ISSN 1949-8519 (Print)
ISSN 2154-6711 (Online)

Forum for World Literature Studies

世界文学研究论坛 Vol.2 No.2 August 2010

Literature
الأدب
Littérature
Literatura
Литература

Shanghai • Wuhan • West Lafayette

Forum for World Literature Studies

Special Thematic Issue

Renaissance Travels

Edited by

Ty Buckman and Charles S. Ross

Editors in Chief
Huang Tiechi, Shanghai Normal University, China
Nie Zhenzhao, Central China Normal University, China
Charles Ross, Purdue University, U.S.A

Editorial Board
Valerie Babb, University of Georgia, U.S.A
Massimo Bacigalupo, Universita' di Genova, Italy
Ty Buckman/ Wittenberg University, U·S·A
Knut Brynhildsvoll, University of Oslo, Norway
Arturo Casas/Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain
Chen Zhongyi, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, China
Chen Wei, Shanghai Normal University, China
Fan Pik Wah, University of Malaya, Malaysia
Fan Xing, Wuhan University, China
Margot Hillel, Australian Catholic University, Australia
Martin Humpal, Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic
Koji Kawamoto，Tokyo University, Japan
Hank Lazer, University of Alabama, U.S.A
Lee Nam-Ho, Korea University, Korea
Leevi Lehto, Finland
Liao Kebin, Beijiing University, China
Liu Jianjun, Northeast Normal University, China
Luo Lianggong, Central China Normal University, China
Roland Lysell, University of Stockholm, Sweden
Anne-Marie Mai, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Yuri Mineralov, Maxim Gorky Literature Institute, Russia
Rana Nayar, Panjab University, India
Jale Parla, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi, Turky
Elizabeth Ramos, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brazil
John Rathmell, University of Cambridge, U.K
Derek Parker Royal, Western Illinois University, U.S.A
Stephan Michael Schröder，University of Cologne，Germany
RAkesh Mohan Sharma, SPN Mahavidyalaya, India
Monica Spiridon/ Bucharest University, Romania
Sun Jian / Fudan University, China
Jüri Talvet / University of Tartu, Estonia
Kwok-kan Tam, The Open University of Hong Kong, China
Jørgen Veisland, University of Gdansk, Poland
Tatiana Venediktova/ Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia
Tomo Virk / University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
Wang Xiaoping, Tianjin Normal University, China
Wang Lixing, Nankai University, China
Yin Qiping, Hangzhou Normal University, China
Zheng Kelu, Shanghai Normal University, China

Editorial Assistants
Liu Fuli
Yan Ggexin
Yi Lijun

主编
黄铁池／上海师范大学（中国）
聂珍钊／华中师范大学（中国）
查尔斯·罗斯／普渡大学（美国）

编委会
瓦莱丽·巴布／佐治亚大学（美国）
马西姆·巴斯加拉珀／热那亚大学（意大利）
台艾·巴克曼/威登堡大学（美国）
克努特·布莱恩希尔兹沃／奥斯陆大学（挪威）
阿图罗·卡萨斯/地亚哥-德孔波斯特拉大学(西班牙)
陈众议／中国社会科学院（中国）
陈伟／上海师范大学（中国）
潘碧华／马来亚大学（马来西亚）
樊星／武汉大学（中国）
玛格特·希勒尔／澳大利亚天主教大学（澳大利亚）
马丁·罕帕尔／布拉格查理大学（捷克）
川本皓嗣，东京大学（日本）
汉克·雷泽尔／阿拉巴马大学（美国）
李南浩／高丽大学（韩国）
利维·利托（芬兰）
廖可斌／北京大学（中国）
刘建军／东北师范大学（中国）
罗良功／华中师范大学（中国）
罗兰·利塞尔／斯德哥尔摩大学（瑞典）
安妮－玛丽·梅／南丹麦大学（丹麦）
尤里·米涅拉洛夫 /高尔基文学院（俄国）
瑞那·内亚尔／旁遮普大学（印度）
基尔·帕拉／伊斯坦布尔比尔基大学（土耳其）
伊丽莎白·拉莫斯／巴赫亚联邦大学（巴西）
约翰·拉斯梅尔/剑桥大学 （英国）
德雷克·帕克·罗亚尔／西伊利诺伊大学（美国）
斯蒂芬·迈克尔·施罗德（德国）
瑞凯士·莫汉·夏玛／ＳＰＮ大学（印度）
莫里卡·斯普里顿 / 布加勒斯特大学 (罗马尼亚)
孙建／复旦大学（中国）
居里·塔尔维特／塔尔图大学（爱沙尼亚）
谭国根／香港公开大学（中国）
乔根·维斯兰德／哥但斯克大学（波兰）
托莫·维尔克／卢布尔雅娜大学（斯洛文尼亚）
王晓平／天津师范大学（中国）
王立新／南开大学（中国）
塔吉亚娜·维涅季克托娃/国立莫斯科大学（俄国）
殷企平／杭州师范大学（中国）
郑克鲁／上海师范大学（中国）

编辑助理
刘富丽
杨革新
易立君

Contents

Introduction
Ty Buckman and Charles S. Ross 169

World Shakespeare

Othello and the French Tradition in *Les enfants du paradis*
Charles S. Ross 172
Shakespeare in Iowa
Brady J. Spangenberg 181
The Anti-Gaze in a Hybrid Shakespeare: A Discussion of Women Characters in *Prince of the Himalayas*
Runlei Zhai 194
Love and Empire: The Transnational Logic of Feng Xiaogang's *The Banquet*
Jinhua Li 206
Representations of Shakespearean Women in Contemporary Brazilian Media
Christiane F. de Alcantara 215
Creating the Ghosts of Modernity: Magic and Memory in *Hamlet* and *Cien Años de Soledad*
Jason Lotz 227

Renaissance Travels through Milton, Time, and Mind

Expensive Egypt
David Read 237
Language and Difference in Hakluyt's *Principal Navigations*
Marianne Montgomery 246
Olympias and Infidelity in the Alexander Romances: A Cross Cultural Study
Jena Al-Fuhaid 254
The Mythical Method in Song and Saga, Verse and Prose: Part II
James Nohrnberg 270
The Epic Decision: From Homer to Milton
Peter Hufnagel 303
The Fight Over the Body in *Paradise Lost* Book IV
Ty Buckman 317
Devotional Method and Efficacious Reading in John Donne's *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*
Mardy Philippian, Jr. 329
Wang Xiao-ping Won the 2nd Nara International Myriad Leaves Prize of Japan
Chao Gao 338

目　　录

导言 …………………………………………… 泰·巴克曼　查尔斯·罗斯(169)

世界的莎士比亚

《天堂的孩子》中的《奥赛罗》和法国传统 ………………… 查尔斯·罗斯(172)

莎士比亚在爱荷华 ………………………………… 布莱迪·斯班根贝格(181)

反凝视技巧在杂»fl fl˚¿–¨ ˙ — ˜ ¸ˆ£”¡¶ˇ†´ › ¯˝ı ¡• —¯fi— ¨¸˛ — ¿ ……… …………………………………………………………… ¨ (194)

爱情与江山:冯小刚《夜宴》中的跨国界思维 ……………………… 李‰ı哗(206)

莎士比亚式女性在当代巴西影视中的表现 …………………………………… ………………………………………… 克里斯蒂安·德·阿尔坎塔拉(215)

创造现代性的幽灵:《哈姆雷特》和《百年孤独》中的魔力与记忆 ……………… ……………………………………………………… 杰森·罗茨(227)

在文艺复兴中漫游:弥尔顿、时间和思想

昂贵的埃及 ……………………………………………………… 戴维·瑞德(237)

哈克利特《航海全书》中的语言与差异 ……………… 玛丽安·蒙哥马利(246)

亚历山大传奇中的奥林匹亚斯和背信弃义:一种跨文化研究…………………… ……………………………………………………… 耶拿·阿-福海德(254)

歌曲、传奇、诗歌和散文中的虚构方法 ……………… 詹姆斯·诺恩伯格(270)

史诗般的决心:从荷马到弥尔顿 ……………………… 彼得·胡夫纳格尔(303)

为身体而战:以《失落园》第四卷为例 ………………………… 泰·巴克曼(317)

约翰·邓恩《紧急时刻的祷告》中的祷告方法和有效阅读 …………………… ……………………………………………………… 马蒂·菲利皮(329)

王晓平获日本第二届 NARA 万叶世界奖 …………………………… 曹　高(338)

Introduction

Ty Buckman and Charles S. Ross

This issue of Forum for World Literature Studies focuses on the English Renaissance from a global perspective. It consists of two collections of essays, one for each of the two greatest English poets, Willliam Shakespeare and John Milton. The first collection, titled "World Shakespeares," continues work begun Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace, edited by Alexander C. Y. Huang and Charles S. Ross (Purdue University Press, 2009) and has been further inspired by the recent publication of Chinese Shakespeares by Alexander C. Y. Huang (Columbia University Press, 2009). These articles look at Shakespeare's influence and legacy not only in different countries but in different regions and literary genres; that is, not only in France, China, and Brazil, but also Iowa and the mythical town of Macondo.

The seven essays in the second grouping, titled "Milton, Time, and Mind," constitute a small but rich sampling of the scholarship that was presented at two meetings of the Purdue University Renaissance Prose Conference. The first of these conferences was held at Wittenberg University, November 1 and 2, 2007; the second conference, convened by former students in honor of Professor Michael Murrin of the University of Chicago and Professor James Nohrnberg of the University of Virginia, was held at Purdue University, November 5 and 6, 2009. Essays inspired by the work of Professor Michael Murrin at the University of Chicago will appear in the January 2011 issue of the journal Arthuriana.

Our travels through the Renaissance begin with an essay that looks at the French obsession with the theme of jealousy. In "Othello and the French Tradition in Les enfants du paradis," Charles S. Ross shows how the French have admired Shakespeare but also sought to provide a context for his work that would suit a French audience. Jealousy plays well in France, it seems, from Voltaire's imitation of the play in Zaire to Marcel Carné's film Children of Paradise. Germany provides the backdrop for the next essay, in which Brady Spangenberg takes a daring leap by showing how our current global interest in Shakespeare also works in terms of what in American letters is called regionalism. He shows how Shakespeare's play is as much about property as daughters, and the Iowan setting of Jane Smiley's imitation of King Lear, the novel and movie A Thousand Acres, gives us a unique view of the German inflections of midwestern America.

We next turn to the first of three essays on Hamlet. In her essay "The Anti-Gaze in a Hybrid Shakespeare: A Discussion of Women Characters in Prince of the Himalaya's," Runlei Zhai takes the issue of the female gaze familiar in literary students and combines it a theoretical approach to Asian Shakespeare found in Alexander Huang's work. The result is penetrating analysis what happens when the film-

maker Sherwood Hu sets Shakespeare's Hamlet in Tibet. Reading this essay, we were reminded of the scenes in the Merchant-Ivory film Shakespeare Wallah set in the Himalyan foothills. In that movie the end of colonialism seems to spell the end of Shakespeare in India. Zhai's essay suggests more positive aesthetic outcome for Shakespeare's fortunes, as in Feng Xiaogang's version of Hamlet, where slow-motion horses and beautiful landscapes make a similar experiement in beauty. But the film also raises cultural, as Jinhua Li shows in her essay "Love and Empire: The Transnational Logic of Feng Xiaogeng's The Banquet." Her argument is that The Banquet situates Hamlet in literary traditions associated with tenth-century China, the turbulent years of the the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms. One of these traditions, Li argues, is that of the beautiful woman who creates havoc.

Brazilian cinema and TV offer their own conception of women, which affects its representation of Shakespeare. Christiane F. de Alcantari, in her essay "Representations of Shakespearean Women in Contemporary Brazilian Cinema," provides a useful overview of a subject new to many of us, the Brazilian adaptations of The Taming of the Shrew, The Merry Wives of Windsor, The Merchant of Venice, and Romeo and Juliet. It is a rich tradition and worth considering for our courses on Shakespeare, particularly the way women find strategies for dealing with the men in their culture. It is not just American but global audience who need to pay closer attention to Shakespeare south of the border, a goal of comparative literature that can be facilitated by Jason Lotz's essay "Creating the Ghosts of Modernity: Magic and Memory in Hamlet and Cien A? os de Soledad." Despite differing conceptions of magic in the Renaissance and in Gabriel García Márquez's famous novel, the problem of memory provides a connection between Hamlet and magical realism, the term used to describe so much of modern literary fantasy.

If Shakespeare relation to the modern world is pervasive, it takes someone of Professor James Nohrnberg's scope and learning to argue for an equally pervasive presence of Milton in modern culture, and we are pleased to offer her his keynote address in addition to the other essays related to the theme of "Milton, Time, and Mind." In keeping with the nature of the journal in which they now appear, these essays involve journeys – across texts, cultures, times, genres, religious traditions, and media. (Indeed, Professor Nohrnberg's formidable essay at the heart of these selected papers crosses all of these boundaries itself.) It is useful to think of this grouping as a hinged diptych, with the three essays in the first panel taking up the experience of travelers and objects and fame that cross borders to arrive in Renaissance England. David Read, in his essay "Expensive Egypt," examines the place of Egyptian antiquities in the quotidian experience and popular imagination of Shakespeare's audience as a means of better understanding Shakespeare's vision of Alexandrian Egypt in Antony and Cleopatra. In "Language and Difference in Hakluyt's Principal Navigations," Marianne Montgomery argues that the penchant for early modern English travelers to ignore language difference in their travel narratives, and those few cases where the strangeness of a non-English language or the need for an interpreter is noted, both reveal deep-seated English cultural attitudes about distancing and embracing other cultures. And Jena Al-Fuhaid traces the depiction of the towering figure of

Alexander the Great and his lesser known mother Olympias across two cultures and two literary traditions languages and three centuries—to reveal the fundamental congruity that these literary figures evoke.

The hinge is provided by James Nohrnberg's expansive "The Mythical Method in Song and Saga, Verse and Prose: Part II," that takes as its starting point T. S. Eliot's formulation of a "mythical method" to explain the relationship between cultures and myths, past and present. In pursuit of his thesis, Nohrnberg's tour de force runs forward and backward in time, making its way between such texts as the Davidic cycle in II Samuel and Milton's Paradise Lost and Thomas Pynchon's Gravity's Rainbow, and up and down the scale of putative literary merit, from Virgil's Aeneid to Ian Fleming's Dr. No.

The second panel follows James Nohrnberg's treatment of Milton in the midst of his larger argument with three essays that concern how religious poetry in England in the seventeenth century can be read against its continental and classical analogues. Peter Hufnagel's essay, "The Epic Decision: From Homer to Milton," takes up the paradox that John Milton faces in rendering the fall of humankind in Paradise Lost as an essentially (Protestant) heroic act, one in keeping with the values of the epic tradition that he inherited from Homer's Iliad. Ty Buckman begins his essay, "The Fight Over the Body in Paradise Lost Book IV," with a single scene in from Milton's epic and traces it back to two points of origin, one in an obscure epistle in the New Testament, the other in Homer's Iliad, to illustrate the nature of the poet's "encyclopedic" impulse. And Mardy Philippian, Jr. concludes the collection with his essay, "Devotional Method and Efficacious Reading in John Donne's Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions," a study of Donne's greatest devotional text against the backdrop of its Spanish and English analogues, to argue that in place of a devotional method, Donne offers his readers a theology of language.

We hope that readers who follow these scholars on their various journeys here described will gain a sense of what was possible in literary criticism at the beginning of the twenty-first century, a time when the lack of a single dominant critical practice has made possible the crossing of many literal and figurative frontiers.

【Notes】

1. The editors gratefully acknowledge the skilled and tireless assistance of Gabriel Valley, an editorial research assistant and student at the University of Chicago, in the preparation of these essays.

Othello and the French Tradition in *Les enfants du paradis*

Charles S. Ross

Abstract The French have long both admired Shakespeare and despaired at finding a way to compete with his greatness. Voltaire imitated *Othello* in his play *Zaïre*, to great success, while perhaps the greatest French film, *The Children of Paradise* (*Les enfants du paradis*), includes a rousing staging of *the death of Desdemona* on the French stage of the 1830s. The main characters in the film each stress some aspect of how the French sought to incorporate Shakespeare while maintaining their own cultural identity.

Key words *Othello*; France; Voltaire; *Zaïre*; mime; jealousy

Author Charles S. Ross is Professor of English and Director of the Comparative Literature Program at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana. He has translated Boiardo's *Orlando innamorato* and Statius's *Thebaid* and is the author of *The Custom of the Castle from Malory to Macbeth* and *Elizabethan Literature and the Law of Fraudulent Conveyance: Sidney, Spenser, Shakespeare*. He is the co-edited with Alex C. Y. *Huang* of *Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace* and co-editor of *Forum for World Literature Studies*.

In America today *Othello* is a play about racial justice. In Stephen Greenblatt's classic reading in his chapter in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, for example, Othello registers the strains not just of a man whose skin color is different from that of his Venetian employers, but of a man who cannot find the keys to a society to which he is always an outsider. So many studies focus on Othello's race that one almost forgets the enormous part jealousy plays both in defining Othello's character and moving the plot. And perhaps one should. Even Giraldi Cinthio's source story seems to be a warning to fathers to be on the look out for barbarians, particularly those men who would steal away their daughters. It may in fact be a only a partial reading of *Othello* to regard it as a play about jealousy. Nonetheless, that is how the play comes across in Marcel Carne's 1944 French film *Les enfants du paradis* (*Children of Paradise*). The way the film selects from the play and the themes it chooses to emphasize illustrate several features of Shakespeare on film. It translates certain lines, gives emphasis, leaves out a lot, draws inspiration, but most of all develops a portion of the original that is not really there, or there only in a liminal way. Each of the main characters reflects a certain way French culture subsumes and transforms Shakespeare. A mime, a woman who loves more than one man, a dandified criminal, an actor who uses Shakespeare to advance his own career, and an aristocrat whose stabbing satisfies the French dissatis-

faction with Othello's brutal strangling of Desdemona—each illustrates the historical French reaction to Shakespeare.

The success and scandal of Shakespeare's art have been topics of French literature since at least the eighteenth century. [1] His reputation soared at mid-century when the French started to adore anything English. Yet it was also variously thought that Shakespeare's language was low, he mixed comedy and tragedy, his plots were too complicated, and he did not really understand love. He was a child of nature, a genius, but his art was scandalous and catered to the common taste. It was hardly fit for women of society to watch. By contrast, the classic French theater of Corneille and Racine, a product of the ancien regime under Louise XIV, was considered stately and refined. The actors declaimed in the twelve-syllable rhymed couplets called alexandrines, and a good speech was as good as a good story. As George Steiner has suggested, the plot of a classical French play can turn on the shift of a nominative case noun from the formal vous to the family tu (*After Babel*, 46). There is no rush to the end. Historically the stage was a place for the upper classes, including refined women.

Behind much French thinking about Shakespeare lies Voltaire, who could never get over some of Iago's lines in the first scene about a black ram topping a white ewe. Such lines were written for the audience, not for the art. They pandered to the people. And how could one write a play about a Moor who strangles his wife? Such barbarities and were a scandal to refinement. To correct the problem Voltaire wrote a play called *Zaïre* that is a version of *Othello* but more concerned with love than death: "Our [French] lovers," he said to the English, "speak as lovers, yours only as poets," by which, however, he meant that the French used the forms of gallantry popular at the court of Louis XV, not real passion (Haines 16).

Even as Shakespeare inspired the French, their attitude toward him was diffident. Voltaire corresponded widely and wrote two introductions to *Zaïre* but never mentioned *Othello*. His play was enormously popular: parodied, translated, and performed 488 times at the Comédie-Française between 1732 and 1936. Today it is thought that the play's improbabilities make it impossible to revive, that its attitude toward religion is contradictory, and even that its formal verse is weak, especially when compared to that of Racine, the master of the tragedy in alexandrines. But reading *Zaïre* reminds us of the fascination that certain Shakespearean passages could exert over readers. Voltaire's plot cannot bear comparison to Shakespeare's, but Orasmine's suicide speech, based on Othello's, is not bad. Orasmine, a Turkish sultan, is much more polished than Othello, and in complete contrast to Shakespeare's play, the Desdemona character, Zaïre, is in part responsible for his jealousy, since she discusses with Nérestan, her former prisoner companion and now rescuer, the conflict between her love for the sultan and the irreconcilable attraction of baptism and escape. Where Othello learns too late the truth of the handkerchief, Orasmine learns too late not that he has been deceived by his associate Coramine, as Iago deceives Othello, but that Nérestan is her brother, not lover. Although the plot creaks, it creates the right opportunity for Orasmine's final speech. As in Shakespeare, the repentant murderer suggests how events should be related, then surprises his audience

by killing himself. He uses the same weapon that he had use on *Zaïre*, and he concludes his speech with an anaphora, that Saturday afternoon matinee figure of speech where the first word of a line is repeated. The drum-beat suggests how much Voltaire wished to duplicate the power of what the plot produces in Shakespeare:

> Dis-leur qu'à ses genoux j'avais mis mes états;
> Dis-leur que dans son sang cette main s'est plongée;
> Dis que je l'adorais, et que je l'ai vengée. (Il se tue.)
> [Tell them that I laid my kingdom at her feet; tell them that I plunged this hand into her blood; tell them that I adored her, and that I have avenged her. (He kills himself.)][2]

As Voltaire's borrowing indicates, disdain for Shakespeare is a French pose, but so is adoration. Everyone from Voltaire on down loved the ghosts, which provided what Aristotle called the "probable impossible" and the French vraisemblance (Haines 30). It is interesting that the nineteenth-century Germans stressed the folk aspects of Shakespeare such as fairies and the supernatural and rejected his cosmopolitanism as too French. The French actors of the Comédie-Française started adopting the pantomime, practicing before mirrors, showing emotion, impressing spectators like Alexandre Dumas, Victor Hugo, Alfred de Musset, Théophile Gautier, and Hector Berlioz (Pemble 9). Berlioz saw *Hamlet* in September 1827, shortly after having heard Beethoven for the first time, and realized Voltaire's disdain was wrong about Shakespeare. He fell in love with and later pursued the English actress Harriet Smithson, who played Juliet and Ophelia. Berlioz finally met and married Harriet in 1833, although he had little English and she spoke only rudimentary French. In 1839 his *Roméo et Juliette* became a greatest success. It did not follow Shakespeare's text but relied on Garrick's version of the play he had seen in 1827. He flourished, but the woman who had played Juliet lost her career and her looks.

The fortunes of Othello have been traced by Margaret Gilman in her book *Othello in France* (Paris, 1925). In 1717 a piece called the *Dissertation sur la poèsie anglaise* focused on Desdemona's death by strangulation. If she was choked, how could she then talk to Emilia? The first translation, by Pierre-Simon La Place in 1745, eliminated coarse scenes, including Desdemona's murder. Iago's scenes are reduced, foreshadowing how the great Shakespearean theme of his inexplicable evil never does find its full equivalent in France. In 1785 a M. Butini produced a stage version, never produced, that featured a white Othello, the three unities, and an absent Iago in the final scene (Gilman 45). A 1793 version by Jean-François Ducis made Othello's skin yellow and leathery (Gilman 59 cites Ducis: "le teint jaune et cuivré... de ne point révolter l'oeil du public, et surtout celui des femmes"). It included some thoughts on the state of the French Revolution, which by 1792 had turned into a reign of terror, complete with spying, punishment, and vengeance rather than justice (Gilman 71). Nonetheless Ducis gave the play a happy ending, a tradition that will last through Les enfants du paradis. His plot became the basis for an opera by Giachino Rossini in 1816, centered on Desdemona (Gilman 90) which was translated into

French from Italian. In it Othello swears to get vengeance when the Iago figure presents him with an intercepted letter, written by Desdemona to the Doge's son, whom her father is forcing her to marry. Opera, it turned out, was the perfect venue for Shakespeare, since it did not have the formal requirements of tragedy such as the three unities or the notion that only upper class subjects were suitable.

As a result of the opera, Othello's story was very well known in France when the great poet Alfred de Vigny translated Othello and had it produced at the Comédie-Française in 1829. He added a long preface about the need to reform the French drama, what he called l'exécution, the call for realism that is one of the themes of Les enfants du paradis (Gilman 96). In his version Othello is not a blackamoor, with short, curly hair, but has "le teint d'Abd-el-Kadir" (letter of September 27, 1857, qtd. in Gilman 102).

For Victor Hugo, Shakespeare was a god. Hugo held séances during his twenty years of exile on the English Channel islands of Guernsey and Jersey, during which Shakespeare conveniently spoke to him in French, since he could not understand English (Pemble 10). His son François-Victor Hugo translated Shakespeare's complete works with good vocabulary and exactness in his 18 volume Oevres complètes de W. Shakespeare (Paris 1859 – 1866). Volume V is titled "Le Jaloux" and features Othello along with Cymbeline, illustrating the French fascination with jealousy that will culminate when Frédérick Lemaître in Les enfants du paradis exploits the theme by playing Othello.

The magnetism of certain set speeches that we see in Voltaire's *Zaïre* appear in various French films. *The Winter's Tale* underlies Conte d'hiver; we find rehearsals for a production of Shakespeare's *Pericles in Paris nous appartient* (dir. Jacques Rivette, 1960) and for *Richard III in L'important c'est d'aimer* (dir. Andrej Zulawski, 1975).[3] But nothing surpasses Frédérick Lemaître's speech as he murders his stage Desdemona in Marcel Carné's film *Les enfants du paradis* (*The Children of Paradise*, dir. Marcel Carné, 1945). Filmed in Vichy France in 1944 and finished after the liberation, it is considered one of the greatest of French films. For years in the 1950s and 1960s it was continuously shown along with Casablanca at the Brattle Street Theater in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

In *Les enfants du paradis* we see the classic themes of the French love-and-hate affair with Shakespeare. The film revolves around a woman of the demi-monde named Garance who is loved by four men, each jealous of the attention others pay to her. It is set in the theater world of 1830s Paris, a time, according to the credits, when the old classical style of declaiming texts was being replaced by a more emotional, realistic style. The narrative to the DVD set presents this as a war between two schools of French actors. But if we turn to our books about the influence of Shakespeare in France, we learn that in fact a series of performances in 1827 by English actors spurred a revolution in French acting. The film portrays this shift when the upstart actor Frédérick Lemaître turns a sentimental play into a farce and then performs Othello with a realism made all the more intense because his rivals for Garance watch him from the audience as he kills Desdemona.

Delight in the demi-monde world of courtesans, disdain for Shakespeare, a thea-

ter that played to a social class rather than a nation, as Shakespeare does by promoting English culture—all these appear in the film. One notices the elevated diction too, and a certain formal correctness that cannot be discerned by looking at just this one scene. There is also that particularly French idea of art as the mirror of society, one that finds its way to the foreign student of French literature through classic works like Alain Fournier's popular novel *Le Grand Meaulnes* (1913). This blending is, of course, a theme of Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and also *Hamlet*, where the play within the play mirrors the reality of King Hamlet's murder. Yet art and illusion can be found in almost all drama. The central theme of Shakespeare's influence in France, rather, jealousy, which both is and is not at the heart of Shakespeare's *Othello*.

In America today we usually think about *Othello* in terms of race and how Iago improvises his way to undoing his military commander. But for Les enfants du paradis, and in particular for the actor Frédérick Lemaître, *Othello* is a play about jealousy. In the film the character Garance is a high-class prostitute loved by four men: the mime Baptiste Debureau, whose love is hopeless; the actor Frédérick Lemaître, who seduces her but can live without her; a dandified criminal named Pierre François Lacenaire, who joins the crowd almost as if just to keep up appearances; and Édouard de Montray, an aristocrat who at the half-way point of this two-part film offers her his protection in exchange for her becoming his mistress. Each of the characters can be used to illustrate a particular aspect of the appropriation of Shakespeare into French culture.

The mime Baptiste Debureau (played by Jean-Louis Barrault, the teacher of Marcel Marceau) is perhaps the least Shakespearean character because he works without words. Of course there were undoubtedly great moments of miming in Shakespeare's theater, but they could not be known form the text alone, which represents such a challenge to interpreters in any country or culture. Baptiste's character is almost a parody of the French attraction to Shakespeare. He loves Garance but always from a distance, the way France loves Shakespeare as much by reputation as intimate knowledge. Meanwhile Baptiste is loved by a woman named Nathalie, who eventually marries him and bears him children. Nonetheless Baptiste carries a torch for Garance, almost in the same way as the French theater somehow longed for its own Shakespeare.

