to write 'whore' upon?, 4.2.73-4.

Anthony and Cleopatra

In nature's infinite book of secrecy /A little I can read, 1.2.8-9.

King Lear

Keep thy foot out of brothels ... thy pen from lenders' books, and defy the foul fiend, 3.4.85-6.[2]

Romances

Cymbeline

Such gain the cap of him that makes 'em fine, / Yet keeps his book uncrossed, 3.3.25-6.

A book?, 5.5.227.

Your neck, sir, is pen, book, and counters; so the acquittance follows, 5.5.260-1.

Pericles

Her face the book of praises, where is read / Nothing but curious pleasures, 1.58-9.

Who has a book of all that monarchs do, / He's more secure to keep it shut that shown, 1.137-8.

The Tempest.

Here, kiss the book, 2.2.123.

Kiss the book, 2.2.134.

[2] This reference is from the 1623 Folio, although it does not differ from the 1608 Q.

I'll to my book, /For yet ere supper-time must I perform /Much business appertaining, 3.1.95-7.

Did ever plummet sound / I'll drown my book, 5.1.57.

Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me, 1.2. 167.

There may'st thou brain him, / Having first seized his books, 3.2.83-4.

Remember / First to possess his books, 3.2.87.

Burn but his books, 3.2.90.

The Winter's Tale

Let me be unrolled and my name put in the book of virtue, 4.3.111-12.

The Two Noble Kinsmen

This good deed / Shall raze you out o' th' Book of Trespasses, 1.1.32-3.

Poetry

The Rape of Lucrece

For princes are the glass, the school, the book / Where subjects' eyes do learn, do read, do look, 615-6.

Writ in the glassy margins of such books, 102.

Yea, the illiterate that know not how / To cipher what is writ in learnèd books, 810-11.

To blot old books, and alter their contents, 947.

Poor women's faces are their own faults' books, 1253.

The Passionate Pilgrim

Study his bias leaves, and makes his book thine eyes, 5.5.[3]

Sonnets

After a thousand victories once foiled, / Is from the book of honour razèd quite, 25. 11.

Show me your image in some antique book /Since mind at first in character was done, 59.7-8.

And of this book this learning mayst thou taste, 77. 4.

Shall profit thee and much enrich thy book, 77. 14

The dedicated words which writers use / Of their fair subject, blessing every book, 82. 3-4.

Book both my wilfulness and errors down /And on just proof surmise accumulate, 117. 9-10.

O, let my books be then the eloquence / And dumb presages of my speaking breast, 23. 9-10.

[3] Not included in the *Norton* edition, see William Shakespeare, *The Narrative Poems*, ed. Maurice Evans (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1989).