Unknown to Baptiste, Garance loves him, but knows she cannot live with him. Eventually a false accusation forces her to live with an aristocratic protector, Édouard de Montray. As the film climaxes, however, she returns to Paris after traveling with the Count and begins attending Baptiste's performances in secret. She is met in her private box by the actor Frédérick Lemaître, who has come to watch his rival in the theater. Lemaître suddenly realizes that his former lover in fact loves Baptiste and declares, perhaps a bit too pompously to be credible, that he himself now feels jealousy and so is ready properly to perform Shakespeare's *Othello*, having felt the proper emotional motivation.

Lemaître's definition of Othello solely in terms of jealousy illustrates how knowledge of a Shakespeare play begins with a limited understanding of the play. By defi-

ning the play as about jealousy Lemaître is able to wrap himself in Shakespeare's mantel and give his stage an artistic aura it needed. As Alex C. Y. Huang argues throughout his book *Chinese Shakespeares*, Shakespeare serves as a representation of himself, a form that can be appropriated by a foreign culture. For Lemaître the play gives him a way to break away from the outworn conventions of French drama. It may be that the film's authors realize there is much more to Othello than a portrait of jealousy, and that they transferred some of Iago's evil to the villainous Lacenaire and the self-involved Count de Montray. But Lemaître strikes the popular note. We may find his portrayal of Othello murdering Desdemona—the part of his play the film shows—melodramatic, but in the world of the film it is meant to be brilliant, emotional, and new. Watching from a box in the balcony where he sits with Garance, de Montray feels the jealousy toward Lemaître that on stage Lemaître as Othello expresses for Cassio. It makes for great cinema, and is on a par with the theatrical artificiality in Andrej Zulaski's *L'important c'est d'aimer*, where an actress struggles to play Shakespeare's Lady Anne in French:

> Lemaître (playing Othello): Get me some poison, Iago, this night. [Portez-moi du poison, Iago, ce soir.] I'll not expostulate with her lets her body and her beauty unprovide my mind.
>
> Iago: Do it not with poison. Strangle her in her bed, even the bed she hath contaminated.
>
> Lemaître (playing Othello): Yes, let her rot and perish and be damned tonight for she shall not live.... [His voice continues as the camera shifts: "Non, ma coeur est chargé avec..."]
>
> Montray: Such savagery and lack of decorum. I can't say I like this Monsieur Shakespeare. True, one goes to the theater today not for the play, but for the actors. Garance: You insisted on coming, my friend.
>
> Montray: No doubt I had my reasons.
>
> Lemaître (playing Othello): Hang her! I do but say what she is. The pity of it, Iago. The pity of it....
>
> ..... [after Garance insists to Montray that his rival is not Lemaître and a cut away to Baptiste entering the theater]
>
> Lemaître (playing Othello): That handkerchief which I so loved and gave thee, thou gavest to Cassio.
>
> Desdemona: No by my life and soul. Send for the man and ask him.
>
> Lemaître (playing Othello): Sweet soul, take heed. Take heed of perjury. Thou art on thy deathbed.
>
> Montray (to Garance): Dying: easily said, and just as easily done.
>
> Garance: Why do you laugh?
>
> Montray: Because if we duel in the morning, he won't be here to talk of death in the evening.
>
> Garance: You are mad, Edouard.
>
> Montray: Why should you care, if it's not him you love?
>
> Desdemona: Kill me tomorrow. Let me live tonight.

Lemaître (playing Othello): Nay, if you strive—
Desdemona: But half an hour. But while I say one prayer...
Lemaître (playing Othello): Being done there is but one pause.
Desdemona: But while I say one prayer.
Lemaître (playing Othello): It is too late. [Othello smothers her. The curtain falls. The audience applauds enthusiastically.][4]

In contrast to Lemaître, whose jealousy is more theatrical than real, the genuinely jealous character in *Les enfants du paradis* is Count Édouard de Montray. Suspecting that Garance loves Lemaître, he insults his rival by insulting Shakespeare, as he and his aristocratic friends repeat the centuries-old French accusations that Shakespeare is naïve and coarse, not fit for gentle ears:

Montray: Monsieur, you play your bloodthirsty brute so naturally.
Lemaître: You are too kind. I merely played him as Shakespeare wrote him, as natural as possible
Montray: A peculiar person, this Shakespeare. I hear he made his literary debut as a butcher's apprentice.
Lemaître: Why not?
Montray: Which would explain the bestial nature of his plays and his popularity among dockers and carters.
Lemaître: And kings!
First Aristocrat: I see why I found this play so distasteful and shocking. I'll buy my coachman a seat. It's worth trying.
Lemaître: Then allow me to offer you a box... for your[*put a space after box before the period*] horses! It's worth trying!

The Count and his friend represent the French upper classes for whom a character in the play of the French critic Cubières asked the rhetorical question, "Did ancient kings made love in Alexandrines?" The answer, surprisingly to us, was yes (Haines 34). The point is that one went to the theater to learn something about princes and high behavior, not the shenanigans of the lower classes.

Édouard de Montray is in the process of provoking Lemaître into a duel when Lacenaire shows him that his true rival is Baptiste. The Count de Montray's murderous rage finds itself blocked. He cannot accuse or kill Garance; he never has had her emotional loyalty. As a man of honor he can hardly challenge Lemaître and Baptiste. It would be meaningless to duel either one, since they are not part of his aristocratic world. At this point Lacenaire steps in. A rather asexual dandy, he has no interest in Garance except to make trouble, and needs to utter only a few insults before he and the Count are committed to a duel the next day. In a nice little touch that perhaps captures Othello's reference to his exploits in Aleppo, Lacenaire finds Montray in a Turkish bath and murders him there rather than wait for a duel.[5] He thus transfers what French tradition had regarded as the unacceptable stabbing of Desdemona by the barbarian Othello into the more properly French revolutionary theme of the striking

down of a rich aristocrat, even by a man who is little more than a member of the vile canaille.

Shakespeare has comic duels, which probably connect with the comic tradition of the commedia dell'arte that influenced French theater too. The confrontation of the drunken Lemaître with de Montray compares to the confrontation of Viola and Sir Andrew Aguecheek in *Twelfth Night*. But Shakespeare's plays have no one like Garance. She is a high-class prostitute who has sought the protection of a wealthy aristocrat—something common enough in Shakespeare day, when it is highly likely that Emilia Lanyer, the dark lady of the sonnets, was a kept woman in the household of the Lord Chamberlain who sponsored Shakespeare's own theater company. Shakespeare shows no real sympathy for common prostitute, and as common as the keeping of more fashionable mistresses must have been, we rarely see such a woman in any play. Iago accuses Bianca of being such a woman, but its seems that she loves Cassio rather than that she is a professional woman. The French film makes up for Shakespeare's lack in the figure of Garance, who has not one but four men in love with her.

Les enfants du paradis focuses on the love triangle, or rather, triangles, since four men love Garance. The competition of two men for a woman who loves both is a particularly French plot device that is surprisingly absent in Shakespeare's plays, though it does appear in his sonnets. Romeo has no rival for Juliet. She is never interested in Paris. Valentine in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* is willing to give Silvia to his friend Proteus, and Demetrius intrudes on the relationship between Hermia and Lysander in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, but Silvia and Hermia have no interested in the extra man. Theirs is not the story of François Truffaut's *Jules et Jim*. Directors like to suggest that Juliet's mother is attracted to Tybalt. It makes sense that a woman said to be twice Juliet's age and therefore about 28 and married to a man who has not danced for "five and twenty years" (*Romeo and Juliet* 1.5.37) should find a younger man attractive. But the play gives no hint of such a liaison. We never see Lady Capulet and Tybalt together. The love triangle that Othello imagines does not exist, since there is no evidence of a liaison between Cassio and Desdemona.

No woman in Shakespeare is emotionally torn by her love for two attractive men. There are duels, but none for honor alone, without regard to nationalism, or for the honor of a woman, as there are in French literature and *Les enfants du paradis*. Shakespeare's verse is the rich in vocabulary. It has nuance, but does not depend on it as exclusively as classical French theater, where often what is said hardly matters, only the way it is said. To bring Shakespeare into France successfully requires genius and the ability to transpose, to find equivalents and make substitutions. Les enfants du paradis does not look directly at Othello, but it captures enough of it to merit an honored place in the history of intercultural transpositions.

【Notes】

1. For accounts of the history of Shakespeare and France I have relied on Haines, Pemble, Gilman, and Lounsbury.

2. *Zaïre*, act 5, final scene, in Voltaire, *Complete Works*, 8:522. My translation
3. Richard Burt, "Mobilizing Foreign Shakespeare's in Media," 232, lists movies that include scenes from Shakespeare.
4. Quotations from *Les enfants du paradis* are taken from the English subtitles for convenience. I include an untranslated remark in French and a summary of the end. The film mirrors what is happening on stage between Othello and Desdemona, in italics, with the jealousy that seizes Édouard de Montray as he sits with Garance.
5. Mirella Jona Affron, in "'Les enfants du paradis': Play of Genres," 48, argues that the Turkish element is part of the melodrama that, more than Shakespearean tragedy, defines the genre of the movie.

【Works Cited】

Affron, Mirella Jona. "'Les enfants du paradis': Play of Genres," *Cinema Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Autumn, 1978), 45 – 52.

Burt, Richard. "Mobilizing Foreign Shakespeare's in Media." In *Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace*, eds. Alex C. Y. Huang and Charles S. Ross. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2009. Pp. 231 – 238.

Gilman, Margaret. *Othello in French*. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1925.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Haines. C. M. *Shakespeare in France: Criticism Voltaire to Victor Hugo*. London: Oxford University Press, 1925.

Huang, Alex C. Y. *Chinese Shakespeares: Two Centuries of Cultural Exchange*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Lounsbury, Thomas R. *Shakespeare and Voltaire*. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1902.

Pemble, John. *Shakespeare Goes to Paris: How the Bard Conquered France*. London: Hambledon and London, 2005.

Steiner, George. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Voltaire. *The Complete Works of Voltaire*. Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation. 1988. Vol. 8.

Les enfants du paradis. Dir. Carné, Marcel. Cinema Pathé. 1945.

Shakespeare in Iowa

Brady J. Spangenberg

Abstract Shakespeare and the US state of Iowa have few, if any, direct connections. Yet even from Iowa's early pioneer days of the mid-nineteenth century, Shakespeare has maintained a notable presence in Iowans' reading habits and imaginations due to his use of agricultural motifs to portray families in crisis, particularly in *Hamlet* and *King Lear*. Centered around the associated themes of individual toil and familial strife, this article surveys the history of Shakespeare in Iowa from Hamlin Garland's recollections about farm life in the 1870s to two contemporary film adaptations *Field of Dreams* and *A Thousand Acres*.
Key words *King Lear*; *Hamlet*; Iowa; Iowa films, Hamlin Garland; individual toil; agriculture in literature
Author Brady J. Spangenberg is a PhD Candidate in Comparative Literature at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana. He is currently at work on his doctoral thesis entitled, "Civil Death in Early Modern Europe from Luther to Hamlet." Email: bspangen@purdue.edu

In truth, William Shakespeare and Iowa, one of the United States, have very little in common. A mid-sized, land-locked state in the middle of America's Great Plains, Iowa sits more than fifteen hundred miles away in any direction from the nearest ocean. About ninety percent of Iowa's total land area (56,000 sq. miles/145,000 km^2) is devoted to agriculture. There are about seven times more pigs than citizens living within Iowa's borders (Monke). The state is not a cultural haven for early modern theater. Despite a town named Stratford in the north central part of the state (current population of 746), Shakespeare's armies, nobles, ships, pageants, and witty dialogue have never seemed at home in the sparsely-populated, rolling hills. As one twentieth-century chronicler of Iowans' reading habits put it, "While Shakespeare's works possess great literary value ... they are hardly suited to the abilities and the needs of the great masses of boys and girls who are finding their way into the high school" (Counts qtd. in Nemzek 224). Yet for all their seeming unsuitability, Shakespeare's plays have nonetheless persisted in Iowa, particularly those like *Hamlet* and *King Lear* that depict distressed individuals caught in a web of familial strife. Shakespeare permeates many literary and filmic depictions of Iowa, from Hamlin Garland's 1917 autobiography about growing up in Northeast Iowa to farm-based films of the late twentieth century such as *Field of Dreams* (dir. Phil Alden Robinson) and *A Thousand Acres* (dir. Jocelyn Moorhouse, adapted from Jane Smiley's 1991 book of the same name). The cultural interchange between Shakespeare and Iowa centers around the theme of individual toil and familial strife, a theme that is latent in Shake-

speare but brought into prominence by the culture and geography of Midwestern America.

To most Iowans past and present, Shakespeare's plays and even the playwright himself represent high intellectual culture, which is often contrasted with the common culture of a farm state where rural values predominate. In *A Son of the Middle Border* (1917), Hamlin Garland recounts how Shakespeare's lines provided a welcome escape from the monotony of northeastern Iowa farm life during the 1870s. "I now went about with a copy of Shakespeare in my pocket and ranted the immortal soliloquies of *Hamlet* and *Richard* as I held the plow" (206 – 07). Garland paints a picture of pastoral harmony, where the bard and the plow, the word and the hand, the closed theater and the open plain merge into a moment of spiritual nirvana. As a teenager Garland left his home state for artistic refinements of New England, and such spirit-enriching moments come to seem childish. Other Iowans have followed his example. Meredith Wilson (Mason City), John Wayne (Winterset), Johnny Carson (Corning), Bill Bryson (Des Moines), and Ashton Kutcher (Cedar Rapids) belong to the list of artistically successful Iowans who left the state, to return only sparingly if ever. Of course, all is not darkness among the cornfields. In the past ten years, Shakespeare has gained artistic ground in the Hawkeye State, which now boasts its own Shakespeare-oriented organization, the Iowa Shakespeare Experience (founded in 2002), as well as recurring productions such as the Iowa Repertory Theater's annual "Shakespeare on the Lawn" performance at the Salisbury House in Des Moines.[1]

Escapist literature, even if written by Shakespeare, can only fascinate the mind for so long before the reality of one's surroundings impinge on the fantasy. This interference is particularly true in Iowa, where, as Garland reminded his readers, the harsh reality often interrupts even the most pristine thoughts. The problem is that the details of farm life are messy, boring, and routine. When most authors write about the "merry farmer," Garland explains, they tend to "omit the mud and the dust and the grime, they forget the army worm, the flies, the heat, as well as the smells and drudgery of the barns" (129). If pushed far enough, any farm activity, such as milking cows on a frozen winter morning, can seem like an epic tale of humans overcoming adversity. But Garland's point is that such occurrences happen every day, and even worse, that one arduous activity always leads to another. The issue of timing on a farm almost completely negates the possibility of constructing a successful plot in the Aristotelian sense. There are no beginnings, middles, or ends, just conveyor belts of activity. Milking the cows also means cleaning their stalls and feeding them, and all of that before the milk sours or the bucket spills. Even harvest, the most conclusive event on a farm, can take over a month to complete.

The lack of an empirical connection between Iowa, the Bard, and his plays does not mean that Shakespeare can only serve as a marker of otherness for Iowans, of a life that is not their own. As Alex C. Y. Huang and Charles Ross have shown in their recent study of Shakespeare in Asia, each of Shakespeare's plays "has an uncanny ability to appeal to a generation or a culture" (2). Iowa is no different. In much the same way that Germany's G. E. Lessing found a genius in Shakespeare who could mirror all of his own writerly faults (377) and Ralph Waldo Emerson champi-

oned Shakespeare as the fount of individual creativity and originality (Bristol 124), Iowans have also squeezed some relevant lessons from the English playwright's works.[2]

At first, the lessons gleaned from Shakespeare were largely rhetorical and historical due to the influence of William Holmes McGuffey's *Readers*, an early English language textbook that emphasized diction, delivery, and rhetoric (Pawley 279). Aside from the odd library folio of Shakespeare or a personal edition of a well-to-do book collector, the McGuffey *Reader* is the place where nearly every nineteenth-century Iowan, including Garland, first encountered Shakespeare. In the *Rhetorical Guide*, first published in 1844, McGuffey included famous speeches by Hamlet, Henry V, Othello, and Marc Antony, which were all chosen for their historical value (Vail 17). Garland reports that he and his fellow students "were taught to feel the force of those poems and to reverence the genius that produced them, and that was worth while" (113). Of course, Garland's Shakespeare repertoire, at least according to his recollection some forty years after the fact, seems to have been much larger and more literary in nature than what the small passages from McGuffey's *Rhetorical Guide* would have offered. Nevertheless, Shakespeare had a place in early Iowa, tenuous and haphazard as it was.

Shakespeare's reputation for high culture in the early American Midwest may have also arisen due to the non-British cultural heritage of local residents. At the time of its inclusion in the Union in 1848, Iowa's white population possessed a mix of cultural heritages, with no one group exhibiting dominance. By 1870, the population of Iowa had eclipsed one million, of which a majority claimed German heritage, followed by Irish and Scandinavian (Bogue 89 – 90). British or English interests became relatively smaller and were restricted largely to venture capitalists (Cook 622). Even though the German-heritage immigrants were largely lower-class laborers and farmers, they likely also carried with them their peculiar cultural prejudices with regard to English theater in general and Shakespeare in particular, who has a long tradition in Germany dating back to the mid-eighteenth century.

German literary scholars and critics, who influenced Iowan culture, have looked up to Shakespeare as a model playwright worthy of emulation ever since Christoph Martin Wieland published the first German translations of Shakespeare between 1762 and 1766 (16 plays in all) and G. E. Lessing sung Shakespeare's virtues first in his *Literaturbriefe* and later in his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* (1767 – 68). Shakespeare's German legacy was not hindered by the fact that much about his plays remained a mystery. Many lines still seemed untranslatable, if not completely incomprehensible. "Is it then always Shakespeare," Lessing mimics his readers' concerns, "who understood everything better than the French? That makes us angry; we simply can't read him" (84).[3] Later Lessing reassured his readers that Germans still have much to profit from the beauties of Shakespeare's translated verses, even if some of the deficiencies threaten to diminish the value of the German language even further. Lessing held out hope that Shakespeare's "beautiful qualities" would in time be discovered and later appropriated by the German national theater (84). His theatrical successor in Germany, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, took up Lessing's charge and

began to mine Shakespeare for more thematic structures. In his famous "Rede zum Shakespeares-Tag [Speech on Shakespeare's Day]," given at his familial home in Frankfurt on October 14, 1771, Goethe emphasized the individuality of Shakespeare's stage figures, which he contrasted against the rigid structures of society:

> Shakespeare's theater is a beautiful show of rarities, in which the history of the world floats before our eyes on an unseen thread. His plots, speaking in the vernacular style, are not plots, but his pieces twist around a secret point (one that still no philosopher has either seen or defined), in which the very essence of our selves—the pretended freedom of our will—collides with the necessary progress of the entire world.[4]

Goethe retains a sense of his predecessor's mysticism about Shakespeare's plays, but Goethe also emphasizes the theme of individuals suffering at the hands of the world. It is this theme of suffering and society that carries over into narratives about Iowa. The lone farmer out in the field, the housewife silently enduring her lot at the kitchen table, the senile man agonizing over his decline—all of these figure into the lore of Iowa, and all of these are prominent in Shakespeare's tragedies, especially *Hamlet* and *King Lear*.

Shakespeare's presence in Iowa did not stagnate with the few soliloquies and conversations available in the McGuffey *Readers*. Iowa's population continued to grow on into the twentieth century and so did the demand for more intensive education. This push culminated in 1902 when the state legislature passed a mandate for compulsory school attendance (Pawley 278). Shakespeare's history plays remained the most widely read, but as Claude Nemzek's survey of 1929 high school curricula reveals, Iowans were beginning to develop a taste for comedy and tragedy as well. Nemzek shows how Shakespeare's plays account for five of the top twelve titles most regularly used in Iowa textbooks during 1929: *The Merchant of Venice*, *Macbeth*, and *Julius Caesar* enjoyed top-five status in every available study. *As You Like It* and *Hamlet* also saw regular use (223). But if the only lessons early Iowans took from Shakespeare emphasized the high culture of early modern England, which displayed sophisticated speech patterns, rhetoric, and poetry, then Shakespeare could just as easily be supplanted by travel literature or foreign romance literature, both of which are easier to read. There had to be another reason to keep Shakespeare's plays in focus.

If one considers the German reception of Shakespeare in conjunction with his persistence in nineteenth-century Iowa, the shared mystified attraction among both sets fits with what Harry Levin calls a general acknowledgement of Shakespeare's rhetorical and experiential superiority (112). For Iowans in particular, Shakespeare represents a legacy of nineteenth-century American escapism, a hope for future cultural refinement, that was tinged with a sense of identification. The trials of daily life on the Midwestern plains taught the early settlers that survival was anything but easy, particularly when just it is just one person and (maybe) his or family striving against the world. This scenario blossoms in *King Lear* and *Hamlet*.

The broad expanse of the Iowa landscape, rather than inviting its denizens to ex-

plore, tends to drive them closer together, as if each homestead, each community were united against the detrimental forces both natural and man-made of the outside world. Shakespeare's tales of families in crisis, particularly those such as Hamlet's and Lear's who are involved in a property quarrel, provide insight into the vicissitudes of Iowa life. In his essay "What is the Midwestern Mind?", Thomas T. McAvoy notes that the most important problem for Midwesterners at any given time "is the Midwest, the land in which they live, earn their livelihood, and plan their future. They are chiefly concerned with the prosperity, the business, the labor relations and the suitability of their own community" (12). In this sense, Iowans tend to look at *King Lear* as a play not about the younger generation's desire for a quick inheritance (the greediness toward the fathers that Goneril, Reagan, Edmund exhibit). Rather, Iowans focus on the raging patriarch who neglects to care properly for the transfer of his estate and power. Iowans find the same problem of inheritance in *Hamlet*, namely that the problems at Elsinore lie not with the younger generation but with the ruling generation's failure to maintain the steady, uncontested strength of the kingdom.

The Iowan focus on comfort over money is partly due to the middle-to-lower class heritage of many of the state's inhabitants. As McAvoy explains, the industrial and agricultural development of Iowa was largely a lower middle-class project (6). Any type of financial success was (and still is) generally explained as the fruit of hard work, a lesson Hamlin Garland learned well under the rule of his task-master father. "Having had little play-time himself," Garland remembers of his father, "he considered that we were having a very comfortable boyhood. Furthermore the country was new and labor scare. Every hand and foot must count under such conditions" (100). Each individual functions as an essential cog in the wheel of daily activity, and any deviation from one's expected duties, as with the increasingly unpredictable Hamlet or the ever-more bumbling Lear, threatens to undo the entire community.

As is often the case in Shakespeare's social groupings, the close-knit qualities of many Iowa families and communities are what make them successful, but this proximity also tends to exacerbate any discontent. More than a few Iowans have, at one point in their life, uttered along with Hamlet, "Iowa's a prison" (compare Hamlet on Denmark, 2.2.243).[5] Many would stay, but the lack of opportunity for intellectual and professional advancement sends young Iowans elsewhere. Hamlet similarly dreams of continuing his education outside of Elsinore's walls, but family matters keep him close to home. Iowa life is similarly determined by a tenuous equation in which communal success must be balanced against individual aspirations. Such an equation is rarely in balance, often leading to a tension that boils just beneath the sunny surface, and so Shakespeare's plays provide more than just a means of imaginative escape. Constantly at odds yet hopelessly bound to each other, the families surrounding the Kings Hamlet and Lear serve as models for understanding life lived between the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers.

Despite the efforts of some critics to prove otherwise, Shakespeare was not an agriculturalist.[6] But knowing how to work the land is different from knowing how the land works, and it is the latter which Shakespeare uses to great effect both in *Hamlet* and *King Lear*. Producing a successful harvest requires planning, careful mainte-

nance, persistence, and a little bit of luck, all of which exist in the kingdoms of Denmark in *Hamlet* and ancient England in *King Lear*. In both plays, Shakespeare invokes the landscape and agricultural concerns as a backdrop for his portraits of individual suffering amidst familial discord. In the middle of Act 4 of *Hamlet*, Cladius muses over how best to deal with the increasingly troublesome Hamlet: "He's lov'd of the distracted multitude," Claudius proclaims as he goes on to compare the management of his kingdom to crops producing an even yield. The common people "like not in their judgment, but their eyes, / And where 'tis so, th' offender's scourge is weigh'd, / But never the offense. To bear all smooth and even, / This sudden sending him away must seem / Deliberate pause" (4.3.4 –9). Like Claudius, King Lear invokes agricultural imagery in his darkest hour. When it looks like the usurping Edmund has taken control of the kingdom, the broken King comforts Cordelia with a prophecy of bad harvests, "Wipe thine eyes; / The good-years shall devour them, flesh and fell, / Ere they shall make us weep! We'll see 'em starv'd first!" (5.3.23 –25). Though both kings treat agricultural issues as secondary to the more important matters of family and power, they still refer to land management as a means to assess Hamlet and Edmund's behavior. In other words, bad harvests and starvation do not make for good stories in themselves but rather signify the stakes of the main familial drama.

Lear knows Edmund lacks the power to manage a harvest, much less a kingdom. His incapacity for genuine rule makes his attempt to seize power immoral, not any abstract spiritual flaw or philosophical error. Lear's language recalls the Biblical Joseph's invaluable interpretations of the Egyptian Pharoah's two agricultural dreams, the first about fat and skinny cattle and the second about corn stalks devouring each other (NRSV, Gen. 41:1 –8). Had Joseph not been there to help Pharaoh manage the harvest, most of the Egyptian populace would have perished. The same, Lear thinks, will be true of Edmund's reign.

The way in which Shakespeare's characters manage the land marks the passage of time and character development, but the productivity of a particular tract of land also serves as a tangible way to measure the wisdom of past decisions. Are the living conditions growing better or worse? Is the social welfare improving or suffering? Claudius claims that the multitude is distracted by Hamlet's mischief, but he never states what the Danish populace is neglecting. Are they the striking artisans of *Julius Caesar* or have the Danes left the plow in the field? Either way, Claudius, as ruler of the kingdom, needs to find a way to get them back to work. As the members of Hamlet's and Lear's families increasingly turn their attention toward each other, they also turn away from the material success of their kingdoms.

An untended field means trouble elsewhere, and one can often start with the household. True to their Shakespearean models, the films *Field of Dreams* and *A Thousand Acres* use an agricultural background as a means to measure the moral success of the landowners. Both films depict a family farm in danger due to some ill-conceived decisions by the familial figurehead. *Field of Dreams* follows a *Hamlet*-style plot of an impetuous young know-it-all with a few crazy ideas, while *A Thousand Acres*, in an adaptation of *King Lear*, marks the decline of an aging patriarch intent on

dividing his kingdom amongst his three daughters. In both cases, the fate of the farm mirrors that of the family. Where *Field of Dreams* ends happily for the Kinsella family, *A Thousand Acres* ends with every acre of the Cook operation on the auction block. Neither story focuses directly on the day-to-day operations of the respective farms. The movement from planting to harvest does not become an epic of man versus nature. Rather agricultural processes move along in the background, just as they do in *Hamlet* and *King Lear*, marking both time and morality. Here success is not measured by triumph or wealth but rather by maintenance. As McAvoy has remarked, those that succeed in Iowa are the ones who focus on the problem of living with and for each other, who focus on "the land in which they, earn their livelihood, and plan their future" (12). The story of Iowa is not one of immediate success but of survival, of living to grind out yet another day and another year.

The Iowa version of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is the film *Field of Dreams*, which presents the story of Ray Kinsella (Kevin Costner), a New Jersey man who marries an Iowa woman, Annie (Amy Madigan), and decides to try his luck at farming. "The only thing we had in common," Ray narrates the opening sequence, "was that she was from Iowa, and I had once heard of Iowa." The locals, particularly Ray's brother-in-law Mark, consider Ray the ultimate outsider and doomed to failure. How could someone with virtually no prior knowledge about farming presume to succeed in an endeavor that requires intimate knowledge of the region's weather, soil, and people? Like Hamlet duly engrossed in his philosophical studies in Wittenberg, Germany, Ray proves himself to be a moderate success among foreigners. His fortunes, however, take a turn after he hears a ghostly voice emanating from somewhere in his cornfield, saying, "If you build it, he will come." The rest of the movie turns on various interpretations of the pronouns "it" and "he," but initially Ray believes he must build a baseball field (the "it") in the middle of his cornfield so that an old-time baseball player named Shoeless Joe Jackson (the "he")—who was banned from the game in 1919 for allegedly losing the World Series intentionally—can return to enjoy the game one more time. At the end of the movie, Ray finds himself in a Hamlet-inspired face off with his deceased father (the actual "he"). Just as at times only Hamlet can hear or be addressed by his father's ghost, not everyone in Ray's family can hear the ghostly voice, much less understand its cryptic riddles. It takes a singular act of belief to pursue the ghost's suggestions for better as with Ray or for worse as with Hamlet.[7]

Like *Hamlet*, *Field of Dreams* is essentially a family drama set against an agricultural backdrop. Just as Denmark is an unweeded garden, Ray's cornfield, with the large baseball diamond in its midst, appears doomed to produce an unprofitable, and therefore unsuccessful, harvest. The prospect of unproductive farmland sends Ray's brother-in-law into a near apoplectic fit near the end of the movie, recalling the earlier scene when Ray plowed under his ripening corn crop:

Mark: Ray do you realize how much this land is worth?
Ray: Yeah, yeah, 2200 hundred bucks an acre.
Mark: Well, then you gotta realize you can't keep a useless baseball diamond

in the middle of rich farmland!

During the plowing scene, the camera focuses mainly on a half-smiling Ray, but in the background, There sit all of his neighbors watching from the roadside. In a scene reminiscent of the final duel in Hamlet, the local townspeople even bring lawn chairs, waiting, one supposes, for lightning to strike the foreigner for his lunacy. Like Hamlet, for whom everyone has a different explanation, Ray's behavior is both explicable and inexplicable. The individual toils while those around him bicker and snipe.

If *Field of Dreams* creates an agricultural setting for one man's strange behavior, Jane Smiley's 1991 novel *A Thousand Acres* and Jocelyn Moorhouse's film adaptation of it offer a similar rural setting for Shakespeare's *King Lear*. The issue here is not the mystery of a man but the careless division and legacy of a farm. Like the drudgery of day-to-day farm operations, land quarrels are tedious affairs at best. They generally involve a multitude of interested parties, largely hinge on legalistic details, and rarely end with any sort of timeliness. Yet Shakespeare's *King Lear* opens with just such an event that requires both a considerable amount of time and staging. The first scene of *Lear* is only one of four in the play to eclipse three hundred lines, and it commands the onstage presence of nearly the entire principal cast. The scene touches every aspect of the proposed property transfer: property lines, management requirements, familial relationships, and even financing ("nothing will come of nothing"). This initial and detailed focus on Lear's divestiture provides a foundation for the legal and familial drama that follows because it specifically delineates what is at stake for all involved parties. Second, the settlement establishes a type of moral barometer by which one can assess character and decision-making in the play. Here again the financial, legal, and managerial details of a land arrangement form the basis of an unfolding familial drama, and though these details are somewhat tedious, they are still necessary. Inter-familial intrigue is only interesting if we know what the members are fighting about.

As the movie title *A Thousand Acres* suggests, numbers frame the action of the film even though the characters rarely discuss them outright. Most of the details about the Cook homestead are condensed into Larry Cook's (Jason Robards) one-minute speech to his eldest daughter Ginny when the film opens. In an attempt to capture the ceremonial grandeur of Shakespeare's initial scene, Larry and Ginny stand in an untilled field beneath the late-morning horizon. The mix of sun, cornrows, and light breeze suggest the expansiveness of the Cook agricultural operation. In Smiley's novel, Ginny goes into more exacting detail, easily reciting the worth of each acre on the family farm, around $3200 per acre in 1979, and she assures the reader that her father not only knows the value of all the other farms in the county but also the amount of debt each owner currently carries (23). The movie dialogue is more nebulous with the facts and figures, but the elder Cook recalls his ancestors building and cultivating "everything" by hand. This "everything" is just as non-specific as Cordelia's "nothing," so one at least has a sense of the plot's downward trajectory.

The carefully planned divestiture, endowed with all the official pomp of courtly or, in the case of Moorhouse's film, agricultural simplicity, turns into a free-for-all

where all predators, leeches, and hangers-on strive to claim a piece of the kingdom. This disarray stems from the concerted attention paid to land boundaries at the outset of Shakespeare's play. Without Lear and Larry Cook's geographic and mathematical descriptions, it would be impossible to know what exactly is at risk. In this sense, the rest of the plot develops into one big argument about who gets to manage what.

The opening scene of *King Lear* asks much of anyone striving to produce a contemporary adaptation. The scene must not only include all the legal, geographical, and financial details of Lear's divestiture (including his own personal addenda), it must also depict the escalating emotional tension in the room, as first Cordelia and then Kent receive their respective banishments. Though it is a relatively long scene compared to others in the play, the pace should feel rushed, giving rise to the sense that the various judgments, proclamations, and decisions have not been fully thought through. Lear's "fast intent" only picks up speed as it encounters more resistance, and Goneril's closing line does nothing to retard the pace, "We must do something, and i' th' heat" (1.1.307). Lear's stormy exit from the court should leave a sense of uncertainty. The divestiture itself as well as Cordelia's disinheritance happen so fast that it becomes difficult to predict what will happen next. "Such unconstant starts," as Regan calls them (1.1.299), require everyone to prepare for an uncertain future.

Moorhouse's version of the divestiture scene figures this uncertainty by letting the camera pan to each family member's face as they individually pale during Larry's announcement. The scene occurs on the edge of a recently planted field, symbolizing hope for the year's crop, while the grand patriarch sits beneath an enormous oak tree so tall the screen shot captures all trunk and no leaves. The correlation between Larry Cook and stolid nature recalls the opening scene in Peter Brook's famed 1971 film, where Lear, played by Paul Scofield, appears wearing a massive bearskin cloak, seated in a dome-like throne of stone. Imposing as Scofield's presence is, the scene contrasts with the opening montage, in which shabbily-clad peasants make a difficult trek toward the castle to hear the King's doom. Here again, the land structures the unfolding familial drama. In contrast to the scowling Scofield, Jason Robards delivers his divestiture intentions with flowing ease, turning the figure of Lear into more of a doddering yet benevolent grandfather, which is perhaps even more dangerous in farm management terms. At least the tyrant knows what he wants.

The world outside the family or community, though dangerous, can be overcome as long as everyone gets along. From the days of back-breaking pioneer toil to the current time of genetically-modified seeds and ten-thousand-acre farms, the outside world has been and still is brutal. A decade rarely goes by in Iowa in which tornadoes, floods, hailstorms, drought, and markets have at one time or another endangered the communal welfare, and the years between 2000 and 2010 have been no different. One of the worst disasters of decade was the F5 tornado that nearly decimated the small town of Parkersburg, Iowa, on May 25, 2008. With winds above 205 miles per hour the tornado destroyed nearly forty percent of the homes in the area. But according to Parkersburg City Clerk Gary Hinders, the community response was to rebuild right away: "[The residents'] attitude has been 'lead, follow or get out of the

way. ' They were digging basements before their debris was hauled away" (Love).

In the face of widespread destruction on his stage, Shakespeare too tends to end his tragedies with a vision of community-building. In *Lear*, the now elder statesman Albany declares a state of mourning, "Our present business is general woe," but he also directs Kent and Edgar to start figuring out how to restore order, "Friends of my soul, you twain / Rule in this realm, and the gor'd state sustain" (5.3.319 – 21). In the case of *Hamlet*, it is worth noting that due to the strength of the Danish royal family, Norway's Young Fortinbras must pass over Denmark on his first martial expedition and instead attack the much weaker and less valuable Poland (2.2.71 – 76). But at the end of the play, after the Danish royals have murderously torn themselves apart, Fortinbras opts for a state funeral, an act of reconciliation between the warring parties, in hopes of restoring order to the beleaguered kingdom (5.2.395 – 403). There is a lesson to be learned from both Shakespearean families and Iowa communities: a group of people can accomplish nearly any objective, overcome any obstacle, so long as they do not succumb to infighting in the process.

This lesson plays out at the close of both *A Thousand Acres* and *Field of Dreams*, though in almost polar opposite fashion. Where the Kinsellas find that their magical baseball field has brought the family closer together as well as the promise of commercial success as a tourist attraction (the movie set in Dyersville remains a tourist attraction to this day), the Cook family farm and homestead have been sold to a large farming conglomerate. Like Lear and his daughters, the Cook family virtually imploded. In a modern update to Shakespeare's tragedy, Moorhouse, following Smiley's novel, ascribes the primary cause of the family's downfall to Larry Cook's incestuous relationships with his two eldest daughters. As the anthropologist and social theorist René Girard points out, "incestuous propagation leads to formless duplications, sinister repetitions, a dark mixture of unnamable things" and virtually invites a crisis of community-shattering proportions (75, 115). Invariably in societies where incest is forbidden, there is no social fix for incest except for all parties to move on in separate directions, either that or risk a violent crisis of community-shattering proportions (49). This dispersal is true for the Cooks in *A Thousand Acres*. Each of the sisters moves on in her own way. Ginny flees to Minneapolis, Minnesota where she takes a non-descript job as a waitress in a roadside café; Rose tries to continue the farming operation but eventually succumbs to cancer; and the youngest Caroline, the Cordelia figure, returns to her job as a lawyer in Des Moines (the capital of Iowa and often the symbol of urban, non-agricultural living). But even with the members of the Cook family scattered, the final image of the film--another Iowa trope--reveals a panoramic view of a country road next to a cornfield, while Ginny narrates a monologue about hope for the next generation in the form of Rose's two daughters, Pammy and Linda. Their names and genders may be different than the Duke of Kent and Edgar, but their task remains the same, namely to sustain the communal project.

Though *Field of Dreams* is a success story and does not follow the same downward, tragic trajectory of its Shakespearean model, Ray Kinsella's success is similarly explained as a boon for the entire community. Ray's double victory of familial and agricultural sustainability mirrors that of Young Fortinbras, for he as well, in an unsta-

ted way, seeks to rectify his forefather's shortcomings and, likewise, restore his family and state's reputation. The success of Ray's magical baseball field is prophesied by Terrence Mann (James Earl Jones), "People will come, Ray. They'll come to Iowa for reasons they can't even fathom." The same could be said of Shakespeare himself.

The details of life on an Iowa farm do not make for great literature, theater, or film. The days are long; the activities are repetitive; and the triumphs are small. Yet for a few souls, like Hamlin Garland, there remains a certain romantic magnificence embedded in the state's rolling hills but not in the sense of mountaintop panoramas or ocean horizons. Rather, the Iowa countryside offers a glimpse of an endless horizon, one that allows its residents to dream of something beyond the homestead but not so much as to make them believe that their efforts are insignificant. This perhaps explains the mix of attraction and criticism that sustains the view of Shakespeare as escapist literature. But as in his plays, the numerical, geographical, and environmental details of the landscape provide a backdrop to other types of narratives. Stories about familial strife often find the greatest expression when the land is at stake. This is because crises do not develop overnight, nor is it possible to judge them immediately after the fact. One must wait, like Young Fortinbras in *Hamlet* or Kent and Edgar in *King Lear*, to see what can be salvaged, what must be remembered, and what must be forgotten. The history of Shakespeare in Iowa follows much the same path. Often praised, regularly undermined, sometimes forgotten, yet he persists. Even without a direct physical link to Iowa life, he functions like the voice in Ray Kinsella's field, disembodied and a little vague yet instructive in the ways of families and land management.

【Notes】

1. More information on the Iowa Shakespeare Experience is available at their Web site <www. iowashakespeare. org>, and the performance schedule for Shakespeare on the Lawn can be found at <http://www. salisburyhouse. org/events_shakespeare_on_the_lawn. html>.
2. All translations from German are my own. "So würde ich Shakespeares Werk wenigstens nachher alseinen Siegel genutzt haben, um meinem Werke alle die Flecken abzuwischen."
3. "Aber ist es den immer Shakespeare, der alles besser verstanden hat als die Franzosen? Das ärgert uns: wir können ihn ja nicht lesen."
4. "Schäkespears Theater ist ein schöner Raritötenkasten, in dem die Geschichte der Welt vor unsern Augen an dem unsichtbaren Faden der Zeit vorbeiwallt. Seine Plane sind, nach dem gemeinen Stil zu reden, keine Plane, aber seine Stücke drehen sich um den geheimen Punkt (den noch kein Philosoph gesehen und bestimmt hat), in dem das Eigentümliche unsres Ichs, die prätendierte Freiheit unsres Wollens, mit dem notwendigen Gang des Ganzen zusammenstößt."
5. All quotations from Shakespeare's plays are taken from The Riverside Shakespeare, ed. G. Blakemore Evans, 2nd edition.
6. In her monumental analysis of Shakespeare's imagery, Caroline Spurgeon registers a few Shakespearean references to farming, yet when compared to those for gardening, the farming references "are not only much more perfunctory and general, but are very small in number" (46). In a 1985 article in Agricultural History, Robert Spier and Donald K. Anderson attempt to refute Spurgeon and argue that Shakespeare not only had a more intimate knowledge of agriculture but that he also wrote

that knowledge into his plays. Yet the evidence is paltry at best. Shakespeare refers to the plow only three times (LLL 5.2.884; Henry 5 4.08.14; and Two Noble Kinsmen 2.3.28). At one point in Henry V, he makes reference to a colter, a knife that cuts the turf in advance of the plowshare, as it "rusts through disuse (5.2.46)" (Spier and Anderson 451). The colter reference appears in the Duke of Burgundy's eulogistic entreaty to the warring Kings of England and France. Peace, Burgundy laments, "hath from France too long been chas'd, / And all her husbandry doth lie on heaps, / Corrupting in its own fertility" (5.2.38 – 40). The only practical farming advice contained in Burgundy's lament works as a type of negative example, namely how magistrates and farmers ought not to behave. Though they attempt to prove otherwise, Anderson and Spier eventually must capitulate to Spurgeon's thesis that Shakespeare's farm imagery is almost wholly metaphorical rather than realistic.

7. Stephen Greenblatt, in *Hamlet in Purgatory*, has argued that Hamlet's singular failure to follow his father's commands, first to avenge his murder but secondly to, "Remember me" (1.5.91), are what ultimately lead to his undoing. This causes a "shift of emphasis from vengeance to remembrance" (208). It is also worth noting that Hamlet completely forgets his father's request not to blame Gertrude for her speedy remarriage.

【Works Cited】

Bogue, Allan G. "The People Come." *Schwieder* 83 – 103.

Bristol, Michael. *Shakespeare's America, America's Shakespeare*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Cook, Pauline. "Iowa Place Names of Foreign Origin." *The Modern Language Journal* 29.7 (Nov. 1945): 617 – 28.

Garland, Hamlin. *A Son of the Middle Border*. Lincoln, NE: U of Nebraska P, 1979.

Girard, René. *Violence and the Sacred*. Trans. Patrick Gregory. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1977.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. "Rede zum Sch? kespeares Tag." *Shakespeare in Europe*. U of Basel, Switzerland. 2002. Web. 2 May 2010.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Hamlet in Purgatory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2001.

Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version. New York: Oxford UP, 1989.

Huang, Alexander C. Y. and Charles S. Ross. "Introduction to Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace." *Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace*. Eds. Alexander C. Y. Huang and Charles S. Ross. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue UP, 2009. 1 – 14.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun. GmbH & Co. 1981.

Levin, Harry. "The Primacy of Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 26.2 (Spring 1975): 99 – 112.

Love, Orlan. "Parkersburg a Shining Example of Post-Disaster Recovery." *Iowa. com.* The Gazette. 2010. Web. Apr. 30 2010.

McAvoy, Thomas T. "What is the Midwestern Mind?". *Schwieder* 3 – 24.

McManaway, James G. "Shakespeare in the United States." *PMLA* 79.5 (Dec. 1964): 513 – 18.

Monke, Lowell. "The Pigs of Iowa." *NetFuture* 114 (Nov. 30, 2000). Web. 20 Jul. 2010.

Moorhouse, Jocelyn, dir. *A Thousand Acres*. Touchstone Pictures, 1997. Film.

Nemzek, Claude L. "English Programs of High Schools in Iowa." *The School Review* 40.3 (Mar. 1932): 221 – 26.

Robinson, Phil Alden, dir. *Field of Dreams*. Universal Pictures, 1989. Film.

Ross, Charles S. "*Othello* and the French Tradition in *Les enfants du paradis*." Unpublished manuscript.

Schwieder, Dorothy, ed. *Patterns and Perspectives in Iowa History*. Ames, IA: Iowa State UP,

1973.

Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. 2nd ed. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans, et al. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.

Smiley, Jane. *A Thousand Acres*. New York: Anchor Books, 1991.

Spier, Robert F. G. and Donald K. Anderson, Jr. "Shakespeare and Farming: The Bard and the Tusser." *Agricultural History* 59.3 (Jul. 1985): 448–61.

Spurgeon, Caroline F. E. *Shakespeare's Imagery: And What It Tells Us*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1958.

Vail, Henry Hobart. *A History of the McGuffey Readers*. Cleveland, OH: The Burrows Brothers Co, 1911.

The Anti-Gaze in a Hybrid Shakespeare: A Discussion of Women Characters in *Prince of the Himalayas*

Runlei Zhai

Abstract Sherwood Hu's *Prince of the Himalayas* reverses the characteristic gaze of Hollywood films by refusing to confine itself to the other position. The film is an example of hybrid Shakespeare, but instead of waiting passively for Shakespeare's gaze, Hu challenges Shakespeare, especially Shakespeare's characterization of the female characters in the play. Using elements of Eastern culture, Hu rewrites Gertrude and Ophelia, and creates the wolf woman. By reversing the relationship between the gazer and the gazed, Hu establishes the theme of love, forgiveness, and faith. Hu's anti-gaze marks a new trend of Asian Shakespeares.

Key words anti-gaze; hybrid Shakespeare; love; forgiveness; faith; mask

Author Runlei Zhai is a Ph. D. student in Department of Comparative Literature at Purdue University. She got her first Ph. D. degree in American Literature at Beijing Foreign Studies University. Her research interests include American western fiction and Chinese western fiction, women's writing, and environmental literature. Email: rzhai@ purdue. edu

In "Conflicting Fields of Vision: Performing Self and Other in Two Intercultural Shakespeare Productions," Joanne Tompkins argues that "[performing] Shakespeare with, among, and against other cultures (particularly non-Western cultures) directly confronts otherness and the anxiety it produces, since Shakespeare—used for centuries as a marker of 'self' in the Western world—is not the only 'self' on stage" (611). The anxiety appears in most Asian Shakespeares. Korean Director Lee Yountaek, for example, produced *Hamlet* in Seoul in 1996, but according to Yeeyon Im, the production reflected nothing but "the impasse of contemporary Korean society" (276). Japanese productions of Shakespeare face a similar challenge of erasing or compromising the local culture.[1] In 2006, Chinese director Feng Xiaogang produced *The Banquet*, a film version of *Hamlet* with martial-arts elements, that pleased neither European critics, who labeled the film to be too westernized, nor Chinese reviewers, who complained that it aims at a "completely non-Chinese audience" (Huang 234). That same year a Tibetan version of *Hamlet* was released. Directed by Sherwood Hu, this film entered the running for the Golden Globe Awards in 2007 and won awards in the 22nd Napa Sonoma Wine Country Film Festival and the Monaco Charity Film Festival in 2008. It also attracted attention in the academic field. For example, in 2009,

Wu Hui compared the theme of revenge and forgiveness in both films.[2] In China, Su Dongxiao argued that *Prince of the Himalayas* reflects a kind of Eastern anti-gaze by multiplying Western narrative structure with Eastern images and themes.[3] This paper argues that the anti-gaze Su has identified is possible because Hu does not confine himself to the other position in a hybrid Shakespeare. Instead of waiting passively to be gazed at, Hu challenges Shakespeare, especially Shakespeare's characterization of the female characters in the play. Using elements of Eastern culture, Hu rewrites Gertrude and Ophelia, and creates the wolf woman. This combination of female re-characterization and setting marks a new trend in Asian Shakespeares.

In filming a Tibetan version of *Hamlet*, Hu knew that if he rigidly followed the original text without considering the local conditions and customs, his production would turn into a show of puppets wearing Asian masks. His solution was to deny Shakespeare's authority and synchronize the original text with the local culture. From the beginning Hu sought to create a hybrid film:

> Having lived in the US for almost twenty years, I have experienced a lot. As a Chinese poem goes, "Night comes and where is my home?" I keep asking myself, "Where am I from? Where am I going to?" Four years ago, I went to a coffee shop in New York with a friend. In our chat, I suddenly had an idea. If I move Hamlet to a place which is the closest to the sky, and ask him to ponder over the questions about life and death there, what effects would I have? At that moment, the mysterious Tibet gave birth to *Prince of the Himalayas*. (http://www.spph.com.cn/books/bkview.asp? bkid = 118040&cid = 352845)

As a Chinese American film director, Hu sought to establish a coexistence between Western and non-Western cultures not only by moving Hamlet to Tibet but also by standing back from his own position as a Chinese director thinking about Hamlet in a New York coffee shop. Hu was born and raised in Shanghai but relocated to the US to receive his Masters of Arts degree from New York State University and earned a Ph. D. in directing from the University of Hawaii at Manoa. His educational background in a sense predetermined the hybridization of his cinematic production. Yet, unlike many other Asian film makers, Hu welcomes such hybridization. He named his film *Prince of the Himalayas* to indicate its multiple origins. Posters for the movie illustrate the beautiful and mysterious Tibetan landscape while at the same time proclaiming that the film is an adaptation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.[4] Hu's version of Shakespeare denies the Western text as the only authority. Tibet itself is a competing authority. Yet Hu goes a step further. Westerners have generally viewed Tibet as a mysterious place. It has the world's highest mountains. Some of its mountain peaks are holy places that only religious disciples could get close to. The Tibetan Buddhism and the indigenous religion, Bon, are unique in world religions. Even its medicine seems inexplicable by science. In many of the Western films, Westerners appear as explorers or expeditioners hoping to unveil the mysteries of Tibet. In adapting *Hamlet* to Tibetan culture, Hu refused to adopt such a Western gaze. He makes Hamlet a native Tibetan and dates his story back to a time when no Western explorers have found the

place. By authorizing the Tibetan culture, Hu changes the original power relationship between Western and non-Western cultures and develops a way for his film to gaze back on the Western culture.

The same hybridization that characterizes the dominant culture of the film also characterizes the way Hu protrays the main female characters. In typical Hollywood films, the camera gazes at women. Hu tries instead to make them people, not objects. For example, Hu completely reworked the character of Gertrude. He has said that he was always troubled by the idea of Gertrude's wedding Claudius only two months after her husband's death: "The portrayal of Claudius and Gertrude seems rather unreasonable in the original text. As the queen, how come Gertrude hastily marries the murderer of her husband?" (Zhou 174) Hu's question is not new. Due to insufficient clues in the play, audience and critics find it hard to explain Gertrude's immediate marriage with Claudius or to determine if she is involved in the murder. Most film productions reflect such a difficulty. In Laurence Olivier's *Hamlet* (1948), there is only a vague hint that Gertrude might have been an accomplice when Hamlet in Act III, Scene II watches the angry Gertrude leave the room in surprise. In Franco Zeffirelli's *Hamlet* (1990), Gertrude appears innocent, and her sensuality seems the only reason the director can give for her marriage. In the modern version of *Hamlet* (2000), Michael Almereyda shows once again an ambiguous Gertrude, leaving the doubts on her open for discussion. If Hu accepted Shakespeare as the only authority, he would follow those directors in shooting an ambiguous Gertrude, or at least a woman who is controlled by her passion. While it may work for those Anglophone directors, such a cloned image in Tibetan culture would not be convincing. Hu therefore orientalizes Gertrude, making her a pious, faithful, and self-sacrificing mother. Hu's interpretation goes like this. Seventeen years ago, the young Nanm (Gertrude) is forced to leave her lover, Kulo-ngam, who is Claudius in *Hamlet*, and to marry Kulo-ngam's brother, King Tsanpo. Being faithful to love, Nanm gives her virginity to Kulo-ngam before her marriage and as a result bears a son, Lhamoklodan, the prince of Himalayas. In Hu's rewrite, Nanm's marriage with Kulo-ngam is not a betrayal but a reunion with her lover and son. That's why she appears to be so happy at the beginning of the film.

It is not a rare phenomenon to rewrite Gertrude in Asian Shakespeares. In Feng Xiaogang's *The Banquet*, for example, Gertrude is an ambitious woman who wants to have power and love at the same time. Yet her sensuality and adultery strike Chinese audiences as Western, if not Shakespearean. By contrast, Hu uses Chinese culture to challenge both Shakespeare and Western culture. Between Gertrude and Nanm, there are three essential differences. First, Nanm does not love King Tsanpo. She loves from the beginning Kulo-ngam but is forced to marry the king who is simply attracted by her beauty. Hence, when Lhamoklodan asks "have you eyes" in the closet scene, Nanm gives a totally different answer from that of Gertrude in Shakespeare's play. Nanm does not say "Oh, Hamlet, speak no more! / Thou turn'st mine eyes into my very soul, / And there I see such black and grained spots / As will not leave their tinct" (3.4.90–93). Instead, she smacks her son out of anger and explains: "You don't know the truth. You don't know how powerful or desperate love could be."

Because Lhamoklodan speaks for the most part the same words Hamlet does, while Nanm does not follow Gertrude, we find ourselves listening to her instead of only watching her. This shift is part of what I mean by the anti-gaze that characterizes Hu's film. Moreover, by repeating Hamlet's words, Lhamoklodan represents a Western perspective. By giving different answers, Nanm stands for an Asian voice. The key word in Nanm's answer is love, which Lhamoklodan misunderstands as Nanm's confession of loving both King Tsanpo and Kulo-ngam. He therefore says to Nanm, "Throw away the worse part of your heart! Keep the other half!" In contrast to Gertrude, who gives an evasive answer—"What shall I do" (3.4.187), Nanm does not hesitate to choose. "You are wrong! You are absolutely wrong! The part you ask me to throw away is exactly my true love." By emphasizing how Nam corrects Lhamoklodan's mistake, Hu defies the Western perspective.

Going further, Hu turns Gertrude into a popular image in Chinese folklore and literature—a woman who suffers from her unhappy marriage and endures hardship for those she loves. "I love your uncle. My love began long before your birth. It is your father who deprived me of my love... Seventeen years! Ah, seventeen years! Life without love is death!" Hu has Nanm emphasize the precedence of her love. It precedes her marriage, and her marriage brings her nothing but misery. It should be noted that feminist readings of *Hamlet* began half a century ago in the West. In 1957, Carolyn Heilbrun published "The Character Hamlet' Mother" to defend Gertrude. The essay was warmly welcomed by feminist critics. In 1994, Margaret Atwood wrote the story "Gertrude Talks Back." In that story, Gertrude admits that she commits the murder because of long-term sufferings from her unhappy marriage. "It wasn't Claudius, darling, it was me!" (Atwood 19) In 2000, John Updike published *Gertrude and Claudius*, in which Gertrude's unhappy marriage is once again emphasized. Unfortunately, all these voices are muted in Anglophone cinematic productions. The original text becomes the main hindrance for those directors' free adaptations. Hu is different. He gets inspiration from his Asian background, and creates a woman who trusts, values, and sticks to her love. When Nanm says "You are wrong" and reveals gradually the truth of love, she becomes the one who holds and controls the voice. The audience, especially the Western audience, loses the privilege of relying on the Western text. They have to listen to what Nanm says to understand the whole story.

In addition to her hidden love and unhappy marriage, Nanm is different from Gertrude in the way she relates to her son. The Oedipus complex seems to be a popular reading of *Hamlet* in the West. In Zeffirelli's version, for example, Hamlet seems intent on raping Gertrude in the closet scene, which makes the Hamelt-Gertrude relationship "the most graphic of the Oedipus-inspired interpretations on film" (Bevington 630). Yet such a reading is in conflict with Chinese culture. In Hu's adaptation, there is no indication of the Oedipus complex at all. Just like a traditional Chinese mother, Nanm cares about her son and does not hesitate to save him when Lhamoklodan tries to commit suicide after killing Odsaluyang's father. Hu films an emphatic close up to show how Nanm uses her hands to grab Lhamoklodan's knife, an important plot to show her as a good mother. Moreover, Hu changes the identity of Lhamoklodan to make Nanm's remarriage more understandable. While Hamlet is the

son of Gertrude and old Hamlet, Lhamoklodan is not the son of King Tsanpo. His real father is Kulo-ngam, who is forced to call his son nephew for seventeen years. When Nanm marries Kulo-ngam, she is hoping to make the wedding a family reunion, an important concept in Chinese culture. That's why when Lhamoklodan comes back to attend King Tsanpo's funeral, Nanm seems eager to tell Lhamoklodan his true identity. The revelation of Lhamoklodan's true identity replaces the story of revenge for the father's death. The search for a hidden identity and the need to learn concepts of love, forgiveness, and faith fit an Eastern paradigm rather than a Western perspective, at least as *Hamlet* defines that perspective.

Nanm therefore differs from Gertrude in the way she embodies Eastern conceptions of love and forgiveness. In Tibet, life is to a large degree influenced by a person's religious faith. People believe that one should not lie, steal, or be greedy, let alone harm or kill others. While Shakespeare's play allows the possibility Gertrude is involved in her first husband's murder, Hu's movie makes clear that Nanm has nothing to do with the death of King Tsanpo. She gets excited when she realizes that Kulo-ngam may be the murderer of King Tsanpo. Her religious faith tells her that the only way for redemption is to ask for heaven's mercy. In the film, there is a full length shot of how Nanm runs to a lake and prays sadly in tears. It is one of the most striking scenes when Nanm and Kulo-ngam hug each other beside the lake, begging sincerely for heaven's mercy. The lake here is supposed to be Lake Manasarovar, which the theme song of this film focuses on.[5]

> A sea of faces
> Om mani padme hum
> But I cannot find my lover
> He is gone
> Om mani padme hum
> Lake Manasarovar is glistening
> Om mani padme hum
> Is it the holy lamp
> my lost lover lights for me. . . .
> (my translation, He)

While the loss of the lover foreshadows the impending death, Lake Manasarovar embodies the religious faith with which one is able to light the holy lamp.[6] In *The Tune of Brahma*, Shakyamuni Buddha mentioned the 10 benefits of lighting the holy lamp:

> One becomes like the light of the world
> One achieves clairvoyance of the pure eye as a human
> One achieves the Deva's eye
> One receives the wisdom to discriminate virtue from non-virtue
> One is able to eliminate the concept of inherent existence
> One receives the illumination of wisdom

> One is reborn as a human or deva
> One receives great enjoyment wealth
> One quickly becomes liberated
> One quickly attains enlightenment
> (http://www.khandro.net/ritual_offering_light.htm)

Hu uses such religious ideas to convey the theme of the whole film. He hopes that his audience could be enlightened to the concepts of eternal love and forgiveness that his rewrite stresses. As Hu once mentioned in an interview,

> "I'm going to make a totally different *Hamlet*. It is different not only in form but in connotation. It is about love, not revenge. It subverts the story of usurpation and revenge. It is a story in search of love and forgiveness. Mysterious births and blood relationships make all characters suffer. It is about love's helplessness, dangers, and devotions. *Prince of the Himalayas* expresses the transmigration and eternity of love. (http://www.spph.com.cn/books/bkview.asp?bkid=118040&cid=352845)

Because he focused on love, Hu naturally needed to think hard about how to portray Ophelia. Odsaluyang resembles Ophelia in the basic plot. She loves Lhamoklodan, the prince of Jiabo Kingdom, who accidentally kills Po-lha-nyisse, Odsaluyang's father, and is forced to leave the country.[7] Odsaluyang then goes mad and dies in water. It is easy to recognize this Tibetan version of Ophelia. Yet, there are fatal problems in this image. In *Shakespeare, Madness, and Music* (2009), Kendra Preston Leonard devotes a whole chapter to filmic Ophelias, arguing that directors like Laurence Olivier, Franco Zeffirelli, and Michael Almereyda "treat Ophelia in similar fashion by infantilizing her, limiting her intelligence, and eradicating, both her spoken and sung vocality" (65). Those directors unanimously choose to show a sexually immature Ophelia, who is incapable of understanding her life and people around her. The hidden logic goes like this: Ophelia is not mature enough. She is too naïve to understand what is going on around her, which leads to her madness. Such an image can never go along with a story of love and forgiveness. By contrast, Hu creates an Ophelia who differs from traditional Ophelias in three ways, which can be analyzed in terms of love, faith, and forgiveness.

First, Odsaluyang is more active and outspoken in love than Ophelia. She does not hide her feelings but rather embraces Lhamoklodan when he returns from Persia. Having received a precious gift from Lhamoklodan, she announces her love by saying "just like your love, I'll keep it forever." In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Ophelia is submissive and obedient. She obeys Laertes when he compares love to "a fashion and a toy in blood" (1.3.6) and asks her to "think it no more" (1.3.10). She has the same words when Polonius forbids her to "give words or talk with the Lord Hamlet" (1.3.135). Odsaluyang is different. She is more confident and firm in her love. When her brother, Lessar, expresses his concern by saying "if he gets your love but cannot be with you, your sorrow will be endless," Odsaluyang assures him, "I'll let

love keep my heart." She trusts her love and shows no regret in sleeping with Lhamoklodan. If Ophelia is but "a body to be watched" (Rutter 302) in other filmic versions, Odsaluyang is obviously more vocal and brave. Her words are in most cases expressions of love, the theme Hu wants to convey in his rewrite.

The second way Hu tries to de-center Western values is by giving Odsaluyang a strong religious faith. In *Hamlet*, Ophelia has little mind for herself. She is more like a puppet, easily controlled and manipulated by others. She makes no protest when her father uses her as a piece of bait to test Hamlet's state of mind. When Hamlet kills her father, she does not express any anger but becomes mad instead. Her grief and insanity seem proof of women's frailty. Odsaluyang, by contrast, is more dominant than Ophelia. Knowing that Lhamoklodan is mournful about his father's death and mother's remarriage, she urges him to be tough and strong. She can even sense Lhamoklodan's plan and warns him against doing anything hasty and rash. In *Hamlet*, Ophelia returns the love letters out of her father's wish. In *Prince of the Himalayas*, Odsaluyang returns their token only after Lhamoklodan kills her father. The different timings reveal different personalities. Ophelia is devoid of independent mind. She seems too young and innocent to understand the surrounding complications. She does not even make her own decisions. In contrast, Odsaluyang judges for herself. She returns Lhamoklodan's love token not because she is obedient but because she can no longer accept his love. When Lhamoklodan exclaims, "You are my love. Only you can save my soul!" Odsaluyang retorts, "Don't talk about love. You are unworthy of it!" To fit the plot, of course, she cannot be the perfect woman, even though she is strong. Lhamoklodan's revenge and killing violate her religious faith, and become the main reason for her madness. In the departure scene between Odsaluyang and Lhamoklodan, Hu switches his camera back and forth to show Odsaluyang's inner turmoil, and then focuses on Odsaluyang's hand, showing how the love token drops from her hand onto the ground. When other directors insist on Ophelia's failure to comprehend the world, Hu highlights a moral and ethical choice that no one feels easy to make.

Hu makes the third change of Ophelia—her active willingness to forgive—the most subtle. It takes two steps to realize. First, Hu romanticizes Odsaluyang in her madness. He shows her not much like a lunatic but an angel or fairy. Odsaluyang never curses or complains. She does not scream uncontrollably as Ophelia does in Olivier's *Hamlet*. Nor does she behave lewdly to her guardians, which Zeffirelli takes more than two minutes to demonstrate. She does not have wild and terrified eyes. She looks instead gentle, amiable, and happy. She often dances or sings beside Lake Manasarovar. She asks for heaven's mercy, hoping to have a reunion with her lover and her father in the afterlife. By romanticizing Odsaluyang, Hu diminishes the idea of hate and revenge.

The second step is to make Odsaluyang pregnant. But where many students like to believe, based on very little textual evidence, that one of the causes of Ophelia's madness is that she finds herself pregnant, Hu focuses not on the horror of her unwed situation but the religiousness of the event. Odsaluyang gives birth to a baby as she dies, and such an event has religious connotations, epitomizing the concepts of love,

forgiveness, and faith. In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Ophelia's death is not put onto stage. It is told by Gertrude and serves more like a fuse for the later duel between Hamlet and Laertes. In Zeffirelli's film, Ophelia's death is shown, and yet the camera stays far. Audience could only see her from a distance, indicating a cold and reserved response. In contrast with Ophelia's death, which is sad, helpless and desperate, Odsaluyang's death does not mean the end. It is followed by the birth of a baby. Hu is careful not to picture too realistically the process of childbirth. For him, it is more like a legend that people hear, tell, and respect. Hence, Odsaluyang walks into the camera, looking not particularly like a woman in labor. She faces the lake (Lake Manasarovar), which is static and still. It externalizes Odsaluyang's mentality: although she is in physical agony (she is going to give birth), she is not possessed by any hatred or repentance. She is going to give birth to a baby. Hu emphasizes the religious connotation by having a bird's eye view of Odsaluyang. It seems that someone is looking down from heaven and witnessing the birth of Odsaluyang's baby. Considered by both Hindus and Buddhists to be a place of pilgrimage, Lake Manasarovar is associated with several religious legends. "Hindus regard it as mental creation of God Brahma specially made so that pilgrims to Kailash would have a place to perform their ablutions. Buddhists believe that Queen Maya, the Buddha's mother, was carried here by the gods and washed prior to giving birth to Buddha" (Chamaria 66). Hu's intention here is pretty clear. Although Odsaluyang dies, she forgives Lhamoklodan, and the new-born baby, who is supposed to the leader of their later generations, embodies mercy and forgiveness from heaven. The scene after her death proves such a message. Hu uses a wide-angle lens to show the beautiful Tibetan landscape. There are interconnected mountains, green trees, and a bright sun reflected in the river, an indication of spring. When the wolf woman, a created character in *Prince of the Himalayas*, follows the baby's cries and finds Odsaluyang's child near the lake, she picks him up and exclaims, "Prince! Prince of the Himalayas!" The audience suddenly realizes the power of forgiveness Hu tries to convey. People may die. Hatred and revenge bring nothing but disasters. Only forgiveness can bring hope back to the world. It comes in the form of new life and forms an endless cycle of life, death, and rebirth.

Lhamoklodan is not inspired by this moving scene because he does not see it. Instead, he drops into a state of despair, and he is in this low condition when he has to make his final decision between revenge and forgiveness. Hu realized that Lhamoklodan's relationship to the two main women, Nanm and Odsaluyang, is insufficient to fully establish the themes of love, forgiveness and faith. He therefore introduced the character of the wolf woman to lead Lhamoklodan to enlightenment. In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the ghost of old Hamlet refers to religious conceptions like purgatory and asks for his justice. He wants Hamlet to kill Claudius, leaving Hamlet on his own to ponder whether he should take revenge or not. In *Prince of the Himalayas* the ghost is an evil force, not wrapped in religiosity. He forces Nanm to marry him, makes no hesitation to kill her and Kulo-ngam after realizing the betrayal, and urges Lhamoklodan to kill his real father. The only counter-force is the wolf woman, who knows all the truths. If the ghost represents the force to revenge, the wolf woman

epitomizes the wish to forgive. She is different from Nanm and Odsaluyang. Her message is more direct and explicit.

In order to avoid the difficulties the audience may have in accepting this created character, Hu disguises her as a prophet figure that is commonly seen in Shakespearean plays. Hu makes her first appearance mysterious and foreshadowing, perhaps imitating the way Akira Kurosawa introduces the forest spirit in *Throne of Blood*. She comes out of nowhere and seems to know what has happened and will happen. She interrupts Kulo-ngam, who tries to wash his hands in Lake Manasarovar, and says, "The old king died. The new king ascends the throne. There will be blood everywhere." Her words, like those of the forest spirit in *Throne of Blood*, foreshadow impending deaths and disasters that no one can escape. But here the wolf woman plays a greater role than in *Throne of Blood*. She does not disappear after foretelling the future disasters. She remains in the camera, standing either behind the characters or in distant corners. Her role manifests in two aspects.

First, she is the narrator for what happens in the past. Knowing not much more than Lhamoklodan, the audience may frequently feel puzzled by the hidden secrets in the film. The wolf woman shoulders the responsibility of solving the mystery. When Kulo-ngam admits his sin to Nanm and says that it will be his fate if Lhamoklodan kills him in the end, the audience may not understand their sadness. The wolf woman appears here to give the explanation. "The older brother is a powerful king. The younger brother is forced to give up the girl he loves. They see each other before marriage, and the girl gives herself to the younger brother. For seventeen years, the loved ones are torn apart. The king discovers their love. Unable to accept the shame, the king decides to kill his younger brother and punish his wife in the cruelest way." In giving the wolf woman the power to explain, Hu draws the audience's attention once again to the Asian voice. One needs to listen to and respect such a voice to understand the whole truth. The truth goes like this: almost everyone in the film needs to choose between love and hate, between revenge and forgiveness. Their decision determines the destiny of not only themselves but those around them. As the central figure, Lhamoklodan has to make his decision, which to a large degree determines the end of the film.

Where Kirosawa's forest spirit represents destiny, Hu's wolf woman represents active agency. Her role goes beyond that of narrator. She is a participant, and she helps Lhamoklodan choose his course of action, talking with him after he has set his mind on revenge. She not only warns him that "Slaughter is coming to family members" but also helps him to think: "I'm going to tell you a story between two brothers in a royal family." By revealing the hidden story, the wolf woman seeks to prevent an impending disaster. Unfortunately, the ghost appears and interrupts her story. The wolf woman tries again in the mousetrap scene. Being invited by Lhamoklodan, the wolf woman puts the murder scene onto stage. While the mousetrap serves mainly as a proof of Claudius's sin in *Hamlet*, it is for the wolf woman to tell the truth in *Prince of the Himalayas*. Hu borrows the mask dance that is popular in Tibetan festivals to tell the story. Through the mask dance, the wolf woman hopes to remind Lhamoklodan not to be cheated by the masks. He needs to discover the truth hidden

behind. Hu has similar hopes. *Prince of the Himalayas* wears the mask of a Shakespearean play. It helps to attract attention from both audience and critics. What the film is truly about, however, is a Tibetan story of love, forgiveness, and faith. What's more, the masked dancer obtains a new power. While the audience watches the dancer on stage, the dancer can gaze back on the audience behind the mask. The reversed relationship between the gazer and the gazed becomes one of the most important features of this film. Although the mask dance is interrupted by a flock of crows coming into the court and putting out the light, Hu's mask dance continues. It rises to the climax when Lhamoklodan knows his true identity. To prevent him from making mistakes, the wolf woman gives explicit advice: "Do not let the miseries of your last generation become the reason for your hatred!" Hearing this, the ghost gets furious. "You've said too much! What are you teaching him?" The wolf woman answers directly, "Love! Real love!" Her answer helps Hu to lift the mask and reveal his true purpose—to tell a Tibetan story of love. Before he dies, Lhamoklodan says to the ghost, "I hope my death can remind people of the choice between love and hate. I have no regrets. Hope your evil spirit stay away from our pure heaven in Jiabo. Go!" And the ghost disappears.

In addition to the concepts of love, forgiveness, and faith, there are two more messages hidden behind the mask. One is the concept of reunion, which is highly valued in Chinese culture. Nanm hopes to have a reunion with Kulo-ngam and Lhamoklodan in her remarriage. Odsaluyang hopes to have a reunion between her lover and her father with the help of heaven. Death is what ultimately brings Nanm, Kulo-ngam, and Lhamoklodan together. The picture of their bodies in blood on the white snow is impressive and startling. The second message is the eternal cycle of life and death. In the last shot of the film, Hu focuses on Lhamoklodan's baby son and the fire burial behind. Death and birth are here connected. In Buddhist religion, death is not the end. It is just one part of samsara—the eternal cycle of life, death, and rebirth. Although Lhamoklodan, Kulo-ngam, Nanm, Odsaluyang, and Lessar are all dead, they have brought hope to their land. The hope is Lhamoklodan's son, the future leader of Jiabo. When he grows up, he may lead his people to stay away from hatred and revenge and to live in a purified world. This hope marks as the ending note of Hu's mask dance.

Prince of the Himalayas is a daring challenge to Shakespeare. Although there are similar characters and plots, Hu gives totally different interpretations. His Gertrude is not characterized by "a mother's guilt upon her son" (Eliot 91). She is instead a victim of forced marriage and a pious, self-sacrificing mother. Odsaluyang is localized, as well. She is not "a decorative object" (Mulvey 63) that is often seen in Western cinematic productions. She is brave, outspoken and kind. She gives birth to a baby, a symbol of hope in the film. The wolf woman is Hu's most daring creation. She exists to challenge the Western interpretation. She is the only one who knows all the truths. She is also an important force to stand against revenge. Through these female characters, Hu presents the theme of his film—not revenge, but love, forgiveness, and faith. Hu's rewrite challenges the Western perspective. It requires efforts for Western audience to understand his film, which is based on Asian culture. By au-

thorizing the local elements, Hu realizes the anti-gaze that more and more Asian films are heading for.

It should be admitted at the same time that there are still many problems with this film. Its editing is rather choppy, and there are too many close up shots in the film. The actors and actresses, being all Tibetan natives and speaking the Tibetan language, seem awkward and affected in reciting the Shakespearean lines. Moreover, Sherwood Hu adopts computer animations, which give a poor presentation of how a baby comes out of water. Hu has good hopes to integrate religious connotations into the childbirth scene. Yet, it remains a question how to harmonize Shakespearean plots with mysterious legends. Despite its weaknesses, *Prince of the Himalayas* tries hard to develop a hybrid approach to Shakespeare that balances cultures and attracts audiences.

【Notes】

1. See Yasunari Takahashi, "*Hamlet* and the Anxiety of Modern Japan," *Shakespeare Survey* 48 (1995): 99 – 111.
2. Wu Hui, "To Seek Revenge or to Forgive: Two Chinese Films about *Hamlet*," *Shakespeare et l'Orient*. Edité par Pierre Kapitaniak et Jean-Michel Déprats (2009): 189 – 197. Wu gives a detailed analysis of the two films but does not explain why *The Banquet* is necessarily better.
3. Su Dongxiao, "Crossing Borders through Hybridization: An Examination of Postcolonial Narrative Strategy in *Prince of the Himalayas*," *Dianying Wenxue* 6 (2009): 39 – 41.
4. Interestingly, one cannot find any indication that *Throne of Blood* is a Japanese version of *Macbeth* in Akira Kurosawa's posters. Nor can one find any indication that *Chicken Rice War* is a Singaporean version of *Romeo and Juliet* in Chee Kong Cheah's posters. It seems not a common practice in previous Asian Shakespeares.
5. The song's name is "Holy Incense" sung by Sa Dingding and composed by He Xuntian.
6. In Tibet, Lake Manasarovar is a place of pilgrimage. It is believed that people can cleanse all sins by bathing in it or drinking its water. In Hu's film, the lake is one of the most frequently-appeared backgrounds. It indicates how important religion plays in the film.
7. In Tibetan language, Jiabo means exactly the king.

【Works Cited】

Atwood, Margaret. "Gertrude Talks Back." *Good Bones and Simple Murders*. New York: Doubleday, 1994. 16 – 19.

Bevington, David M. *Shakespeare: Script, Stage, Screen*. New York: Pearson Longman, 2006.

Chamaria, Pradeep. *Kailash Manasarovar on the Rugged Road to Revelation*. New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1996.

Eliot, T. S. "Hamlet and His Problems." *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*. London: Methuen, 1920. 87 – 94.

He, Xuntian. "Holy Incense." *Alive*. Perf. Sa Dingding. Wrasse Records, 2008.

Hodgdon, Barbara, and William B. Worthen, eds. *A Companion to Shakespeare and Performance*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Hu, Sherwood, dir. Ximalaya wangzi [Prince of the Himalayas]. Tibetan. Hus Entertainment and Shanghai Film Studios, China, 2006.

---. http://www.spph.com.cn/books/bkview.asp? bkid = 118040&cid = 352845.

Huang, Alexander C. Y. *Chinese Shakespeares: Two Centuries of Cultural Exchange*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Im, Yeeyon, "The Location of Shakespeare in Korea: Lee Yountaek's *Hamlet* and the Mirage of Interculturality." *Theatre Journal* 60, no. 2 [2008]: 257 – 76.

Leonard, Kendra Preston. *Shakespeare, Madness, and Music: Scoring Insanity in Cinematic Adaptations*. Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2009.

Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Feminist Film Theory: A Reader*, ed. Sue Thornham. New York: New York University Press, 1999. 58 – 69.

Rutter, Carol Chillington. "Snatched Bodies: Ophelia in the Grave." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Vol. 49, No. 3 (Autumn, 1998): 299 – 319.

Tompkins, Joanne. "Conflicting Fields of Vision: Performing Self and Other in Two Intercultural Shakespeare Productions." *A Companion to Shakespeare and Performance*. Eds. Barbara Hodgdon, and William B. Worthen. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 610 – 624.

Zhou, Jie. "A Representation and Deconstruction of *Hamlet in Prince of the Himalayas.*" *Kejiao Wenhui* (June, 2008): 174 &185.

Love and Empire: The Transnational Logic of Feng Xiaogang's *The Banquet*

Jinhua Li

Abstract This paper investigates the cultural logics that justify the typical marketing decision that opts for a complete localization of the original materials and thus the minimization of foreign literary source in transnational Chinese film adaptations. I will use Feng Xiaogang's *The Banquet* as a case study to investigate the cultural logics and politics of transnational Shakespeare adaptation in contemporary Chinese cinema. I argue that Feng Xiaogang's appropriation of the Shakespearean text is a re-production of a textual cultural identity that situates the narrative in the continuum of the Chinese visual and literary traditions through thematic displacement, structural gender politics, and visual signifier re-configuration.
Key words *The Banquet*; Shakespeare adaptation; cultural logics; gender; transnational cinema
Author Jinhua Li is a doctoral candidate in the Comparative Literature program at Purdue University. Her research interests include transnational film remakes, Chinese language cinema, and gender and politics in popular media. Email: li193@purdue.edu.

Just as Marjorie Garber unerringly observes that "Every age creates its own Shakespeare" (3), every culture imagines its own Hamlet, and each version of film adaptation inevitably offers its own interpretation of Hamlet through literary and cinematic translation of the Bard's text. For Chinese audience, the most vivid imagination of *Hamlet* exits in Feng Xiaogang's adaptation of Hamlet, *The Banquet* (夜宴). Yet not every audience is aware of the fact that *The Banquet* is a Chinese version of Shakespeare's Hamlet due to a thorough localization strategy in this transnational adaptation. Feng Xiaogang transplants the Shakespeare's narrative from sixteenth century Denmark to tenth century China to give the story an authentic historical background in the turbulent years of the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms. This film's allegiance to Shakespeare is further masked by the absence of its Bard-connection in both the standard and the international trailers. Apparently, the cultural re-imagination of prince Hamlet calls for an amnesiac disregard of his previous life in a foreign culture.

In fact, this minimization of foreign literary source in transnational Chinese film adaptations is a typical marketing decision that opts for a complete localization of the original materials. Many transnational film remakes choose to transplant the original materials to a time-space that is characteristically Chinese. Li Shaohong's *Xuese Qingchen* (《血色清晨》) (*Bloody Morning*) transposes Gabriel García Márquez's

Crónica de una muerte anunciada (Chronicle of a Death Foretold) to a village in south China in the 1980s; Xu Jinglei's *Yi ge mo sheng nv ren de lai xin* (《一个陌生女人的来信》) (*Letter from an Unknown Woman*) re-imagines Stefan Zweig's namesake novella in the hutongs of Beijing in the 1930s; Hu Xuehua's *Ximalaya Wangzi* (《喜马拉雅王子》) (*Prince of the Himalayas*) is another transnational Shakespeare adaptation that renders Prince Hamlet a royal man in an ancient mythic Tibetan kingdom; and *San qiang pai an jing qi* (《三枪拍案惊奇》) (*A Simple Noodle Story*) is Zhang Yimou's transposition of the Coen Brother's *Blood Simple* to the mountainous inland province of Gansu in a historical past. Such ubiquity of cultural localization forms an industrial pattern that raises the question: What is the cultural logic of localization in a transnational adaptation? In other words, why is localization and hence assimilation of foreign texts the trade standard for cross-cultural cinematic translations of foreign literary texts? *The Banquet* offers a case study of the cultural logic and politics of transnational Shakespeare adaptation in contemporary Chinese cinema, because of the way Feng Xiaogang appropriates a Shakespearean text. His method is to reproduce a textual cultural identity that situates the narrative in the continuum of the Chinese visual and literary traditions. To do so he displaces themes, restructures gender relations, and configures visual signifiers.

If the "moral complexity, psychological depth, and philosophical power" in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is somehow impossibly encapsulated within prince Hamlet's famous "to be, or not to be" soliloquy (Greenblat 289), such thematic intricacy is effectively displaced in *The Banquet* by a theme familiar in ancient Chinese literary tradition—kingdom and beauty, or *jiangshan meiren* (《江山美人》). The political ambition of the emperor and the sexual desire of a man have always been at odds in traditional literatures of imperial love. Surrounded by wives and concubines, the emperor is ironically expected not to fall in love with these women but instead treat them either as hostages of political allegiance or mere producers of legitimate heirs for the empire. This can be partly explained by the polygamous tradition in ancient China, where more wives means more sons to carry out the royal family line and further secure the succession of the throne within the family. Therefore, emperors who give love priority over politics invariably witness the tragic downfall of themselves or their government. For centuries, emperors are cautioned against the feminine hazard of *femme fatale* in the narratives of Emperor You (周幽王) in the West Zhou Dynasty, who entertained his favorite concubine Bao Si (褒姒) by lighting fire beacons to trick his vassals, and Emperor Xuan Zong (唐玄宗) in the Tang Dynasty, whose devotion on his Concubine Yang (杨贵妃) led to a political riot that eventually caused the Dynasty to decline.[1] Such sentiment seems absent in the Western tradition, which instead finds romance in the Duke of Windsor's decision to abdicate the throne in order to marry his love. Chinese history recognizes the female threat to a regime of patriarchal power. The name it gives to this the moral snare is *jiangshan meiren*.

Instead of foregrounding Hamlet's dilemma, *The Banquet* centralizes the theme of *jiangshan meiren* in a feudal patriarchy in several significant moments throughout the film. Wu Luan's romantic involvement with Wan is audibly juxtaposed with a tumultuous historical background in the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms by the authorita-

tive voiceover at the beginning. Circumscribed by national disquietude and political unrest, Wu Luan's escapist tendency to isolate himself in the south and immerse himself in the trivial art of music and dance effectively disqualifies him as appropriate candidate for the throne despite his legitimate claim to the sovereignty. As "Wu Luan" literally means "no masculinity" in Chinese[2], Prince Wu Luan is symbolically effeminate because his tender feelings for the Wan prevent him from fighting for power. Like prince Hamlet, Wu Luan expresses an aversion to the throne; but unlike Hamlet, Wu Luan's revenge is tinted with a sexual desire for Wan, the beauty who could endanger the kingdom.

In Feng Xiaogang *The Banquet*, the motif of *jiangshan meiren* is significantly articulated by Emperor Li during his first sexual encounter with Wan. With an anxiety to outdo his brother to please Wan in bed, Emperor Li manifests his willingness to satisfy Wan sexually even beyond what is deemed appropriate for a "wise and valiant man," as Wan refers to her late husband, the previous Emperor. "The tug between power and love has tormented past emperors for centuries," Emperor Li says as he lusts over Wan's feminine body, "but when there is you, Sister-in-law, what need do I have of a kingdom?"[3] Apparently, Emperor Li has made a choice between the kingdom and beauty—he chooses love over power. This bedroom conversation foreshadows a tragic ending for a self-indulgent ruler, as history repeatedly proves.

The antithesis between power and love, politics and sexuality, and kingdom and beauty is also represented through the blurred boundary between the political discourse of the royal court and the private discourse of the inner chamber. In what appears to be Emperor Li's first court meeting after coming into power, Governor Pei attempts to reveal Emperor Li's usurpation of the throne by addressing Wan as Empress Dowager, hinting at Wu Luan's legitimate position as the Emperor. Wan's proper position in the royal family, therefore, becomes the focal point of contention that determines the political climate of the court. When she kneels to Emperor Li and calls herself "Empress," Wan acknowledges Emperor Li's identity as her husband as well as his position as the emperor. To Emperor Li, the tug between power and love seems to temporarily reconcile when he jokingly says that the sculpture that has been made to present his reign should look like a dragon and a phoenix, the traditional metaphor for sexual intercourse and marriage.

Unless we recognize the Chinese theme of the conflict between kingdom and beauty, Emperor Li's mythic propensity toward an erotic conquest of Wan is rather baffling. Audiences wonder, for example, why Emperor Li drinks the poisoned wine at the end of the film, when, unlike in *Hamlet*, he is not physically forced to do so. His cruel assassination of Wu Luan and iron-fisted rule of his court seems reasonable approximations of Shakespeare's Claudius, but his doting devotion to Wan distinguishes him from Hamlet's lustful uncle (1.5.45, 55) and makes him seem more like Emperor Xuan Zong, who is politically condemned in official historic discourse but widely popular throughout Chinese folk literary tradition as a symbol of undying love.

The similarity of Emperor Li to Emperor Xuan Zong is most revealingly manifested in the climatic sequence of the night banquet. After Qing Nü, having taken a sip of the wine that Wan toasted to Emperor Li, dies of poison, it dawns on the Emperor

that the poisonous wine is meant for him. Now the camera noticeably invites a sympathetic identification with Emperor Li by using extreme close ups. It peruses his face. But in this scene, words speak for themselves:

> Emperor Li: You poisoned the wine?
> Wan: Yes.
> Emperor Li: You want me to die?
> Wan: Yes.
> Emperor Li: And all along I thought I was warming your heart.

This emotional moment dramatizes how the Emperor comes to terms with his painful reality. Shot in a slow, internal rhythm, this scene serves as the Emperor's reconciliation with Wan and his own death. But the last blow is yet to come: Emperor Li is decisively crushed when Wan urges Minister Yin to initiate the coup. The Emperor's emotional devastation feasibly explains why he calls off the Imperial Guards from Wu Luan and his otherwise baffling decision to drink the poisoned wine, to the obvious incredulity of Wu Luan. The missing piece of the puzzle that renders the apparent irrationality of the Emperor's actions sensible is his love for Wan. The Imperial Guards are ordered to protect Wan from the rage of Wu Luan at Qing Nü's death, but when Wu Luan specifies the target of his revenge, Emperor Li immediately dismisses the Guards and hence exposes himself in danger, while he could quite easily have Wu Luan killed, who is hopelessly outnumbered. As the Emperor lies dying on Wan's lap, his final words crystallize his suicidal decision to drink the wine, "You offered me a toast, how can I refuse?" When Wan wants him dead, Emperor Li embraces death.

This unShakespearean resolution is prepared for earlier in the film, when Emperor Li knowingly ignores a premonition of his impending death. Against Lord Chamberlain's suggestion that it is not auspicious to receive guests, Emperor Li insists on giving the banquet not only on an extremely ominous day, but also at midnight, a most sinister time in the Chinese imagination, which happens to coincide with the sinister quality Shakespeare gives to the clock striking twelve in the first scene of Hamlet. We can see how cultures overlap even as they differ. The choice of time, which echoes the time of the first appearance of Hamlet's father's ghost (a scene from the film) is significant as an indication of the Emperor's violation of customs: midnight is not customarily chosen for a royal banquet in ancient China, and the in-betweenness signified by this unearthly hour possesses an "uncanny quality" that is generally feared (Belsey 114). In addition, Emperor Li's order infringes the hospitality and social harmony that is demonstrated by the activity of banqueting: everyone must attend on pain of death.

Looked at retrospectively, Emperor Li, rather than Wu Luan, is portrayed in a tragic light. Emperor Li's suicide and death is justified by a familiar allusion to "centuries of emperors" who are "tormented between the tug between power and love" that he self-reflexively meditates in the scene of his first sexual encounter with Wan. This portrayal finds in Claudius something that is not absent from Shakespeare but not usually stressed: a man perhaps less driven by a lust for power than by Gertrude's

beauty. In the Chinese imagination, Emperor Li is historically re-configured as one among many emperors who choose love over power, beauty over kingdom and pay dearly for politically incorrect decisions.

The re-characterization of Claudius as a stereotypical passionate Chinese emperor caught between love and power is coupled by a portrayal of Gertrude in the upwardly-mobile figure of Wan. Despite Wan's narrative function as a "structural focal point" that hinges the film (Chapman 2), she also embodies a disruptive feminine resistance to the male gaze that must be suppressed. If Emperor Li dies for moral and political reasons, Wan must die as the usurper of not only the throne, but more importantly, because she usurps the male role.

In the final scene, when the Empress is celebrating her victory, a mysterious dagger penetrates her from behind, much to the surprise of audience and critics. This unexpected turn of events at the end of the film has been described as "magical" (Ross 7). Indeed, this dagger (presumably the Sword of the Yue Maiden) is almost comparable to the fantastic reincarnation of Hermione in *Cymbeline* for its magic power to solve the apparently unsolvable problem: the superiority of the feminine over the masculine. While a female ruler may sometimes not pose a predicament for Western sentiments, as for many in 1590s England under Queen Elizabeth, an Empress, especially at the historical moment against which the film is set, connotes an entire history of catastrophes caused by women in China.

The warning against women can be traced back as early as *The Book of Songs*, which says, "disorder is not come down from Heaven, / Rather it is the spawn of these women. (乱匪降自天,生自妇人)." (trans. Allen 284).[4] Women, especially beautiful women, are often seen as hongyan huoshui (红颜祸水), literally, "the beautiful woman who brings havoc," who will bring calamity to both herself and the world. The Tang Dynasty, the most powerful and prosperous Kingdom in ancient Chinese history, is popularly believed to be brought down by a beautiful woman, the favorite concubine of Emperor Xuan Zong, Concubine Yang. In a historically accurate mimetic symmetry, Emperor Xuan Zong's cinematic proxy Emperor Li and Concubine Yang's proxy Wan both have to follow the historically designated trajectory of fate. That the film chooses such a moment in history is hardly innocent of an allegorical meaning.

Having suffered during the slow decaying of the Tang Dynasty, the Chinese have come to associate the feminine more closely with an alien and dangerous Otherness, a subversive evil force. This is precisely what Fredric Jameson, in his discussion of romance as a magic narrative, has observed when he writes that

> it is becoming increasingly clear that the concept of evil is at one with the category of Otherness itself. ... The point, however, is not that in such figures the Other is feared because he is evil; rather, he is evil because he is Other, alien, different, strange, unclean, and unfamiliar. (140)

Such thinking suggests why in the film the alien feminine world should be kept strictly apart from the masculine world, and women should not be allowed to interfere with

politics and national affairs. In the Chinese imagination, particularly in the post-Tang era, if the masculine world is ever tinted by the feminine, disaster threatens. So, what matters at the end of the film is not who kills the Queen, but that the Queen must die.

The death of Wan is a visually doubled Other of that of Wu Luan. Wu Luan's final words, "it is so good to be able to die," most explicitly answer Hamlet's question in his celebrated soliloquy (3.1.58 – 90). However, the opportunity to speak is significantly denied to the Queen, who dies a silent death. In her final soliloquy, Wan, for the first and only time in the film, calls herself the Emperor instead of the Empress. It is also here that the Empress uses the royal pronoun *zhen* instead of "I" to refer to herself.[5] Hence, this is a climactic moment when she believes that she has finally reached the zenith of her life and succeeded in her most audacious transgression, which is why she must die—the feminine should absolutely not be enthroned.

The Queen's silence, in addition to its apparent symbolism of her lost power of discourse, gives a final comment to the film's gender politics. The last scene therefore begins with a shot of the fabric of qiansu hong (茜素红), a particular red that Wan loves. As the red fabric is falling down from a high roller, Wan reaches in vain to catch it, only to find that the fabric is falling through her fingers to quickly for her to reach. Grabbing vainly in the air for nothing, her empty hands become a visual metaphor that foreshadows the futility of her attempt to triumph over men and the masculine territory of politics. As Wan speaks of her transformation from the innocence of the traditional feminine figure embodied in Little Wan to the sophisticated calculating Emperor Wan, this visual metaphor continues to interrupt the verbal narrative. Wan's changes, although verbally represented as success and victory over the patriarchal system, is therefore visually negated by the image of her empty hands.

Colors rehearse the theme of sexual attraction and power. The redness of the fabric is compared to the burning fire of human desire, out of which Wan emerges as a phoenix that is reborn from fire and ashes. But this red is also the color of blood, as Emperor Li observes in his redecoration of the palace. As Wan holds the red fabric close to her heart, the mysterious dagger tints the color of her desire with her own blood. In this scene, the camera takes a spectatorial position that is eye-level with the flying trajectory of the dagger. But when the camera cuts back to Wan, who slowly turns and points directly at the audience, the spectatorial position is decisively incriminating. Pushed to face the accusing finger of Wan, the audience is the partner in crime with the mysterious killer, whose execution-style stabbing sentences Wan to a visual oblivion. The disembodied counter-shot, supposedly from the point of view of the dagger, is a collective if unconscious condemnation of Wan's feminine threat to the masculine power regime.

The Banquet's gendered localization of Shakespeare's Hamlet relies heavily on symbolic cultural and visual signifiers to re-constitute the discourse of a historical exorcism of the feminine Other. In its homage to Zhang Yimou's famous *Hero* (英雄), *The Banquet* exploits symbolic use of color, especially prime colors, to emphasize the clash between the feminine and the masculine. Colors can be invested with symbolic meanings, which is increasingly popular with the Fifth Generation Directors in China.

This tendency finds its aesthetic reference in the colors that are used to paint Beijing Opera masks, which visually label the characterization of the performers. But different from the rigid color symbolism strictly followed in Beijing Opera, what different colors symbolize is more of an idiosyncratic decision on the part of the director rather than based on conventions. The court, a decisively masculine world, is symbolized by black, whereas Wan, emblematic of the subversive feminine power, is associated with red. The confrontation between black and red is therefore a symbolic battle fought between the masculine and the feminine, the realms of public duties and private passion. When asked if the pillars in the palace should be painted in vermilion or ink black, Emperor Li, though not explicitly, indicates that vermilion is his choice. This decision to allow the feminine red to be mingled with the imperial and masculine black foreshadows a dangerous feminine contamination of his reign, which finally results in his demise. For the majority part of the film, Wan is seen either in black or in red, a metaphor that she is oscillating between the two worlds that should be kept tenaciously separate. In her is embodied the "unregulated woman" who "was a disaster for the collective" (Cass 2). This almost melodramatic use of color is essentially a system of demarcation, a "function of drawing the boundaries of a given social order and providing a powerful internal deterrent against deviancy or subversion" (Jameson 140). The strong visual impact created by the juxtaposition of red and black therefore marks the inviolability of the boundary between the two worlds.

Compared with red and black, the other two symbolic colors, white and green, are less easy to be linked to any particular character with similar certainty. Simultaneously the color of all colors and the color of no color, white is employed in no less sophisticated manner. Used traditionally as the color of mourning, white is, above all, a color of true emotion and paradoxically the concealment of it. This is why Wu Luan is first seen in white, wearing a white mask; both express his mourning to lost love and the death of his father. While on stage, both Wu Luan and Qing Nü wear white gowns, because for Wu Luan, the best performance is blank, devoid of any facial expression of emotions. Both Wan and Qing Nü are seen in white, but for them, white is invariably a foreshadowing of the loss of their chastity/virginity. Defying any attempt to pin down its exact symbolization, white intimates what remains illegible to both the feminine and the masculine, designating the necessary but enigmatic boundary between the two worlds.

Green is used conspicuously only at the beginning and the ending of the film, which creates a symbolic visual envelope structure that seems to suggest a spiral development: the green world at the beginning is reduced to a smaller green in a fish tank, which, despite its much smaller magnitude, communicates a hopeful rejuvenation of a clean world that is free from dangers inflicted by the feminine. The last shot of the film, an extreme close up of the green grass floating on the water in the fish tank, is the longest shot in the film, lasting two minutes and forty-eight seconds. During this shot, our gaze is forced to fixate on the green surface, a microcosm that undergoes the circle of change from quietude to disturbance caused by the dropping of a blood-stained sword, to its rippling aftermath, and finally back to its original stillness, as if nothing ever happened. What little turmoil that has been caused by the in-

trusion of an alien subject is quietly assimilated to the system, and the world goes on as usual. Within this single shot, the discourse of gender politics is remarkably visualized with great economy. The intrusion of an alien Other is only temporary no matter how dangerous the Other appears to be. The dagger, although apparently a masculine weapon, is significantly called the Sword of the Yue Maiden. Hence, that Wan is killed by the feminine dagger unmistakably attests to the truth of what has been thought about women: by trespassing into the masculine world, they do not only bring disaster to the world, but also their own destruction.

Cinematic hybridization also distinguishes *The Banquet's* visual stylization. Synthesizing folk dance, ancient song, and fighting scenes that border on modern dance and kung fu choreography, *The Banquet* does not hesitate to resort to any available resources in its visual localization of the foreign narrative. *A Song from Yue* (越人歌), the earliest extant love song, takes over the voiceover's expository narration that sets the background as the imagery of war and rebellion is suddenly taken over by that of the serenity of Wu Luan's artistically architected theatre surrounded by woods. The extreme long shot of the woods quickly changes to an extreme close up of Wu Luan's face, hidden behind a white mask. The exploitation of Wu Luan's masquerade throughout the film echoes the anxiety of not being able to see or to know conveyed by the first line of the play, "Who's there?" (1.1.1). A Song from Yue, stunningly delivered vocally by a man's voice, registers the film's investment on traditional Chinese culture.

While the song is distinctively ancient Chinese, Wu Luan's troupe performs a dance that is transnational. With movements that apparently mimic the externalization of hidden identity, Wu Luan's performance is reminiscent of Japanese noh drama, and its sophisticated physical movements seem to invite a comparison with Chinese acrobatics. The intricate layers of exotic elements within localization further pacify the original text's cultural resistance to be completely localized.

The most significant visual signifier of this cultural localization is the employment of kung fu spectacular to enrich the already glamorous cinematography of the film. Apart from exciting fight scenes in the green woods that reminds audience of Ang Lee's *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* (《卧虎藏龙》), and combats in the snowy desert that alludes to King Hu's *Dragon Gate Inn* (《龙门客栈》), the swordplay and dance between Wan and Wu Luan in her bedchamber attracts most critical attention and interest. To accommodate the innovative combination of kung fu and dancing, the camera uses slow motion, extreme close-up, and bird's eye view to highlight the stylized postures and dynamic shapes created by the fluidly synchronized movement of Wan and Wu Luan. Choreographed in a manner not unlike that of a loving dance, their swordplay is visually presented in a style that unmistakably alludes to the classical Chinese love story *Butterfly Love* (《梁祝》), a story of doomed lovers. The smooth motion created by their flowing clothes eliminates the dooming danger typically felt in a sword fight, but the cold sensation of a sharp sword grazing one's face just by a hair's breadth is made keenly sensible with the camera's strategically placed close-ups.

The addition of kung fu to dance in *The Banquet* also exploits an intertextuality

easily associated with the wuxia pian (武侠片) and kung fu tradition in Hong Kong cinema in the globalized cinematic context. This textual reference further enhances the inter-connectedness of different regional traditions that share visual and aesthetic similarities under a common national cultural rubric. Thus, the localization of Shakespeare's Hamlet facilitates the formation of a diversified and inclusive national cinematic tradition that transcends historical, cultural, and national boundaries.

【Notes】

1. The official historical account of Bao Si 褒姒 can be found in Shi ji <史记>, written by Sima Qian, in the section "the Chronicle of Zhou 周本纪." Documented in such official historical texts as Jiu Tang Shu 旧唐书 (The Old Book of Tang History) and Xin Tang Shu 新唐书 (The New Book of Tang History), the love story between Emperor Xuan Zong in the Tang Dynasty and Concubine Yang can also be found in many popular narratives in ancient and modern literatures, such as the long poem of the Tang Dynasty poet Bai Juyi 白居易's The Song of Everlasting Sorrow 长恨歌, the kunqu play of Changsheng Dian 长生殿 in the Qing Dynasty, and transnationally in Japanese writer Inoue Yasushi's 杨贵妃伝.
2. Luan 鸾 means the male phoenix, so Wu Luan 无鸾 is "no male phoenix," and therefore no masculine power.
3. All quotes from The Banquet are adopted from the film's English subtitles.
4. This is actually a poem that criticizes Emperor You of the West Zhou Dynasty for his doting indulgence of Bao Si that leads to the corruption of his court and indignation among his people. The Chinese original of the entire poem and its modern Chinese translation can be found in this website <http://www.paiai.com/Article/guoxue/jing/shij/200703/5289.html>.
5. There is no exact equivalent for this royal first person pronoun 朕 in English, but the royal plural "we" might come closer to this word.

【Works Cited】

Belsey, Catherine. Why Shakespeare? New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Cass, Victoria. Dangerous Women: Warrirors, Grannies, and Geishas of the Ming. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1999.

Chapman, Rebecca. "Spectator Violence and Queenly Desire in The Banquet." In Asian Shakespeares on Screen: Two Films in Perspective. Special issue, edited by Alexander C. Y. Huang. Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation 4.2 (Spring/Summer 2009). Available online: http://www.borrowers.uga.edu/.

Garber, Marjorie B. Shakespeare After All. New York: Pantheon Books, 2004.

Greenblat, Stephen. "Hamlet." The Norton Shakespeare: Tragedies. Eds. Stephen Greenblat, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard and Katherine Eisaman Maus. New York: Norton, 1997. 287–295.

Jameson, Fredric. "Magical Narrative: Romance as Genre." New Literary History. 7.1 (Autumn 1975): 135–163.

Ross, Charles. "The Banquet as Cinematic Romance." In Asian Shakespeares on Screen: Two Films in Perspective. Special issue, edited by Alexander C. Y. Huang. Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation 4.2 (Spring/Summer 2009). <http://www.borrowers.uga.edu>.

The Banquet. 2006. Dir. Feng Xiaogang. Perf. Zhang Ziyi, Ge You, Wu Daniel. Huayi Bros.

The Book of Songs. Trans. Arthur Waley and Joseph R. Allen. New York: Grove Press, 1996.

Representations of Shakespearean Women in Contemporary Brazilian Media

Christiane F. de Alcantara

Abstract Until the mid-1990s, Brazilian cinema has depicted women as exotic sexual objects. After the turn of the 21st century, Brazilian movie directors have tried to reproduce women as strong characters who defy traditional patriarchal authority. This paper investigates four Brazilian media that appropriate Shakespearean plays, namely the soap opera *O Cravo e a Rosa* and three movies: *O Auto da Compadecida*, *O Casamento de Romeu e Julieta* and *As Alegres Comadres*. In each case, directors not only incorporate elements pertaining to Brazilian cultural identity to Shakespearean plots, but also portray female characters who subvert traditional female roles in order to exert their agency.

Key words cinema; Brazil; women; patriarchy; subversion; transgression

Author Christiane F. de Alcantara is from Curitiba, Brazil. She studied at the State University of Rio de Janeiro, completing her undergraduate and MA degrees English Literature. She is currently a doctoral student in the Comparative Literature Program at Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana. Email: calcant@purdue.edu

Brazilian cinema usually depicts women as exotic sexual objects. In the 1970s, during the military regime, when Brazilian art was very fervent, the most successful genre of movies was the Brazilian *pornochanchada*, a genre known for its highly eroticized depictions of women. In the *pornochanchada*, women were usually cast as coy sexual objects and men were macho sexual athletes (Johnson & Stam 405). After over a decade without any major production in Brazilian film, in 1995 movie makers began a new era of cinema, marked by a neo-liberal and post-modern approach. In this new phase of Brazilian film, contemporary themes such as poverty, violence, and racism became central to the narratives. Especially after the turn of the twenty-first century, the new period of Brazilian cinema has tried to reproduce the reality of Brazilian life in its most diverse contexts throughout the country. In this new perspective, directors have tended to portray women as strong characters who defy traditional patriarchal authority.

The thematic of female subversion of traditional social roles had already been addressed in many Shakespearean plays. If art imitates life, Shakespeare's theater mimicked the society of his time, when religion was at the very center of life in Tudor England. At that time, girls were raised to obey their fathers and later their husbands without questioning. Principally in the upper classes, women's destiny was very limited: they were supposed to be wives and mothers. In other words, women had little

choice in life (McDowall 84). However, in his theater, Shakespeare created some female characters that challenge the traditional passive roles imposed by society, thus showing that women have always struggled to have agency in patriarchal England. For instance, in *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *As You Like it*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Twelfth Night*, and others, Shakespeare was able to depict the conditions of women within a patriarchal system and created characters capable of transcending the limitations of their time.

This paper aims at analyzing the representation of female characters in different appropriations of Shakespeare's plays by Brazilian directors of TV shows or cinema. This paper shall concentrate on four contemporary works: the soap opera *O Cravo e a Rosa* (*The Carnation and the Rose*), and three films, namely *O Casamento de Romeu e Julieta* (*Romeo and Juliet Get Married*), *O Auto da Compadecida* (*A Dog's Will*), and *As Alegres Comadres* (*The Merry Wives*). The soap opera and films here analyzed either incorporate a Shakespearean scene or compose their stories based on the main plot of a Shakespearean play.

In each case the directors adapt famous Shakespearean plays to the realities of Brazilian culture. Alex Huang and Charles Ross argue that "staging a Shakespearean play is a process not simply of representing that play itself but rather of negotiating the dynamics between the locality Shakespeare represents and the locality of the performers and the audience" (4). These appropriations reveal how the Brazilian directors re-invent Shakespeare's plots and adapt them to the Brazilian audience by creating a dialogue between the Bard and the Brazilian forms of cultural expression and showing women as strong transgressive figures.

In order to understand the directors' adoption of Shakespearean elements to their films, it is necessary to correlate the Brazilian texts to the English playwright's works. *O Cravo e a Rosa* (dir. Walter Avancini, 2000) is a Brazilian soap opera first exhibited in 2000 which was based on Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*. The story is set in 1920s São Paulo. The main character Catarina Batista (Katherine) is an example of modern woman in the 1920s who refuses the roles of housewife and mother. Catarina is known as "a fera" ('the beast') for sending all her suitors running away, but in order to help her sister she agrees to marry Julião Petruchio (Petrucchio). Petruchio is a farmer who believes that women were born to take care of their husband and children, that is, to be the queen of the home. Another main character in the story is Bianca. She is completely different from her sister Catarina: she dreams about being engaged and getting married, but can only do so after the older sister finds a husband.

O Auto da Compadecida (dir. Guel Arraes, 2000), originally a play written by Ariano Suassuna in 1955, is a version of Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice*. Adapted to the cinema in 2000 by the director Guel Arraes, this film switches the setting from Venice to the Brazilian desert lands of the Northeast. It incorporates elements that are traditional in Brazilian culture, such as *literatura de cordel* (a kind of popular oral poetry), the Catholic Brazilian Baroque, and traditional Brazilian myths of the Northeast (such as the *Cangaceiro*, a bandit). In this film, two poor friends—Chicó and João Grilo—struggle to find ways to get money so as not to die of hunger.

The alliance of João Grilo's cunning and Chicó's cowardice leads the two men through several tricky adventures until Rosinha, the daughter of the city coronel (the local landowner who rules the town), arrives. Chicó immediately falls in love with Rosinha and decides to pretend to be rich and educated in order to marry her.

O Casamento de Romeu e Julieta (dir. Bruno Barreto, 2005) is a modern and comedic version of Shakespeare's tragedy *Romeo and Juliet*. Instead of setting the plot in Verona as in the original play, in this movie the story is set in São Paulo in the twenty-first century. The main characters are Julieta (Juliet), the coach of a feminine soccer team, and Romeu (Romeo), an ophthalmologist. Julieta is the daughter of Alfredo Baragatti, the fanatic fan and member of the board of directors of Palmeiras soccer team, whereas Romeu is the chief of the uniformed rooting of Corinthians soccer team - the greatest rival of Palmeiras. The original family struggle between the Capulets and the Montagues is transformed into a struggle about soccer, the most important sport in Brazilian culture (Humphrey & Tomlinson 101).

The last work analyzed in this paper is Leila Hipólito's *As Alegres Comadres* (2003), a version of Shakespeare's *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. This adaptation sets the story in nineteenth century Tiradentes, Brazil. The movie shows how a broken Portuguese ex-military man, João Fausto (Falstaff), uses his status as former member of the Brazilian Emperor's court to deceive the local bourgeoisie. His life becomes complicated when he decides to seduce two married women, Mrs. Lima (Mrs. Page) and Mrs. Rocha (Mrs. Ford), because he believes these women have access to their husbands' money. Fausto hopes that once the women have been seduced, they will give him money and jewelry. After the wives learn about his interest in both of them, they pursue their revenge. At the same time, Mr. and Mrs. Lima try to find a suitor to marry their daughter Ana (Anne Page); however, the girl is already in love with a broken aristocrat named Franco (Fenton).

In each of these four contemporary Brazilian adaptations of Shakespearean plays, women appear as strong characters who subvert passive roles and are able to find agency in a patriarchal context. Below I will discuss each work in further details, focusing on the representations of women and in the appropriation of elements pertaining to Brazilian culture and incorporated to Shakespeare's plays.

1. *The Taming of the Shrew* and *O Cravo e a Rosa*

In *The Taming of the Shrew*, Shakespeare's Katherina is first portrayed as bad-tempered, constantly scolding and having fits. In contrast, her sister Bianca is said to show "mild behavior and sobriety" (*The Taming of the Shrew* 1.1.71). Nevertheless, as the plot develops, the situation turns: Bianca refuses to follow her husband's command to come to him (5.2.87 – 88), whereas Kate ends up delivering a brilliant sermon on the importance of a wife's submissiveness to her husband (5.2.148 – 191). In her speech, Kate strongly emphasizes how she has wrongly been scolding and that a wife should obey her husband:

> **Kate**: My mind hath been as big as one of yours,
> My heart as great, my reason haply more,

To bandy word for word and frown for frown.
But now I see our lances are but straws,
Our strength as weak, our weakness past compare,
That seeming to be most which we indeed least are (5.2.182 – 187).

Kate's final speech shows that women should not have a hot temperament or defy their husband. Kate delivers what seems to be the final message of the play, that women should be obedient and subservient to their spouses.

Unlike Shakespeare's Kate, in the Brazilian soap opera *O Cravo e a Rosa*, Catarina maintains her shrew behavior until the end of the story. At first her shrewishness sends all suitors running away, including Petruchio, whom she dismisses because she believes she is too good for him. She claims that she is beautiful, educated, and rich, whereas Petruchio says she is rustic and rude. However, Petruchio and her father Mr. Batista (Baptista) decide to deceive Catarina: Petruchio asks Batista to pretend that he does not approve of Petruchio's courting Catarina. In order to cross her father, Catarina accepts Petruchio's wooing. From this moment we start to see Catarina's strong temperament: she accepts Petruchio's courtship just to show disobedience to her father.

Since Bianca dreams about getting married, she tries to convince Catarina to marry Petruchio, because at that time the younger daughter could only marry once her older sister was already wedded. To help Bianca, Catarina agrees to marry Petruchio, but she imposes some conditions: she will only marry an obedient husband. She demands separate bedrooms and states that she will not perform any wifely duties, because she will only keep appearances. Petruchio accepts and is very submissive to her, but he promises to tame her when they are married. Unlike in the original play where the two sisters do not get along well, in *O Cravo e a Rosa* the women are united to take small but subversive steps so as to achieve their independence. Catarina accepts the role of wife ascribed by society in order to help her sister, but by stating her firm decision that the marriage will not be consummated, she shows that for the early twentieth century society, only appearances mattered.

Even after the wedding, Catarina keeps her shrewish behavior, although she grows more loving towards her husband. For instance, in episode 59, Petruchio finds Catarina crying because Mr. Batista forces Bianca to marry a man she does not love. Catarina's vulnerability and her increasing love for Petruchio lead her to kiss her husband. After they kiss, however, Catarina goes mad and accuses Petruchio of taking advantage of her. Throughout the story of the soap opera, such moments when Catarina's sweeter side is suddenly replaced by scolding repeat themselves in a series of attacks on Petruchio.

However, shrewishness is transformed into a positive characteristic in the soap opera *O Cravo e a Rosa*. This can be perceived, for instance, in episode 124, when Catarina verbally attacks Marcela, Mr. Batista's evil fiancée. Although her behavior does not conform to the way a well-bred woman should act, she is excused for doing a good thing in exposing Marcela's evil doing and saving her father from a deceitful marriage.

Towards the end of the story, Catarina and Petruchio adapt to one another: Catarina becomes more pleasing towards Petruchio, and he also becomes more refined so as to please her. When Petruchio falls seriously ill, Catarina diverts her shrewishness into a more efficient way of imposing her will and having agency: she decides to administer her husband's farm and to build a cheese factory there. Thus, at the end of the story, shrewishness assumes a different characteristic: it becomes associated with female independence and determination.

Another female character whose agency was explored in this TV series is Bianca. Bianca begins the story as a romantic young girl, unlike her sister Catarina, who is portrayed as extremely manipulative and intelligent. Throughout soap opera series, Bianca is obedient to her father, agreeing to marry Heitor, a man she does not love, because it is her father's desire. However, during the final episodes, Catarina's disposition seems to rub off onto Bianca. On the wedding day, Bianca fakes a faint, and with the help of her sister Catarina, she runs away from her unwanted marriage in order to be with the man she truly loves, Edmundo. By acquiring some of Catarina's features, Bianca becomes independent and active. The happy ending with a marriage between Bianca and Edmundo suggests that Bianca's disobedience to her father and her refusal to marry Heitor was proper. The soap opera redefines being a shrew to mean, instead, autonomy and self-sufficiency. In this way it finds a way to make acceptable a patriarchal play that otherwise might seem offensive. According to Velvet D. Pearson, "the play can easily be distasteful to the feminist awareness of the 1990s, and if a way is not found to make the text compatible to the sensibilities of a modern audience, performances of it will cease, and the text will sink into obscurity, to be read only by the most dedicated Shakespeare scholars" (229). Thus, in the Brazilian modern version of the story, Kate's sharp tongue becomes an indication not of a scold but a strong woman.

Although Kate's shrewishness is tamed in Shakespeare's play, Catarina's struggle for genuine agency leads her to a more active and autonomous societal position. In Brazil, soap operas are considered *obras abertas*, that is, open works where audiences' interpretations and perceptions are taken into consideration during the production of the shows. Thus, writers of soap operas may change their original plot according to the audience's will (Lopes 26). This means that Walcyr Carrasco and Mário Teixeira, the writers of the Brazilian soap opera *O Cravo e a Rosa*, might have wanted to make Catarina more submissive at the end of the story, but that the Brazilian public was more interested in viewing a shrew and strong woman struggling to have agency and voice in the 1920s.

2. *The Merchant of Venice* and *O Auto da Compadecida*

Although in *The Taming of the Shrew* Katherine is often believed to lack agency, in several other Shakespearean plays women demonstrate a stronger and more powerful character. Such is the case of Portia in *The Merchant of Venice*. In this play, Bassanio borrows money from Shylock and offers to take a pound of Antonio's flesh if the loan is not paid. When Antonio forfeits, Shylock takes him to court. Unfortunately for Shylock, Portia—Bassanio's wife—disguises herself as a man (Balthazar) and goes

to Venice to serve as legal expert in Antonio's trial to save her husband's best friend. Dressed as a young male "doctor of the law," Portia asks Shylock to show mercy, but the Jewish moneylender refuses. Thus the court must allow Shylock to extract the promised pound of flesh. At that very moment, Portia points out a flaw in the contract: she realizes that it does not entitle Shylock with any drop of Antonio's blood:

> **Portia**: Tarry a little; there is something else.
> This bond doth give thee here no jot of blood;
> The words expressly are 'a pound of flesh:'
> Take then thy bond, take thou thy pound of flesh;
> But, in the cutting it, if thou dost shed
> One drop of Christian blood, thy lands and goods
> Are, by the laws of Venice, confiscate
> Unto the state of Venice (*/The Merchant of Venice/* 4.1.316 –323).

As Portia cunningly realizes, it is impossible to cut skin without dripping at least a little blood. She decrees that if Shylock were to shed any drop of Antonio's blood, or to take any more or less than a pound of flesh, he will lose his lands and goods (Act 4, Scene 1). Shylock is trapped, and thanks to Portia's intelligence, Antonio is freed.

Although Guel Arraes' *O Auto da Compadecida* reproduces Suassuna's play of the same name, the director brings some innovations to his movie. One of the most important innovations is the incorporation of the trial scene. Arraes also substitutes Major Antônio Moraes' sick son for the character Rosinha, who does not exist in Suassuna's play. In Rosinha's first scene she is wearing a white dress, suggesting feminine purity and naiveté. Rosinha seems to represent the perfect daughter, one who is pure, chaste, and subservient to her father. Since the movie portrays the Brazilian *nordestino* society of the 1930s, when women were prepared almost exclusively for matrimony (Moreira & Silva 9), Major Antônio Moraes searches for a husband for his daughter, fearing that his daughter might bring dishonesty to the family (that is, that she might have sex before marriage), if he does not act. But he wants to make sure that Rosinha is united to a wealthy man, so as to consolidate political and financial alliances.

In the Brazilian film *O Auto da Compadecida*, one of the main characters – the poor Chicó – falls in love with Rosinha, the daughter of the city *coronel*. When Chicó discovers that Rosinha is also in love with him, he asks his best friend João Grilo for assistance. In order to help Chicó, João Grilo creates a scheme to deceive the Major: he pretends that Chicó is a rich and educated landowner and introduces him to Antônio Moraes as such. After the introduction, the *coronel* is convinced that Chicó is the best match for his daughter. When he tells Rosinha he has found a husband for her, she immediately rejects the idea, trying to state her will. Nevertheless, she suddenly changes her mind when she notices that her father wants to marry her to the one she loves. She pretends to be obedient in marrying the man her father has chosen, but spectators know that, in fact, she is subverting his male power, using his authority to marry Chicó. Here Rosinha starts to demonstrate her astuteness, de-

mystifying the image of purity we attribute to her in the beginning of the movie (Moreira & Silva 10).

The Major agrees to the union of Chicó and his daughter, believing that he is making a good political alliance. However, in order to marry Rosinha, Chicó has to remodel the local church building. As a poor man, he cannot afford the money for the new design project and borrows from Antônio Moraes. As proof of payment, João Grilo assures the Major that Chicó will give a piece of his back skin if he does not pay for the loan. Knowing that Rosinha's grandmother left her a piggybank full of money as a wedding gift, João Grilo is certain that Chicó will be able to pay the loan. It turns out, however, that because the currency in the piggybank is out of circulation, Chicó and João Grilo cannot collect enough money to pay Rosinha's father. As a consequence, Major Antônio Moraes is entitled to remove a strip of Chicó's skin as payment for the loan.

As in Shakespeare's play, in *O Auto da Compadecida* it is a woman who literally saves her lover's skin. Rosinha realizes that the debt does not include blood. She not only saves her lover, however, but she finds freedom from her father's power, who cannot collect what he is owed.

If in Shakespeare's play Portia had to wear a male disguise in order to make herself credible and to exert her agency, by contrast in *O Auto da Compadecida* Rosinha defies her father's will and power in her own identity and feminine garments. Rosinha's participation in João Grilo's scheme to deceive the Major about Chicó's true identity is very significant. given the strongly patriarchal society of the Brazilian Northeast. It demonstrates that "for the population as a whole, behaviors, attitudes, and values were revealed that diverged from the ideal conceived according to the model of the patriarchal family" (Samara and Costa 214). Rosinha's transgression shows that, although in Brazilian society women are often expected to take submissive roles, in practice many find a way to escape a passive position making their voices heard. Like Portia, Rosinha is empowered when she finds a way to prevent her father from collecting his bond of Chicó's flesh. And like Catarina in *O Cravo e a Rosa* Rosinha in *O Auto da Compadecida* is a transgressive character who finds a way to impose her will in chauvinist and patriarchal society.

3. *Romeo and Juliet* and *O Casamento de Romeu e Julieta*

Another famous Shakespearean play where the female protagonist demonstrates agency is *Romeo and Juliet*. In this play, Juliet is the one to suggest marriage to Romeo and to plot their secret wedding in Act 2 Scene 2:

> **Juliet**: Three words, dear Romeo, and good night indeed.
> If that thy bent of love be honourable,
> Thy purpose marriage, send me word to-morrow,
> By one that I'll procure to come to thee,
> Where and what time thou wilt perform the rite;
> And all my fortunes at thy foot I'll lay
> And follow thee my lord throughout the world (148 – 154).

Aware of her father's plans to marry her with Paris, Juliet decides to marry Romeo in secret, but their love is interrupted by Mercutio's and Tybalt's deaths. Romeo is banished and Juliet goes after Friar Lawrence for advice. The two of them concoct a plan to reunite Juliet with Romeo in Mantua: the night before her wedding to Paris, Juliet should drink a potion that would make her appear to be dead. The Friar, then, would write Romeo a letter explaining their plan and after Juliet was laid to rest in the family's crypt, the Friar and Romeo would secretly retrieve her, and the two lovers would be free to live away from their parents' feuding (Act 4 Scene 1).

It is Juliet who creates the plot that ends in the lovers' tragic end: she is the one to first suggest marriage and together with Friar Lawrence she creates a plan to get rid of the feudal authority of the Capulets and Montagues in order to be with her beloved Romeo. Although Romeo and Juliet ends tragically, maybe suggesting that female transgression brings negative and tragic consequences, in the Brazilian film version of this play the two lovers end happily. In *O Casamento de Romeu e Julieta*, the main couple has to face several episodes of adversity before they can finally be together and the tragic plot is transformed into a comedy.

Like Juliet in Shakespeare's play, in the Brazilian movie, Julieta is also a very strong woman. From the beginning of the story we see her effort to coach a team of female soccer players in Brazil, a country where although soccer is the most popular sport, it is quasi-exclusively played by men. Julieta has to struggle against the board of directors of Palmeiras, the club where she plays, because they believe that soccer is not a sport for women. The directors' sexist opinion about female soccer is discussed by the sociologist Janet Lever, who claims that in Brazil, soccer is associated with masculinity and the presence of women as players or fans would weaken some men's interest in the game (154). Such interpretations of the most popular sport in Brazil are recurrent in Brazilian society, where it is assumed that soccer should be played by men for men only. This chauvinist view of soccer is challenged in the movie by Julieta's talent for the game and by her successful coaching of the Palmeiras women's team. However, despite her efforts to convince the directors of the women's talent for soccer, Julieta loses the battle. She becomes even more disappointed when she discovers that her own father did not vote in her favor.

As the story goes on we see more of Julieta's transgressive side: when she goes to a soccer game with her family, she sees Romeu cheering for her rival club (Corinthians). She becomes immediately interested in him. After an argument with her father, Julieta hurts her eye and goes to an ophthalmologist. During the eye examination, she realizes that the doctor is the same man she saw in the stadium cheering for Corinthians. She interrupts the examination, stares at Romeu and flirts with him. It is Juliet who makes the first move, thus pointing to a new direction for women in Brazil, who traditionally are expected to be coy and wait for men to act.

Another instance when Julieta makes her agency known is when she convinces Romeu to pretend to be a fan of Palmeiras so that he can be accepted by her father. He learns all the history of Julieta's team, wears the team shirt, goes to games with her entire family and even goes to Japan with her father to cheer for her club. Even

though in Brazil most men are strongly devoted to soccer and to their teams, Julieta is able to convince Romeu to switch sides and root for her club. Julieta's passion for soccer, already non-traditional for women, makes her subvert the commonly expected role where she would switch teams in order to please Romeu.

Julieta's most subversive moment occurs after her father discovers that Romeu is not a *palmeirense* (a person who cheers for Palmeiras soccer team). Dr. Baragatti asks Julieta to choose between Romeu or her family, just as Juliet in Shakespeare's play has to choose between her family and the love for Romeo. In this film version, Julieta also chooses Romeu and goes against her father, exerting her agency and refusing to submit to his rule.

Julieta's progressive attitude also demonstrates recent changes in women's behavior in Brazilian society. The movie cleverly shows that a woman can choose to have a career, even if it is traditionally performed by men. It also portrays a transformation in female conduct when it comes to relationships by showing that women can take the first move without being considered immoral. By providing a happy end to the story, it seems that the director Bruno Barreto wants to say that women are allowed to violate socially acceptable norms without being punished. Thus, the Brazilian modern version of *Romeo and Juliet* welcomes female subversion of patriarchal authority.

4. *The Merry Wives of Windsor* and *As Alegres Comadres*

Like the film *O Casamento de Romeu e Julieta*, the Brazilian movie *As Alegres Comadres* (*The Merry Wives*) provides another instance of a daughter who defies her father's will in order to exert her agency in the choice of her husband. *As Alegres Comadres* is a film version of Shakespeare's *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. In Shakespeare's play, at the same time that Mrs. Ford and Mrs. Page plot their revenge against Falstaff, Mr. and Mrs. Page also try to find a suitor for their daughter Anne Page. Mrs. Page prefers Dr. Caius for a son-in-law, and Mr. Page prefers Slender (3.2.55 – 56), but Anne Page does not want to marry either of the two gentlemen chosen by her parents. She is in love with Fenton and at the end of the play the two lovers plot against her parents and get married.

Similarly to Juliet in *Romeo and Juliet*, and to Julieta in *O Casamento de Romeu e Julieta*, in the Brazilian version of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Ana Lima (Anne Page) is the one to make the first move in her love affair with Franco (Fenton). From the beginning of the movie, as Franco descends the train, Ana demonstrates her interest in him. Her eyes follow Franco's movements and later she gossips with Maria (Mrs. Quickly) about him. Moreover, when the couple meets in the forest, Ana kisses Franco and starts to undress him. Although in the play Anne and Fenton are rarely left alone, in this film version the couple is often portrayed together kissing unaccompanied. This proclivity shows Ana's subversion of her father's authority: even if her father states that she shall not marry Franco because he wants her to marry Silva (Slender), she continues with the relationship contradicting his decision.

According to Susan Besse, in the nineteenth century Brazilian society,

> Children of the elite were reared to obey, even to the extent of accepting the

> right of the patriarch to choose their marriage partner. Romance was normally an irrelevant consideration; instead, elite families arranged marriages for their children (often with cousins or close relatives) with the aim of cementing political alliances and guarding property and status(12).

Thus, the traditional role for Ana Lima would be to accept for husband whomever her father chose. In nineteenth century Brazil, she would not have much agency and would be forced to marry Silva, whom she did not love. The fact that she disobeys her father shows her will to exert herself in the choice of a life partner.

The final scene of the play, when the wives of Windsor and their husbands play a prank on Falstaff (Act 5 Scene 5), is interestingly adapted to Brazilian culture in *As Alegres Comadres*. In this film version, the director Leila Hipólito chooses to insert elements of Brazilian folklore such as the *Saci* (a one-legged mulatto youngster who smokes a pipe and wears a red cap that enables him to disappear and reappear wherever he wishes) and the Werewolf, and Orishas of Brazilian Afro religions such as *Ogun* and *Iemanjá* to represent the fairies and elves from the original play. Instead of the instructions to the fairies being delivered by Mistress Quickly, in the film version it is Ana Lima dressed as the Orisha *Iemanjá* who commands the fairies.

In Afro-Brazilian religions *Iemanjá* is the Queen of the Sea, a powerful guardian spirit. *Iemanjá* is a mother of all gods, the goddess of home, fertility, love and family (Omari 60). By choosing to portray Ana as this goddess, Hipólito seems to give more strength to her character at the end of the movie than what we see in the end of the original play. Ana Lima speaks more lines and has the chance to command the prank against Fausto. She is also very bold to deceive both suitors her parents had chosen and to get married to the man she loves.

Moreover, Hipólito chooses to transform the ending of the original play: in the film version, Silva (Slender)'s homosexual identity is revealed, when he is led to marry a boy. Moreover, the director transforms the end for Dr. Caius and Mistress Quickly: instead of having the doctor discover that he was about to marry a boy, the director chooses to exchange the boy for Maria (Mrs. Quickly), so that the doctor is married to his maid at the end of the story.

As we see, at the end of the film version, all the women are happy: Mrs. Lima and Mrs. Rocha are able to maintain their virtue and to exact their revenge against Fausto. Furthermore, Mrs. Rocha is able to prove her loyalty to her husband, Mr. Rocha, and to dismiss his jealous suspicions. Ana Lima is able to marry Franco whom she loves and Maria ends the story married to the French doctor. The happy ending for the women in the story may be Hipólito's feminist way of showing that female transgression does not always end tragically.

To conclude, in several Shakespearean plays the female characters do not conform to the submissive paths previously ascribed for them by Renaissance society. These women refuse to be merely minor characters, displaying their strength and power through their lines and acts. This strength is also represented in Brazilian media in the twenty-first century. In contemporary Brazilian TV and film versions of Shakespearean plays women are usually portrayed as strong characters that resist patriarchal

rules of Brazilian society. In other words, if Shakespeare was able to display the small but transgressive steps his heroines could take in the European societies of the sixteenth century, in twenty-first century Brazilian film versions directors seem to demonstrate that, although traditionally the Brazilian society is very male-centered, nowadays women are gaining more individual strength.

In *O Cravo e a Rosa*, the main character Catarina starts the story as a shrew, but her behavior does not change like that of Kate in *The Taming of the Shrew.* Although at the end of the soap opera Catarina grows more loving towards Petruchio, she still scolds her husband. Moreover, Catarina diverts her shrewishness into leadership when she administers her husband's farm. Her sister Bianca also demonstrates a shrew behavior at the end of the soap opera, when she pretends to faint in order to escape an unwanted marriage. Shrewishness in the modern Brazilian adaptation becomes synonymous with female independence and agency, thus assuming a positive connotation. This view of shrewishness as positive may be associated with a transformation in Brazilian society that started in the first three decades of last century and continues to take place, where women have been gaining more agency and control over their lives (Campos 1). As a result, it seems that even though Shakespeare's play has been widely accepted by both male and female audiences in the past, nowadays it is more difficult to talk about the process of "taming" a wife and the consequences linked to it without sounding chauvinist and sexist.

In addition, the film versions here explored seem to reveal a pattern of female transgression that may be associated with social transformations in Brazilian society. Traditionally, Brazil has been stereotyped as an archetypical patriarchal culture (Stevens 58). The traditional image of women in Brazilian art exploits their bodies and sexualities focusing on their objectification. However, in *O Auto da Compadecida*, *O Casamento de Romeu e Julieta* and *As Alegres Comadres* women are no longer portrayed as sexual objects, but are subjects who struggle and succeed in finding voice and agency in a patriarchal society.

However, I believe that these transformations in Brazilian film are still very much attached to the traditional roles ascribed for women. As we can perceive in all the works analyzed in this paper, even though the female characters in Brazilian soap operas and movies are portrayed as having a transgressive nature, all of them still fit the roles of wives and mothers, the traditional position for women in patriarchal societies. Thus, I believe that contemporary filmmakers have yet been unable to depict a complete subversion of the norms of society and I hope that directors choose to reveal different possibilities for women in future adaptations.

【Works Cited】

As Alegres Comadres. Dir. Leila Hipólito. Perf. Guilherme Karan, Zezé Polessa, Milton Gonçalves. Ananã Produções, 2003. DVD.

Campos, Zuleica Dantas Pereira. "Pela Mulher, Para Mulher: Uma voz Feminista no Recife dos Anos 30". Núcleo de Estudos para América Latina. Web. 2 May 2010.

Huang, Alex & Ross, Charles, eds. *Shakespeare in Hollywood, Asia, and Cyberspace.* West Lafa-

yette: Purdue University Press, 2009.

Humphrey, John & Tomlinson, Alan. "Review: Reflections on Brazilian Football: A Review and Critique of Janet Lever's 'Soccer Madness'". *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1986):101 – 108.

Johnson, R. & Stam, R. *Brazilian Cinema*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Lever, Janet. *Soccer Madness: Brazil's Passion for the World's Most Popular Sport*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, 1983.

Lopes, Maria Immacolata Vassallo. "Telenovela Brasileira: Uma Narrativa Sobre a Nação". Comunicação & Educação. Vol. 26 (2003):17 – 34.

McDowall, David. *An Illustrated History of Britain*. Harlow: Longman, 1989.

Moreira, Lucia C. & Silva, Gisele Belini e. "Uma análise do O Auto da Compadecida – releitura da personagem Rosinha". *Annals of the XXX Congresso Brasileiro de Ciências da Comunicação*. 29 Aug. to 2 Sept. 2007. Web. 3 May 2010.

O Auto da Compadecida. Dir. Guel Arraes. Perf. Marco Nanini, Matheus Nachtergaele, Selton Mello, Rogério Cardoso, Denise Fraga, Diogo Vilela, Paulo Goulart. Globo Filmes, 2000. DVD.

O Casamento de Romeu e Julieta. Dir. Bruno Barreto. Perf. Luis Gustavo, Luana Piovani, Marco Ricca, Mel Lisboa. Globo Filmes, 2005. DVD.

"O Cravo e a Rosa". Globo. Rede Globo, Rio de Janeiro. 2000. Television.

Omari, Mikelle Smith. "The Role of the Gods in Afro-Brazilian Ancestral Ritual". *African Arts*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (1989):54 – 61 + 103 – 104.

Pearson, Velvet D. "In Search of a Liberated Kate in 'The Taming of the Shrew'". *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (1990):229 – 242.

Samara, Eni de Mesquita & Costa, Dora Isabel Paiva da. "Review: Family, Patriarchalism, and Social Change in Brazil." *Latin American Research Review*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (1997):212 – 225.

Shakespeare, W. *Romeo and Juliet*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Popular Classics, 1994.

---. *The Merchant of Venice*. New York: American Book Company, 1998.

---. *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

---. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1921.

Stevens, Evelyn. "Machismo and Marianismo". *Society*, Vol. 10 (1973): 57 – 63.

Suassuna, Ariano. *O Auto da Compadecida*. Rio de Janeiro: Agir, 2005.

Creating the Ghosts of Modernity: Magic and Memory in *Hamlet* and Cien *Años de Soledad*

Jason Lotz

Abstract Modernity's impulse to control both collective and individual memory in an effort to shape a more marketable persona parallels a shift in the regard of magic—a shift that characterizes the postcolonial revolutions that invigorate Gabriel García Márquez's *Cien Años de Soledad* as much as the early modern renaissances that inspire Shakespeare's Hamlet. While Hamlet struggles with the irruption of magic in a world that no longer has room for ghosts, the Buendías of Macondo suffer the extinction of a magic that stitches their world together. In both cases, ability to control memory represents modernity's sublimation of magic and the means to its reconstruction of the world.

Key words magic memory postcolonial Shakespeare identity

Author Jason Lotz spent his first eighteen years near Comarapa, Bolivia. He has taught Spanish and composition at Purdue University, where he is working on a degree in Comparative Literature. His research interests center on the overlap between the early modern period and post-colonialism, including specifically tragedy, allegory, and trauma.

Gabriel García Márquez begins his novel *Cien Años de Soledad* (One Hundred Years of Solitude) in the middle of things: "Muchos años despues, frente al pelotón de fusilamiento, el coronel Aureliano Buendía había de recordar aquella tarde remota en que su padre lo llevó a conocer el hielo."[1] (*Cien Años* 9; "Many years later, facing the firing squad, Colonel Aureliano Buendía happened to recall that distant afternoon in which his father took him to encounter ice.") By beginning *in media res*, Márquez invokes the nostalgic, somewhat prophetic tone and the time-bending, cyclical structure of his narrative. But he also reveals the principal problem that faces the inhabitants of Macondo: memory.

Memory, for the modern individual, allows a person to mentally reconstruct events to suit a conception of the self. It is, in that sense, a mechanism for self-preservation, analogous to language and by extension—if C. S. Lewis's definition of *magia divina* can be stretched slightly—the sublimation of magic.[2] It follows, perhaps not too distantly, that the ability to control images, whether of events (history) or people (selves) fulfills the promise of magic to wield over nature an absolute control. For this reason, Plato in *The Republic* (10.831 – 833) fears the "spell" and "mag-

ic" of poetry; Philip Sidney, more optimistically, in *The Defense of Poetry* notes the connection between *carmina* (song, poem) and *charm* and its relationship to the Delphic oracle, celebrating the ability to delight and teach. Memory, insofar as it can be controlled, managed or even stimulated by language, operates like puppet strings for an individual. Rhetoricians, orators, advertisers all claim as much influence over their audiences—sometimes without exaggerating. But as Renaissance and Romantic scholarship has shouted for years, the real power comes in the ability to write one's own meaning, one's own memory, one's own place in the world. If memory can be harnessed, one can reshape the past and present, or one's identity, according to one's will; one need not be the casualty of birth, class or circumstance—the fact of history: one can be a more desirable fiction. This is modernism—literacy, history, science, religion—the crushing blow to Macondo.

Hamlet, even excluding the vast historical and cultural gap, seems to stand in complete contrast to the Colombian novel. Yes, there are ghosts in both, but they are treated much differently. *Hamlet* begins where *Cien Años de Soledad* ends. Hamlet's is a peculiarly modern struggle, feeding off the tempestuous rise of modern politics and humanist education. In the dark winter of Denmark, the dying embers of a superstitious past give way to a new kind of hero—the stark individual who adapts himself to the shifting dramas of courtly life; college-educated, an actor, soldier, lover, all-around Renaissance courtier. Hamlet's problem is not a lack of memory, but too much. In *Cien Años*, Márquez describes the origin of memory (in the modernist sense)—the capture of the pre-modern or non-modern magic of a town like Macondo into history, which is memory, a place where only ghosts exist. *Cien Años de Soledad* is about the reduction of magic and people and nature into ghosts—words, history, philosophy, religion. What faces Hamlet is precisely this consequence of modernism, and the question Shakespeare asks is what happens when one of those ghosts escapes.

In *Cien Años de Soledad*, Márquez portrays the short-lived and turbulent history of Macondo, a small Colombian town. He traces the town's rise and fall from the perspective of its first and founding family, the Buendías whose own beginning and ending coincide with that of Macondo. Setting the novel rougly between 1830 – 1930, Márquez paints nostalgically the fabled memories of his grandparents while marking in his own generation the termination of the old way of life. His story follows Macondo through the swirling times of pioneering colonialism, civil war, American capitalist imperialism, discovery and—more intimately—the enchantment of the author's own childhood.

Cien Años is ultimately a story of loss, but equally a story of conquest. It is the loss of uncontained magic, of inexplicable but equally accepted connections between human moral actions and their supernatural consequences—quite literally the effects over nature of the moral capacity of humanity. But the other side of this loss is a conquest, a taming, a sublimation in both senses—in the psychoanalytical, meaning the displacement of desires in order to fulfill them in a constructive, society-friendly way; and in the physical, comparable to the endothermic process in which a solid changes directly into gas. Not only does the modernist conquest claim to provide in the decipherable text the acceptable evaluation of that creative magic that for a century floats

uninhibited throughout Macondo, that ciphering turns the solid reality of the supernatural into a gaseous abstraction—into memory.

One can hardly imagine a performance of Shakespeare's tragedy, which hinges on the tension between guise and reality (and banking significantly on the understanding that ghost equals guise and not reality), in Macondo, where the supernatural is not an irruption into the natural order, but instead a continuation of the not-yet-contained energies of a young earth. "El mundo era tan reciente, que muchas cosas carecían de nombre, y para mencionarlas había que señarlarlas con el dedo." (*Cien Años* 9; "The world was so fresh, that many things lacked names, and in order to mention them, one had to signal them with a finger.") Unboxed by language, nature expands freely, naturally, disencumbered by the strictures of sophisticated society. As if in union with nature, José Arcadio Buendía learns the name Macondo in a dream: "Preguntó qué ciudad era aquella, y le contestaron con un nombre que nunca había oído, que no tenía significado alguno, pero que tuvo en el sueño una resonancia sobrenatural." (*Cien Años* 36; 'He asked what city it was, and they responded to him with a name he had never heard, which had no significance at all, but which in the dream had a supernatural resonance.') It is the supernatural resonance of the uncharted, non-literal Colombian-jungle reality that characterizes the narrative of *Cien Años de Soledad* and specifically the nature of the life in Macondo. *Hamlet*, in contrast, begins with the highly ritualized changing of the guards at Elsinore castle.

> BERNARDO: Who's there?
> FRANCISCO: Nay, answer me. Stand and unfold yourself. (*Hamlet* 1.1.1 – 2)

It seems from the exchange that something is out of order, and the ensuing scene, where the guards discuss the appearance of ghost that looks like the late King Hamlet, reveals that the supernatural irruption threatens to unravel the entire fabric of the Danish court. Francisco's response is only the first of many attempts to re-establish the order that presumably preexists the play.

Cien Años, whose beginning is also prodded by the appearance of a murdered ghost, handles the haunting much differently. José Arcadio and Ursula move and found Macondo as the direct result of their interaction with the ghost of Prudencio Aguilar, a man José Arcadio kills for insulting his manhood. Rather than fear the ghost, Ursula pities him; and José Arcadio, recognizing the ghost as the direct extension of his own action, cannot escape the overwhelming feeling of responsibility: "Lo atormentaba la inmensa desolación con que el muerto lo había mirado desde la lluvia, la honda nostalgia con que a? oraba a los vivos, la ansiedad con que registraba la casa buscando el agua para mojar su tapón de esparto." (*Cien Años* 34; "The immense desolation with which the dead man had watched him from the rain tormented him, the deep nostalgia with which he yearned for the living ones, the anxiety with which he scoured the house looking for water to moisten his straw plug.") Here begins the 100 years of solitude, the 100-year struggle against insomnia and forgetfulness, the 100-year reign of unrestrained magic. While José Arcardio tries to appease the ghost

(not unlike Hamlet), the ghost makes no demands: it simply is. The ghost, for as long as the Buendías fail to harness the power of memory, will be a fact of their community. *Cien Años*, in this sense, relates the struggle to lay that ghost (and several other manifestations of their magical reality) to rest. Ironically, that rest will be the literal perpetuation of Macondo as ghost-town in Márquez's melancholic reminder of the pre-modern community.

Macondo's lack of distinction between the natural and supernatural gradually slips into a special modern category that safely orders magical reality as fantastic fiction. Until then, it is the ironic efforts of the inhabitants to unravel the fabric of an adolescent world and an encroaching modernity that ultimately weave them into a garroting net. Charmed by the inventions and scholarship of Melquiades, the Buendías strive for their own mastery of the brave new world only to be repeatedly rebuffed by outside competition, an indecipherable manuscript, isolation, or the distractions of their own physical appetites. Macondo begins high in the mind of its founder, José Arcadio Buendía; it represents a place of promise, hope and possibility. José Arcadio dreams of lasting city of modern sophistication and future. When he visits the gypsy tent of Melquiades, he pays for his sons to see and touch a magical block of ice and he remembers his dream upon founding Macondo of a city with walls made of mirrors. He thinks then that he can interpret the "profound significance" (*Cien Años* 36) of his dream, and he imagines building houses with enormous blocks of ice, beating the heat of the Colombian jungle and turning Macondo into refrigerated city. Of course he misinterprets the mirrors, which rather foreshadow the inbred solitude of the fated community, but his attempt to rationalize the significance of the ice with the memory represents the endemic flaw of the Buendías. And not only do they fail to craft their identities--individual and communal--according to a pragmatic application of memory, but as a family they repeat their mistakes like stitches in their own death shroud.

Both of José Arcadio's sons try to link their fates to the same event of seeing ice for the first time, and Márquez frames their recollections in exactly same way: "frente al pelotón de fusilamiento" (*Cien Años* 9, 112, 120). For Aureliano, the attempt is conscious and rational, and his acknowledgement of his failure is equally explicit: "Él mismo, frente al pelotón de fusilamiento, no había de entender muy bien cómo se fue encadenando la serie de sutiles pero irrevocables casualidades que lo llevaron hasta ese punto" (*Cien Años* 120; "The same, facing the firing squad, was not to figure out how the series of subtle but irrevocable coincidences had gone enchaining themselves together such that they had carried him to this point."). His inability to make sense of his life's history is mirrored by his brother's similar recollections when he faces a firing squad. José Arcadio's (II) mind is flooded with more sensual memories than his brother's; he feels the nostalgia that plagued him during his life evaporate: he hears Melquiades' songs, feels the steps of Santa Sofía, and he experiences the same coldness of the ice in his nose that he also noticed in the corpse of Remedios. But in that moment, as his life is flashing before him and feels himself completing his life, he suddenly thinks of some unfinished business, the sense of fulfillment vanishes, and he is once more accosted by that unshakeable nostalgia, the yearning to go back and find that something forgotten: "Entonces, acumulado en un zarpazo

desgarrador, volvió a sentir todo el terror que le atormentó en la vida" (*Cien Años* 149; 'Then, engulfed in a heartbreaking swipe, went back to feeling all the terror that had tormented him in life').

While both Buendía sons recall the same event, they are unable to memorialize it in the constructed identity of their selves. What should be a formative memory of childhood is actually a distant and indecipherable sign that resists meaning. Márquez describes the meeting of the ice not diachronically, or as a step in the evolution of an identity or character, but as the indelible thing Aureliano and José Arcadio think of "many years later, when facing the firing squad." What seems to the modern reader as memory—meaning that mechanism of self-preservation—is mere recollection. Neither can understand, much less control, the supernatural aura that seems to guide them to their fates.

Memory is the power not only to resuscitate the particulars of the past, but to capture the passage of time in a single, timeless image—that image being identity. But in Macondo, there exists a magic that the Buendías fail to contain; it is a magic of mirrors that determines the identities of the Buendías at birth. Seeing and touching the ice, for Aureliano, did not inspire his curiosity and prod him into becoming the curious, cold Colonel Aureliano anymore than seeing and not touching the ice led his brother to travel the world; the event merely provided the stage to demonstrate their intrinsic qualities. This immutability in the Buendía offspring leads Ursula to fear that the names Aureliano and José Arcadio trap every male into the same two personality types and their inevitable conclusions: "Mientras los Aurelianos eran retraídos, pero de mentalidad lúcida, los José Arcadio eran impulsivos y emprendedores, pero estaban marcados por un signo trágico" (*Cien Años* 221; "While the Aurelianos were introverted, but of an enlightening intelligence, the José Arcardios were impulsive and enterprising, but were marked by a tragic sign"). Unable to escape their own names or write for themselves new futures, the Buendía line is guided by nostalgia, an incessant grasping—but never reaching—at the meaning of the past.

From the beginning the Buendías seem always to repeat the same two stories, according to the two namesakes, the Aurelianos and José Arcadios. Repeated names, repeated personalities, repeated ventures, mistakes, and fortunes all represent repeated prisons in their 100-year solitude. Every Arcadio follows his passionate whims, throwing himself into sex, travel, music, food, or flashy new technology; while every Aureliano seeks a way to evade the cyclical boundaries of time by social or academic advancements—war, philosophy, literature, or science. Where one follows his heart, the other follows his head, both championing a severely independent spirit; they pursue orgasm and epiphany, seemingly cursed against a lasting impact—unable to fulfill their parents' dreams or build foundations for their children's. Despite their attempts to achieve permanence, they exists on the margins of time, unable to tap in and join the trajectory of the modern world.

Hamlet, like the Buendías, exists in a world that will eventually destroy him. At the beginning of the play, he finds himself marginalized by his grief over his father's recent death. But while his uncle and mather want to welcome him back as Denmark's "chiefest courtier," he refuses to re-assimilate into this new fatherless

world. When his uncle, the new king, questions his continued mourning, Hamlet reveals that his world has been turned upside down and that he can no longer make sense of the court.

> KING. How is it that the clouds still hang on you?
> HAMLET. Not so, my lord. I am too much in the sun.

In the one line, Hamlet's loaded reply potentially indicates that the sun does not suit his grief, that he can no longer bear to be among the living, that he can no longer bear to be in the new king's presence, and perhaps also that he is blinded by what once shone light and truth. Of course, not imagining any rebellion or treason, his mother and uncle believe that Hamlet is depressed, wishing to cover himself in shadows and all other trappings of grief. But when the queen asks Hamlet to explain himself, he contends that his marginalization comes from a much deeper, much less conventional urgency.

> QUEEN. Why seems it so particular with thee?
> HAMLET. Seems, madam? Nay, it is. I know not "seems."

Hamlet proceeds to protest the suggestion that he has any sort of control over his grief, that it is neither his behavior (seems), his clothing (seams), or his words (semes) that "denote [him] truly." His particular, distinct and individual grief mean in a more primitive reality than can be arrested by courtly gestures or written laments.[3] At this point, Hamlet has not yet seen the ghost of his father, but alread Shakespeare is preparing the stage, demonstrating Hamlet's readiness for an encounter with something that cannot be conventionally satisfied, something that cannot be denoted truly by the tools of modernity. Unable to make sense of his uncountable nostalgia, Hamlet will drift away from the rationality of the court, swallowing a magical reality and appropriating its ghostly character as he plots his revenge.

Hamlet's yearning for some meaningful expression of his emptiness meets its strangest promise of fulfillment when his father's ghost shows up. From his first interaction with the ghost (or the undead memory of his father), Hamlet compounds his marginalization, always harboring an intensely personal and distrustful grief. He insists on meeting the ghost alone, ignoring the warnings of his friends and councilors and trusting only in his increasingly disturbed judgment. He holds conversations and debates with himself seven times throughout the play for a total of 208 lines, and spends much of his other time on stage either joking or feigning madness; much of his public dialogue seems always subject to his own machinations of revenge, his constant mousetrapping and baiting for reactions. Rather than tap into the community of advisors, Hamlet steels himself for his task of killing Claudius. With doubt and inaction weighing heavily against his plans, he knows he must construct a more courageous and resolute identity: he must swallow whole the reality of the ghost. His soliloquy after meeting his father's ghost reveals his plan of action; as the ghost retreats repeating the mandate "remember me," Hamlet resolves to make the ghost the base of his new

identity:

> Remember thee?
> Yea, from the table of my memory
> I'll wipe away all trivial fond records,
> All saws of books, all forms, all pressures past
> That youth and observation copied there. (*Hamlet* 1.5.95 –99)

That memory, the haunting memory of an undead father, conflicts with all else that Hamlet knows, and so he must empty his mind of all his other memories and found himself solely on the memory of the ghost.[4]

Hamlet's Lady Macbeth-like determination to change his identity seems to stand in complete opposition to the Buendía dilemma. Every Aureliano struggles to memorize the books of Melquiades, the forms and learning his schooling offers; while every Arcadio seems ever-bent on focusing all his passions and energies on the pressures of youth and the "trivial fond records" of songs and lovers and ecstasies. But if the Buendías will ultimately be enveloped by history, becoming the the memory they so long tried to contain, Hamlet too will be reinserted into the organized rationality of Elsinore. His ironic effort to unburden himself of modernity only gives modernity the means to reorder the court. *Cien Años de Soledad* tells the story of the sublimation of magic into the table of history's memory; Hamlet tells the story of one man's attempt at the opposite—at deposition, the change from a gas into a solid, or in this case, from the abstract memory into a real ghost. In the attempt, Hamlet succeeds and appropriates a peculiar isolation, singling himself out to be carefully re-appropriated by a world that does not believe in ghosts. Like Macondo, he will die after his five acts of solitude.

While Hamlet is perhaps in a knowing struggle against the "seems" of Elsinore—the pretentious reduction of grief and loss in a customary show—the Buendías unwittingly bring the net of modernity over their own heads. Theirs is a constant struggle to control memory so their identities can become movable tools in the survival of the new world. Claude Levi-Struauss has said that "Remembering is one of man's great pleasures, but not insofar as memory operates literally, since few individuals would agree to relive the fatigues and sufferings that they nevertheless delight in recalling. Memory is life itself, but of a different quality" (Tristes Tropiques 63). Time and time again, the people of Macondo suffer memory loss and fail to achieve any kind of permanence. Often, as in the case of Aureliano and José Arcadio, it is a personal memory that fails to be included in the whole image of the self. But other times, the community itself forgets. In one episode, an epidemic of insomnia afflicts the inhabitants of Macondo, leading to amnesia:

> Quería decir que cuando el enfermo se acostumbraba a su estado de vigilia, empezaban a borrarse de su memoria los recuerdos de la infancia, luego el nombre y la noción de las cosas, y por último la identidad de las personas y aun la conciencia del propio ser, hasta hundirse en una especie de idiotez sin pasado.

> (*Cien Años* 60; "It meant that when the sick person would get used to his condition of wakefulness, the records of infancy would begin to be erased from his memory, then the name and notion of things, and finally the identity of people and even the awareness of the self, until sinking into a kind of idiocy without a past.")

Unable to sleep, the victims go on living without pause until the blur of their perpetual and meaningless existence completely erases the mind, resulting in a kind of idiot without any connection to a past. Against this eventuality, José Arcadio begins to label everything in the town, even writing out their uses and implications. When this fails to work, he decides to construct a "memory machine," which functions on the basis of reviewing the events of every morning. (*Cien Años* 65) His attempts to hold the magic of memory in language, not unlike modern history and literature, only prolong his decreasing life. The town is only saved when Melquiades, the wandering gypsy, shows up with a cure. It is this injection of magic that keeps the town from fading away, and allows the syncopated dance of magic and ghosts and nature to continue for the duration of 100 years.

It is Melquiades also who delivers to the Buendías a prophetic, but illegible manuscript that puzzles the Aurelianos until the end of the book. Representing the efforts to capture the essence of Macondo in the written word (an inky cloak), the Aureliano Buendías spend hours studying with, or in the library of, Melquiades trying to decipher the text. Even after he dies, the ghost of Melquiades returns to help Aureliano Segundo in his studies; but he tells him that no one will be able to read the manuscript until the end of the 100 years. They each begin confident that their studies will expose them to an outside world of possibility and freedom; if they can stand back and see everything at once, understanding it fully, then they will no loner be the pawns of this magical chess board. It is not until the last of the Buendías is born that the child's father, Aureliano Babilonia, figures out how to read Melquiades' ancient words. And in a moment of epiphany, he recognizes himself and the entire line of Buendías in the story on the parchments. As a supernatural storm rages outside, he reads his own end in the last page—"... como si se estuviera viendo en un espejo hablado" (*Cien Años* 495; "... as if he were seeing himself in a spoken mirror"). Before he even gets to the final line, he understands that he will never again leave the room, that the storm will wipe Macondo away—". . . pues estaba previsto que la ciudad de los espejos (o los espejismos) sería arrasada por el viento y desterrada de la memoria de los hombres..." (*Cien Años* 8; "... so it was foreseen that the city of mirrors (or of mirages) would be razed by the wind and dismissed from the memory of men...) Aureliano Babilonia realizes that the entire existence of the Buendías is a moment in time that only enters history in its passing, a burial shroud woven in the ironic attempt to live forever, a consequence only revealed at the end their ironic attempt to write themselves into history.

By the end of the play, *Hamlet* approaches quite closely to the Colombian novel. Hamlet, like the last Aureliano, realizes his house is finished and that he has brought about the tragic end. Every member of Hamlet's family lies dead on the stage, effec-

tively terminating the haunting of Elsinore and sewing up the stitch where escaped the bit of pre-modern magic. ⑤ But although Melquiades' manuscript ends with the statement that Macondo has been erased from the memory of men, Márquez in *Cien Años de Soledad* resurrects Macondo and reanimates the ghosts of past. Modernity may in the end win, having managed to reduce the magic of Macondo to a book and having replaced the fallen house of Hamlet with Fortinbras. But it is not an emphatic victory. From the perspective of modernity, there is no actual memory, no history. But there will always be a ghost in the machine, a potential return of the magic. Márquez turns Macondo into a wistful fiction, the simulation of memory. He does not rue the loss as much as cherish the ghosts that take the place of a memory, turning experience into myth, capturing the fabled reality of a lost way of life in which actions and events sparkle with magical significance. Perhaps Shakespeare too points to another perpetuation of ghosts: Hamlet's dying command, worrying that the one thing that will continue to live after him will be his bad name, is

> And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain
> To tell my story. (*Hamlet* 5.2.333 – 334)

It may not be the "dream" that keeps Hamlet from killing himself, but something about Hamlet survives with every performance of the play. The end, like sleep, allows the memory its appropriate place in a world that, as Ursula explains, "va acabando poco a poco." (*Cien Años* 224; "... is finishing [or coming to an end] little by little").

【Notes】

1. All translations are my own.
2. Lewis argues in the first chapter of *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* that magic, specifically high magic (as opposed to necromancy or witchcraft and other dark magic) generally referred to a non-mechanic mastery of nature, and in the Renaissance, involved "books" and "terrible words." (8) He further suggests that through the medium of a Christianized "Platonic theology", *magia divina*, at least in its goals for power, found much in common with the eventual scientists who won the age. (13 – 14). Frederic Jameson also addresses the shift away from a romantic conception of magic and its implications then in literature. Since the magic can no longer be accepted as belonging explicitly to "the realm of interpersonal or inner-worldly relations," he argues, it must be "projectively reconstituted into a free-floating and disembodied element [...]" This shift, I suggest, is partially at stake in Hamlet, the ghost bearing the brunt of evil and magical reconstitution. (*The Political Unconscious* 119)
3. 1.2.64 – 65, 74 – 75, 83. In line 76, Hamlet says "'Tis not alone my inky cloak," referring most obviously to his black mourning cloak; but I think the significance of "inky" can perhaps be taken literally to suggest a page of written words. A few scenes later, Hamlet confesses to Ophelia that he has no skill for writing verses; and his teasing exchange with Polonius about the words in his book seems also to suggest at least Hamlet's distrust of language if not also his deeper feeling of something inexpressible.
4. Part of this reading of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* derives from Akira Kurosawa's film adaptation, *The Bad Sleep Well* (1960). Without including any real ghosts, the Japanese director charges the drama

with a ghostliness that exerts a pervasive urgency on the Hamlet character (Nishi) as he works out his revenge plot. While Nishi creates his ghosts—a "mousetrap" wedding cake, an anonymous tip to the police, leaked headlines to the press, a faked death—the power of the ghosts begins to act independently, eventually effecting the noirish conclusion that leaves Nishi caught in his own trap, unable to maneuver between an unexpected love and the moving parts of his scheme.

5. While there is certainly suggestions of magic in Shakespeare's text of *Hamlet*, I owe some of my attention to its presence to Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* (1990), which amps up the magical tone of the drama in order to increase the tension between an encroaching modernity and a lingering romantic worldview. For a better examination of these aspects of the film, see Charles Ross, "*The Banquet* as Cinematic Romance" (*Asian Shakespeares on Screen: Two Films in Perspective*. Ed. Alexander C. Y. Huang. *Borrowers and Lenders: The Journal of Shakespeare and Appropriation* 4.2 (Spring/Summer 2009). < www. borrowers. uga. edu > Shakespeare, William. Hamlet. Ed. Constance Jordan. New York: Pearson, 2005. Print.)

【Works Cited】

Jameson, Frederic. *The Political Unconscious*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. *Tristes Tropiques*. Trans. John and Doreen Weighman. New York: Penguin, 1992.

Lewis, C. S. *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*. London: Oxford UP, 1973.

Márquez, Gabriel García. *Cien Años de Soledad*. Barcelona: Debolsillo, 2004.

The Bad Sleep Well. Dir. Akira Kurosawa. Perf. Toshir? Mifune, Masayuki Mori. Toho, 1960. Film.

Plato. The Republic. *The Collected Dialogues of Plato*. Eds. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989.

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead. Dir. Tom Stoppard. Perf. Gary Oldman, Tim Roth, Richard Dreyfuss. Brandenberg, 1991.

Sidney, Philip. *Defence of Poesie*. Ed. Frank Kermode. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.

Expensive Egypt

David Read

Abstract In this essay I explore the question of the kind and degree of interest in Egyptian antiquities that may have existed in England during the first decade of the seventeenth century. Would at least some members of the audience for Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* at the time of its initial production have known (or thought that they knew) something about ancient Egypt other than what could be gleaned from North's translation of Plutarch, and would Shakespeare have been able to assume that this knowledge existed so that he could invoke and play upon it? I am not arguing that Shakespeare either knew or cared about Hermetism or the related Neoplatonic esoterica floating around in Humanist circles in the period, much of it associated (mistakenly) with ancient Egypt. I am more interested in the relatively mundane question of whether or not there was an intellectual, and even a practical, commerce in the "stuff" of ancient Egypt—pyramids, mummies, burial goods, hieroglyphics—during Shakespeare's later career. Could and would such "stuff" be represented on the English stage? Since *Antony and Cleopatra* itself yields little explicit direction on these questions, the answers are circumstantial and involve some contextual bracketing of the play, using evidence available in reasonably close chronological proximity, whether before or after, to the play's putative first production date of 1606–07. But I think a good case can be made that the prevalent English attitude toward the monuments and practices of ancient Egypt emphasized a notion of inordinate expense in the service of mysterious ends, and that Shakespeare made use of this notion in creating Cleopatra's Alexandrian milieu.
Key words ancient Egypt; Herodotus; pyramids; mummies; hieroglyphics; expense
Author David Read is Professor of English at the University of Missouri. He has written two books and a variety of articles on Spenser, Shakespeare, and early modern colonial writers. Email: readd@missouri.edu

In his excellent study of the intense fascination with ancient Egypt among scholars, artists, and patrons in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Italy, Brian Curran directly puts the question that, with an important regional adjustment, will also concern me in this paper: "What did Renaissance people—or, more specifically, those educated persons with an interest or stake in the subject—know about ancient Egypt? The answer is that they knew—or thought they knew—very much indeed."[1] Curran's answer is framed in terms of the high Italian Renaissance, with its rich banquet of neoplatonists, antiquarians, erudite artists, and wealthy lovers of esoterica, all of whom benefited from access to the Egyptian artifacts, both large and small, that had accu-

mulated on the peninsula during the height of the Roman Empire. The answer for England during the same period would be different: the English knew something about ancient Egypt—not a great deal, but something. As was true in many other theaters of knowledge where Renaissance tastes were made, they were latecomers to the spectacle of Egypt. That being said, it still seems to me worthwhile to try to trace the incipient stages of a traffic that would eventually lead to a variety of influential Egyptian "revivals" within English culture, and to make whatever sense we can of the hints of this traffic in the most famous representation of an Egyptian setting in the English Renaissance, Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*. [2] Roman though the play may be in its general contours—and despite the fact that Cleopatra was part of the Greek dynasty of the Ptolemies that ruled over Egypt from the time of the Alexandrian conquest, and thus in no way connected with the ancient kingdoms—it still offers an intriguing glimpse of the ways that the matter of ancient Egypt found expression in England in an era before archeology, epigraphy, and other forms of scientific inquiry made that matter less mysterious, if not less compelling.

The most helpful point of departure on this topic is John Michael Archer'ses say "Antiquity and Degeneration: The Representation of Egypt and Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*," first published in *Genre* in 1994 and appearing in several iterations since then. [3] Archer offers what is probably the fullest account of the likely textual sources of Shakespeare's representation of Egypt, and has much of interest to say about the potential influence of Elizabethan translations of Herodotus, Pliny, and Leo Africanus on the representation of Egypt in the early seventeenth century. [4] The essay becomes a complex meditation on the troubled and troubling notions of race and gender in *Antony and Cleopatra* as those notions are figured in the play's rendering of the Egyptian scene, and his article is framed by references to the work of Martin Bernal, Judith Butler, Immanuel Wallerstein, and Edward Said. I want to take a considerably more minimalist and less theoretical approach and consider a fairly simple question: what did the audience for *Antony and Cleopatra* expect when they encountered the idea of Egypt in dramatized form, and how did Shakespeare meet their expectations? That is, what kind of conceptual markers does Shakespeare provide to fill out for his audience an at least partly pre-existing mental picture of Egypt? Archer's essay argues that Shakespeare depicts a distinctive version of the monumental. This theme is broached in reference to Cleopatra's lines in Act 5 scene 2 just before the Clown enters with his basket: "now from head to foot / I am marble constant" (239 –40). Archer observes that "Cleopatra's reduction of herself to a statue... has something Egyptian in it—she is preparing herself for entombment in terms that evoke the hermetic association of Egypt with the afterlife." [5] Later in the essay he addresses the play's allusions to actual Egyptian monuments, especially to the pyramids as archetypal features of the Egyptian landscape, and ingeniously links them to Cleopatra via Enobarbus's remark to a freshly chastened Antony in Act 1 scene 2, comparing Cleopatra to "a wonderful piece of work" that it would be a shame to have "left unseen" (151 –52). "Cleopatra," Archer says, "is this 'piece of work,' like a building or statue, marble constant but also a little touristy." [6] The argument goes on to consider Cleopatra and Antony as monuments, and Egyptian monuments as emblems of trans-

gressive sexuality and unstable racial categories, but I would like to take Archer's interesting insight here and draw it back toward my own rather limited question: how did Shakespeare meet the expectations of his audience with regard to Egypt?

Along with the annual flooding of the Nile (a motif threading throughout the play) and the "manner" of the crocodile (a topic on which Antony famously punts when Lepidus asks him about it, 2.7.40 ff.), the audience for *Antony and Cleopatra* seems to have expected to hear about pyramids. In his passing conversation with Lepidus about the Nile, Antony curiously transforms the pyramids into devices for measuring the flood: "... they take the flow o' th' Nile / By certain scales i' th' pyramid; they know / By th'height, the lowness, or the mean, if dearth / Or foison follow" (2.7.17 – 20). A few moments later, Lepidus declares, "I have heard the Ptolemies' pyramises are very goodly things; without contradiction I have heard that" (2.7.33 –35). And in the play's last scene, Cleopatra invokes the pyramids at the climax of her defiant speech to Proculeius after she has been surprised and captured by Caesar's men: "Rather make / My country's high pyramides my gibbet, / And hang me up in chains!" (5.2.60 –62) These references suggest the very long-standing "touristy" aspect of the pyramids; for Lepidus, they would be the things to see in Egypt, along with the crocodile.[7] Shakespeare did not gather his sense of this from Plutarch, though it is difficult to avoid connecting the pyramids (quite anachronistically, one must add) with Cleopatra's monument in Alexandria, which Plutarch does address at some length—leading, of course, to Shakespeare's having left modern directors of the play with a notorious conundrum in staging the later scenes. Perhaps Shakespeare is simply drawing on popular lore about the pyramids, but the notion that they are 'the things to see' is already present in Herodotus, writing in the fifth century B.C.E. In describing the Great Pyramid, he retails an anecdote that Cheops financed its construction by prostituting his daughter, and this is the part of the account that most interests Archer, since it feeds into the discourse of sexuality surrounding Cleopatra.[8]

Herodotus's broader concern, however, is with the cost of Cheops's pyramid. He notes that there are hieroglyphics engraved at the base, "declaring" (or so his interpreter tells him),

> the expence the King was at in the time of his building, for mustardseed, oynyons, and garlike, which... did amount to the summe of a thousande six hundred talents. If this were so, how much shal we deeme to have bene spent upon other things, as upon tooles, engins, victuals, labouring garments for the workemen, being tenne yeares busied in these affayres? I recken not the time wherein they were held in framing and hewing of stones to set them in a readinesse for the main worke: neyther all the space that passed over the conveyance of the stone to the place of building, which was no small numbers of dayes, as also the time which was consumed in undermining the earth, and cutting out of chambers under the grounde...

Herodotus is aware that this treasury-draining landmark is, after all, primarily a

tomb; he notes that after the first ten years of construction, another ten were "consumed... causing certayne chambers to be cut out under the grounde, undermining the stoneworke upon the which the towres were founded, whyche... [Cheops] provided for hys sepulcher."[9] The idea of the pyramids as both extravagant and funereal survives in George Sandys's account (obviously influenced by his reading of Herodotus) of his visit to the Great Pyramid in one of the best English travel books of the early seventeenth century, *A Relation of a Journey begun An. Dom.* 1610:

> Twenty yeares it was a building, by three hundred threescore and sixe thousand men continually wrought upon: who only in radishes, garlick, and onions, are said to have consumed one thousand and eight hundred talents. By these and the like inventions exhausted they their treasure, and employed the people, for feare lest such infinite wealth should corrupt their successors, and dangerous idlenesse beg in the Subject a desire of innovation. Besides, they considering the frailty of man, that in an instant buds, blowes, and withereth; did endeavour by such sumptuous and magnificent structures, in spite of death to give unto their fames eternity.[10]

For Sandys as for Herodotus, the Great Pyramid is a wonder not only because of its sheer size, but because of its "exhaustive" character in terms of the time, money, and labor dedicated to its construction—all spent for the purpose of housing a corpse. Even for a European traveler to visit the pyramid and descend into its stifling inner chambers, long emptied of everything except trash and rubble, would involve a very significant expenditure in those same terms. This distorted ratio between expenditure and function might be said to feature in the early modern perception of many of the monumental wonders of the ancient world. An English citizen in the early seventeenth century could go into almost any church in the land and see lavish memorial sculpture produced at great cost to the family estate, but never on the scale that seemed to prevail in the long-gone civilizations of the Mediterranean and the Near East. The ancient Egyptian case was made that much more intriguing because it was associated with a deeply mysterious set of funerary customs.[11]

John Gillies has usefully discussed *Antony and Cleopatra* in terms of what he calls the "exorbitant," which for him is closely related to though not exactly the same as the exotic. In his argument the word certainly retains its base meaning of being "off the track"—out of orbit, over the limit, exceeding the bounds, and so on. It has special application to Antony and to his avatar Alexander the Great; the exorbitant character is one who cannot be satisfied, archetypally "the conqueror who, having conquered 'the' world, restlessly scans the ocean for another."[12] But "exorbitant" is perhaps most commonly used at present to denote a thing or activity that is outrageously expensive. Though Gillies does not pursue the economic aspect of exorbitance in his treatment of *Antony and Cleopatra*, this aspect does seem essential to the ambiance of the play's Egyptian scenes. While we ponder the decadence, beauty, and wonder of Plutarch's description of Cleopatra's barge on the Cydnus, as delivered so memorably by Enobarbus in Act 2 scene 2, we should also be aware that this particu-

lar pageant would have cost a lot of both money and "sweat equity." Strikingly, the adjective that Agrippa uses (twice) in responding to Enobarbus's account is "rare" (2.2.212, 225); what is rare is rarely also cheap.

It seems plausible to say that in Shakespeare's time there existed among the English an idea of Egypt as a place of exorbitant objects, more specifically of exorbitant objects that have a peculiar mortuary character. Of course, to experience the pyramids and other Egyptian monuments properly meant traveling to where they stood; the traffic associated with them was the emergent traffic of exploration and tourism. However, an "export" traffic to Europe did exist in at least one item connected with ancient Egypt: the panacea known as mummy, which in its authentic form was in fact a powder or paste made since the middle ages from grinding up mummies removed from various desert necropolises.[13] Shakespeare was aware of mummy, as evident from his references to it in *Othello* and *Macbeth*, and Philip Schwyzer points to its mention in the work of a fair number of Shakespeare's contemporaries as well.[14] It does not appear in *Antony and Cleopatra*, but then again it would be a glaring anachronism there, since its use as a medicine developed after the Roman empire was long gone.

Mummy would have been the most readily available Egyptian item in early modern London—available if expensive in quantity, like so many other items of pharmacopoeia arriving from faraway places. Its existence as a trade good appears to have provoked some inquiring minds in Europe to investigate its origins, and so in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries one begins to see detailed accounts of the mummy fields as well as the mummification process.[15] Some of these accounts are accompanied with illustrations, but interestingly not of the mummies themselves; rather of the objects that accompany the mummies. For example, Prosper (or Prospero) Alpini, who used his experience as physician to the Venetian consul in Cairo in the early 1580s to write several important studies of Egypt, offers in the first part of his *Historiae Egyptae Naturalis* (1590) an engraving of examples of the small idols known as *ubshabti* that were placed around the mummies in their sarcophagi. In presenting a picture of such idols in his *Relation of a Journey*, Sandys indicates, perhaps mistakenly, that they actually come *out* of the mummies: "Within their bellies are painted papers, and their Gods inclosed in little models of stone or mettall: some of the shape of men, in coate-armours, with the heads of sheepe, haukes, dogs, &c. others of cats, beetles, monkies, and such like. Of these I brought away divers with me, such in similitude".[16] Both illustrations suggest a deepening interest in these objects as objects, distinct from the mummies that sponsor them, so to speak.

Could such objects have circulated in England at the time that *Antony and Cleopatra* was first produced? More pertinently, could their "similitudes" have figured in any way as stage properties in the early Jacobean theater? There is no evidence one way or the other in the case of Antony and Cleopatra, since there are no contemporary records of its earliest performance(s). What we can say with a fair degree of certainty is that images of such objects were becoming available in England, allowing for the development of a frame of reference, though the range, depth, and quality of reference might still be quite limited.

The most portable of Egyptian antiquities, of course, were the hieroglyphs, authentic examples of which could be studied on the various obelisks and other sculptures of Egyptian origin in Rome, but which also circulated textually throughout Europe from the fifteenth century onward, often in renderings quite far removed from the originals. The most historically significant manuscript source of information on the ancient Egyptian letters was Horapollo's *Hieroglyphica*, a work of unknown provenance first discovered in the fifteenth century, elevated to prominence by the Florentine humanists, and reprinted many times (often with modern commentary) well into the seventeenth century.[17] However, this work only describes the hieroglyphs; in its original form it did not provide illustrations of them, though early modern artists (notably Dürer) later added illustrations based on Horapollo's descriptions. Perhaps just as influential as the *Hieroglyphica*, though of surpassing strangeness, was *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, a prose romance with many illustrations first published by the Aldine Press in 1499, written in a pastiche of Italian, Latin, and Greek; the author has been identified, though not definitively, as Francesco Colonna, a Dominican Friar in Venice.[18] An English translation of this work appeared in 1592 under the title *The Strife of Love in a Dreame*, with the illustrations included. If this text provides the most accessible representation of hieroglyphs for English readers, then those readers would have had a fairly distorted notion of the appearance of the genuine articles, which the *Hypnerotomachia* has translated into the familiar forms of European pictorialism. Judging by Sandys's illustration of hieroglyphs in 1615, common knowledge about them was no more accurate in the early seventeenth century than it had been in the sixteenth.[19] What remained consistent in the early modern reception of hieroglyphs was the idea that they contained a surplus of meaning, that they were vessels of recondite ancient wisdom and talismans that carried magical power—wisdom and power only to be tapped through long, hard study of the hermetic mysteries.[20] This approach led to increasingly elaborate and even cultic interpretations of the hieroglyphs that continued until the symbols were permanently demystified by the discovery of the Rosetta Stone in 1799 and Jean-François Champollion's deciphering of the stone's inscriptions in 1822.[21] The main point I want to make about hieroglyphs, though, is that they fit comfortably into the discourse of exorbitant objects connected with ancient Egypt. They are not precious, indeed they are close to trivial, in a material sense, but to extract their immense metaphysical value requires a huge expenditure of intellectual labor—a form of pyramid-building in the mind.

This is not to say that *Antony and Cleopatra* as a play cares much if at all about hermetic esoterica; no one is likely to mistake Shakespeare for a high-flying neoplatonist (though it is true that George Chapman wrote at least one decent tragedy). The closest we come to anything like an interest in this sort of thing in the play is by way of the soothsayer, who in Act 1 scene 2 claims that "In nature's infinite book of secrecy / A little I can read" (9–10), and in Act 2 scene 3 invokes Antony's "daemon," "spirit," and "angel" while warning him to avoid Caesar (18–20). While he draws the soothsayer and the "daemon" directly from North's translation of Plutarch and does not appear to have absorbed much material from sources other than Plutarch, Shakespeare has nonetheless invested the play in general with a sense of E-

gypt as a place full of objects that, like hieroglyphs, seem to imply higher and more obscure meanings. Isis and Osiris may be somewhere in the deep background, but the prevailing impression is of an Egyptian world that is not quite ready to give up all its secrets. And there is also a strong impression, inseparable from the catharsis of the tragedy, of expense, of vast resources dedicated to an enterprise that finally reveals itself to be of no earthly use. This takes us back to Archer's notion of monumentality; whether the monument in question is Cleopatra or the Great Pyramid, its practical reasons for being never quite seem to square with the awe that it evokes.

The case for *Antony and Cleopatra* as an explicit presentation of Renaissance ideas about ancient Egypt consists, like a mummy broken up for sale, of "shreds and patches" (to borrow a few apt words from *Hamlet*). Even so, these largely circumstantial bits of evidence suggest that Shakespeare is participating, however momentarily, in the shaping of early modern attitudes toward the matter of ancient Egypt. For the Egyptian antiquities—pyramids and ushabti alike—appear to have entered the consciousness of the English in Shakespeare's time not only as curiosities, talismans, and "things to see," but as luxury goods in a very radical form—of the highest quality and craftsmanship, involving countless hours of human labor, but the purpose of which cannot be parsed and made morally valuable in a Christian society living under a reformed dispensation. Such objects, with their relentless claim to otherness and their resistance to conventional interpretations, have always exerted great fascination in societies that could never accept the beliefs that caused the objects to be made in the first place. The fascination only increases with the perceived preciousness of the objects. In the first decades of the seventeenth century we can see the inklings of a market that would grow steadily in size and intensity over the next three centuries, even as the belief of the magical qualities of the antiquities gradually disappeared. One could argue that the development of Egyptology in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was at one level an effort to put an existing form of connoisseurship, and even treasure-hunting, on a serious scientific basis. The principles of this connoisseurship were already sketched out Shakespeare's time, and they can be teased out of *Antony and Cleopatra*. Scion of the Hellenic dynasty of the Ptolemies, far removed in time from the works of the pharaohs, Cleopatra is nonetheless authentically Egyptian because she costs so much, more than anyone except Antony is willing to pay.

【Notes】

1. Curran 15.
2. For my text of the play I have used the Oxford edition edited by Neill. This edition uses "Anthony" rather than "Antony" but I have retained the traditional spelling of the title.
3. See also MacDonald 145 – 64 and Archer, *Old Worlds* 23 – 62. As a supplement to Archer's essay see de Sousa 129 – 40—though in my view this rather differently inflected account of the Egyptian references in the play does not offer any significant advances over what Archer has to say.
4. The first two books of Herodotus's *Histories* were translated by B. R. (otherwise unidentified) and published in 1584; Pliny's *Natural History*, by Philemon Holland, in 1601; and Leo Africanus's *History and Description of Africa*, by John Pory, in 1600.
5. Archer, "Antiquity and Degeneration" 10.

6. Archer, "Antiquity and Degeneration" 18.
7. Perhaps there is some ominous foreshadowing in the doomed Lepidus's fascination with monuments designed to house the dead.
8. Herodotus 211; Archer, "Antiquity and Degeneration" 19.
9. Herodotus 210. Strikingly, the translator B. R. uses the word "pyre" to denote the pyramid throughout this passage.
10. Sandys 128 – 29. This notion is already present in earlier Renaissance writers such as Leon Battista Alberti, who treats the pyramids as grand absurdities in his important architectural treatise *De re aedificatoria*: "Certainly I abhor those monstrous works that the Egyptians built for themselves—works also resented by the gods themselves, since none of them would be buried in tombs as sumptuous" (Alberti 250; qtd. in Curran 72).
11. Archer, "Antiquity and Degeneration" 19, notes the pyramids' "association with death," but does not pursue the consequences of this association in much detail, since his interests mainly lie elsewhere.
12. Gillies 20.
13. On this topic see Wolff 182 – 84 and, on the presence of mummy in seventeenth-century English literature, Schwyzer 151 – 74.
14. Schwyzer 160.
15. Wolff 183 – 94.
16. Sandys 133. Haynes 86, indicates that Sandys gave these objects to John Tradescant, though he provides no source for this information.
17. Allen 112 – 20, Curran 58 – 59 and Hornung 83 – 91.
18. Curran 153 – 58, provides a good overview of this text.
19. It is odd that Sandys, who was in a position to see actual hieroglyphs during his travels, provides such an inaccurate representation of them in his book, but this perhaps points to the familiar problem of the perceptual blind spot that exists for participants in one iconographic tradition when they attempt to render the images in a very different tradition; they will tend to bring those images into line with "existing standards." And it is possible that Sandys simply did not pay much attention to the hieroglyphs that he did happen to see. Haynes points out that the picture in the *Relation of a Journey* is in fact based on second-hand knowledge: "the sample hieroglyph... is not one Sandys saw, but the one everyone read about in Plutarch's *Isis and Osiris* 32; the artist simply drew pictures of an infant, a falcon, a fish, and so on in the style that came naturally to him" (86).
20. Yates is still the best English-language introduction to the complex history of Renaissance hermeticism. Yates, Frances A. *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1964).
21. On attitudes toward the hieroglyphs between the early seventeenth and early nineteenth centuries, see Hornung 98 – 140.

【Works Cited】

Alberti, Leon Battista. *On the Art of Building in Ten Books*. Trans. Joseph Rykwert, Neil Leach, and Robert Tavernor. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1988.

Allen, Don Cameron. *Mysteriously Meant: The Rediscovery of Pagan Symbolism and Allegorical Interpretation in the Renaissance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1970.

Archer, John Michael. "Antiquity and Degeneration: The Representation of Egypt and Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Genre* 27 (1994): 1 – 27.

---. *Old Worlds: Egypt, Southwest Asia, India, and Russia in Early Modern Writing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 2001.

Curran, Brian. *The Egyptian Renaissance: The Afterlife of Ancient Egypt in Early Modern Italy*.

Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2007.

De Sousa, Geraldo U. *Shakespeare's Cross-Cultural Encounters*. New York: St. Martin's, 1999.

MacDonald, Joyce Green. *Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1997.

Gillies, John. *Shakespeare and the Geography of Difference*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Haynes, Jonathan. *The Humanist as Traveler: George Sandys's Relation of a Journey begun An. Dom*. 1610. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1986.

Herodotus. *The Famous Hystory of Herodotus*. Trans by B. R. Anno 1584. Intro. Leonard Whibley. The Tudor Translations 2nd ser. 6. London: Constable, 1924.

Hornung, Erik. *The Secret Lore of Egypt: Its Impact on the West*. Trans. David Lorton. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2001.

Hypnerotomachia. The Strife of Love in a Dreame. London, 1592.

Neill, Michael, ed. *The Tragedy of Anthony and Cleopatra*. The Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Sandys, George. *A Relation of a Journey begun An. Dom. 1610*. London, 1615; rpt. New York: Da Capo, 1973.

Schwyzer, Philip, Archaeologies of English Renaissance Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Wolff, Anne. *How Many Miles to Babylon? Travels and Adventures to Egypt and Beyond, 1300 to 1640*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2003.

Language and Difference in Hakluyt's Principal Navigations

Marianne Montgomery

Abstract The presence (and absence) of non-English vernaculars in the travel narratives in the second edition of Richard Hakluyt's Principal Navigations (1598 – 1600) is considered in light of what Stephen Greenblatt calls the "epistemological optimism" of early modern English travelers. While linguistic difference (and some resulting incomprehension) would seem to be an inevitable condition of travel, especially travel beyond Europe, English travelers tend to give relatively little attention to the languages spoken by the people they encounter. They acknowledge linguistic difference in two contexts in which epistemological optimism fails: when they encounter the languages of people they consider savage and when they find themselves under stress and mention their interpreters. When the English hear unfamiliar foreign languages, they tend to take them as overwhelming, and their textual descriptions and judgments seek to reinscribe distance and difference. Language is worth writing about when it is heard as strange, and travelers seem to hear patterns and sounds as much as they hear individual, meaningful words. In court settings, language difference is acknowledged mainly through occasional mentions of interpreters. Interpreters are mentioned either when the possibility of comprehension is novel or when the English traveler is uncomfortable or uncertain in a foreign setting. When travelers write about language difference we can see a break in the epistemological optimism that often characterizes encounters between the English and the other in early modern travel texts. The captivity narrative of Miles Philips is a striking exception. Philips uses language flexibly in order to navigate global networks of exchange.

Key words travel writing; vernacular language; interpreter; epistemological optimism

Author Marianne Montgomery is Assistant Professor of English at East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina, USA. She is working on a book on foreign vernaculars on the early modern English stage. Email: marianne.montgomery@email.com

Early modern travelers regularly encountered unfamiliar languages. Incomprehension produced by these languages must have been part of their experience of travel. But language does not seem to register in early modern travel texts as a significant category that travelers use to think about the foreign, or even to describe their own experiences of exchange. Randall Davis describes this phenomenon in texts of New World encounters: "Many of the accounts often describe instances of intercultural communi-

cation—sometimes involving rather abstract concepts—without explaining the method of exchange" (231). According to Stephen Greenblatt, when faced with unknown languages, European travelers register persistent "epistemological optimism," since "the greatest temptation was to assume transparency" (94, 95). They want to understand, so in writing they tend to present their exchanges as untroubled by the problems posed by language difference. And, to the merchants and traders whose accounts make up much of the corpus of early modern travel writing, language is less interesting as a cultural sign than as a tool for exchange: "in almost all early European accounts... the language of the Indians is noted not in order to register cultural specificity but in order to facilitate barter, movement, and assimilation through conversion" (Greenblatt 104). Bruce Smith points out the ideological and phenomenological significance of travelers' relative lack of interest in native languages. English voyagers privilege the visual over the aural, in part because sound, non-linear and uncontrollable by the listener, is threatening to travelers. Sound overwhelms the listener and renders him passive (505).

Despite the epistemological optimism of early modern travelers, however, language difference does register in their writings, and in certain key contexts. When do writers of travels and voyages talk about language, and to what ends? To answer this question, I turn for a representative sample to the second edition of Richard Hakluyt's Principal Navigations, a massive compendium of travel accounts published in three folio volumes from 1598 – 1600. This essay describes how and when language difference is acknowledged in Hakluyt's collection. I am not interested in when language was "really" a problem for travelers. Rather, I am concerned with when language registers as something worth writing about, when it makes its way out of the realm of lived experience and into the discourses around travel that, in part thanks to Hakluyt, contributed, as most critics now agree, to forming an English nation and establishing trade and colonization as dual goals of the English overseas project. Like Mary Fuller, who argues for the centrality of writing—as a record and consequently as an organizing force—for voyages, I am interested in the interface between travel and the written record of travel (7). In other words, in what specific generic and narrative contexts do the sounds of exchange make it into print, becoming part of the printed record of voyage, discovery, diplomacy, and commercial negotiation?

Hakluyt's generic diversity requires a cautious approach. Julia Schleck has recently and persuasively argued against the tendency of literary scholars to treat Hakluyt's Principal Navigations as a source of discrete, divisible, and historically reliable facts and anecdotes about early modern attitudes towards the foreign; we need, she says, to produce more historically and generically sensitive readings of Hakluyt. To this end, central to my method was a thorough reading of the entirety of the English voyages in the second edition of the Principal Navigations (1598 – 1600). Much of this mammoth expanse of text—comparable to the expanses of the globe crossed by Hakluyt's narrators—consists of genres that usually do not make it into modern anthologies or abridgements: letters patent, travel logs (daily diaries derived from ships' logs), diplomatic reports, letters from factors to their company masters, charts of navigational distances, lists of commodities, accounts of sea battles, and, most fre-

quently mined by literary scholars, proto-ethnographic descriptions of the bodies, practices, and customs of foreign peoples. References to and descriptions of language difference are present in Hakluyt primarily in the subgenre that Schleck calls the "trade report." Trade reports feature narratives of travelers' receptions by foreign peoples or in foreign courts as they seek to make deals or secure trade and transport privileges; the primary initial audiences for these reports were investors or sponsors back in England. Within the trade report, language is acknowledged most prominently in two contexts: when the traveler cannot understand what he hears or when he finds himself socially or diplomatically disadvantaged. In other words, language registers when a traveler feels "lost," either aurally or socially.

This aural displacement occurs when a traveler encounters language that he hears as alien, highly unfamiliar, and therefore threatening. These sounds occur outside of diplomatic or commercial contexts that might render them usefully meaningful (and then, paradoxically, inaudible in the text). In other words, they occur in contexts in which epistemological optimism is unwarranted or impossible. When the English hear unfamiliar foreign languages, they tend to take them as overwhelming, and their textual descriptions and judgments seek to reinscribe distance and difference, to put these sounds back in their place, as it were. Moreover, they conventionally focus on the most alien and highly ritualized forms of language: war cries, songs, and prayers. In other words, language is worth writing about when it is heard as strange, and travelers seem to hear patterns and sounds as much as they hear individual, meaningful words.

A prototypical example is Giles Fletcher's description of the Tartars. Fletcher's account seems shaped as much by ancient discourses as by observation; he points to "their barbarous condition" and compares them to the Scythians, the notoriously brutal cannibals who stand, in Herodotus' Histories, as the barbaric "other" against whom the Greeks define themselves.[1] This groundwork laid, Fletcher begins his discussion of language with the Tartar battle cry: "When they make any onset, their maner is to make a great shoute, crying all out together Olla Billa, Olla Billa, God helpe us, God helpe us" (2.317). He also describes the sound of the Tartars' language: "Their speech is verie sudden and loude, speaking as it were out of a deepe hollowe throate, When they sing, you would think a kowe lowed, or some great bandogge howled" (2.321). Fletcher's attention to the sound of language is typical in several ways. First, he describes a battle cry, giving the Tartar phrase and its English translation. He presents this cry as customary; this is not narrated as a single observed event but a customary occurrence that other, future travelers might witness and hear. Though he does transcribe the words "Olla Billa," when he describes Tartar speech the terms he chooses, "sudden" and "loud," seem shaped by his own incomprehension; could he have heard their language as anything but sudden and loud? Third, he describes song as well as speech. Unlike an exchange with a potential trading partner, song does not require comprehension. Because it is not useful, it does not need to be interpreted. Rather, it is more safely alien, and does not need to be heard as carrying semantic or syntactic meaning. Finally, Fletcher compares the sound of the song to the lowing of cows and the howling of dogs; he seems no longer

to hear words at all. That a cow and a dog produce different sounds seems not to matter to this description, and the description makes it difficult to imagine what this song might actually have sounded like. But the description makes it quite clear that the writer heard a language that he did not understand, and he describes that language used in alienating forms (a battle cry and a song) and with alienating figures (animal noises). Fletcher's account becomes progressively more loaded and judgmental as he moves from the words of the battle cry through speech to song and finally to the noises of animals (2.317 –22).

Fletcher's description is by no means unique. Other travelers also hear unknown languages as strange, sudden, and even painful to the ear, and they pay special attention to songs and war cries. One voyager into Russia complains that he heard singers whose "songs or voices delighted our ears little or nothing" (1.421). Richard Fisher encounters a long-haired "Savage" in Cape Breton and gives, untranslated, the words of his war cry: "He cryed thrise with a loude voyce Chiogh, Chiogh, Chiogh. Thereupon nine or ten of his fellowes running right up over the bushes with great agilitie and swiftnesse came towards us with white staves in their hands like halfe pikes" (6.94 –5). Comparing foreign languages to the noises of animals is also common. On Martin Frobisher's second voyage for the Northwest Passage, his men encounter on a northerly island "certain of the country people... making great noise, with cries like the mowing of Buls seeming greatly desirous of conference with us" (5.205 –6). This description, as is typical, emphasizes the noise and cries of the locals and compares them to the lowing of bulls. But these signs appear to be relatively easy to interpret; it takes the writer no time at all to conclude, optimistically, that these are welcoming, not aggressive sounds, despite their loudness and animal characteristics.

Besides battle cries and songs, another type of speech frequently emphasized is prayer, particularly public, ritualized prayer. Richard Johnson describes the "devilish rites" of a Samoed priest: "Then he singeth as we use here in England to hallow, whope, and showte at houndes, and the rest of the company answere him with this Owtis, Igha, Igha, Igha, and then the Priest replieth again with his voyces" (1.354). This description, in contrast to Fletcher's, figures not the singer but his listeners as beasts, and the ritual is compared to the cacophony of an English hunt. Moreover, the company responds with repetitive sounds, words that Johnson leaves untranslated. This ritualized language produces startling bodily effects: "And they answere him with the selfsame wordes so manie times, that in the ende he becommeth as it were madde, and falling down as hee were dead, having nothing on him but a shirt, lying down I perceive him to breathe" (1.354). Johnson's syntax imagines a causal relationship between the refrain and the priest's ecstasy. The untranslated words of the ritualized refrain, however, are strikingly juxtaposed in Johnson's account with a moment of optimistic comprehension. He received an explanation of what is happening to the priest:

> I asked them why he lay so, and they answered mee, Nowe doth our God tell him what wee shall doe, and whither we shall goe. And when he had lyen still a

> litle while, they cried thus three times togther, Oghao, Oghao, Oghao, and as they use these three calles, hee riseth with his head and lieth downe againe, and then hee rose up and sang with like voyces as he did before: and his audience answered him, Igha, Igha, Igha. (1.354 –355)

In this middle of a noisy passage, with repeated answering refrains of untranslated words in song, Johnson describes a moment of apparently perfect communication (or at least the optimistic production of such a moment). He requests an explanation and receives it, without any acknowledgment of language barriers that might frustrate such open and clear communication. In this moment, language disappears, only to recur a sentence later, when the refrain that seemed to cast the priest down to the ground now lifts him up again. The two sentences are linked, though, by the word "answered." Johnson positions himself in a position of power like the priest's; both have the power to ask for and receive responses from the worshippers. In this sense, Johnson's optimistic moment of explanation, placed within the ritual, derives some of its narrative power from the ritual itself. Even as he observes the call and response, he positions himself as a participant in it, and its very structure seems to produce answers, even as its language otherwise remains alien.

When encountering languages that they hear as strange, English writers typically acknowledge their own incomprehension. The voyage of Arthur Barlowe to Virginia in 1584 brought on board one native off the coast of Virginia, who spoke of "many things not understood by us" (6.123). A description of "three savages brought to England" in Fabyan's chronicle excerpted by Hakluyt locates their languages among other signs of wildness: "These were clothed in a beasts skins, and did eate raw flesh, and spake such speech that no man could understand them, and in their demeanour like to brute beasts" (5.91). The incomprehension of the Londoners—"no man could understand them"—becomes part of a more extensive catalog of signs of difference that makes these visitors seem more like "brute beasts" than like men. Moreover, because they sound bestial, their words do not, to the chronicler, even count as words: "I heard none of them utter one word" (5.91). The sounds they make, which were likely words in their language, do not for Barlowe even register as language and so invite no attempts at interpretation. They are just sounds. Many travelers, though, recognize words as words and attempt to describe their sound, even when they don't understand them. The writer of John Davis's first voyage for the Northwest Passage in 1575 seems especially alert to the sound of language: "Their pronunciation was very hollow thorow the throat, and their speech such as we could not understand: only we allured them by friendly embracings and signs of curtesie" (5.286). Another tribe's language is described in nearly identical terms: "they pronounce their language very hollow, and deepe in the throat" (5.296). But with this tribe, Davis's men do not rely entirely on optimistic gestures. Instead, they learn words.

Indeed, part of what English voyagers have to do to make sense of unknown languages, languages they may hear as savage and bestial, is the work of interpretation, turning what they hear as noise into comprehensible, useful language. Some trade re-

ports close with brief glossaries that seem designed to give the next Englishmen visiting the area a few key terms useful for trade and basic communication. Davis's voyage includes a glossary that mixes commodities and provisions with imperatives useful for an English traveler trying to take what he can from the natives. These include "Yliaoute, I mean no harm" and "Quoysah, Give it to me." The visitor might ask for other items in the list, including "Sugnacoon, a coat" or "Maatuke, fish" (5. 296). Another such glossary is appended to the end of an account of Sir Francis Drake's circumnavigation; it gives "certain words of the naturall language of Java, learned and observed by our men there," listing 34 words and short phrases for commodities, food, parts of a ship, and numbers, including "Sabucke, silk," "Jonge, a ship," "Suda, enough," and, perhaps optimistically, "Lau, understand you" (8.74). Other glossaries seem less concerned with trade than with even more rudimentary negotiations and the procurement of basic provisions. All glossaries, though, presume that the natives' languages can be learned, understood, and transmitted textually to future voyagers and factors.

Once a language can be understood, whether through these glossaries or when Portuguese, Dutch, Spanish, or English interpreters become available, descriptions of the languages of foreign peoples—as loud, wild, beastly, repetitive, and ritualized—disappear from accounts in the Principal Navigations. Languages used in court settings, with the exception of songs, are never described in these terms. Instead, language difference is acknowledged mainly through occasional mentions of interpreters. In discussing interpreters, I want to emphasize that what is at issue is not the historical presence of interpreters; in most cases, interpreters must have been present in these encounters. Rather, I am interested in when the presence of these interpreters gets recorded in the text; in other words, under what circumstances do writers consider the presence of their interpreters noteworthy? The default position seems to be to leave out interpreters altogether, which makes sense from a class standpoint, since interpreters are servants. When interpreters are mentioned, it is either because the possibility of comprehension is novel or because the English traveler is uncomfortable or uncertain in a foreign setting.

Stephen Burroughs encountered in northern Europe Saami people with whom he shared a language: "some of them could speake the Russe tongue" (1.372). This common language, and the communication it enabled, was surprising enough to be worth noting in the text. In fact, Burroughs, able to communicate, then constructs a glossary of "certaine wordes of their language" (1.372). Likewise, in texts about the Americas, Indian languages are still novel enough that writers often acknowledge interpreters. In the Discovery of Guiana, Raleigh finds "an Indian who spake many languages, and that of Guyana naturally" to interpret for him (7.299). Another Indian interpreter was Manteo, who after spending time in England, returned to his native Roanoke Island with the 1587 colony led by John White. When the colonists are met by natives who first brandish weapons and then turn to flee, "Manteo their countryman called to them in their own language" (6.202). Without Manteo to interpret, "their own language" would almost certainly have been described as beastly war cries. But, with the help of an interpreter, the scene's tension is diffused and the

English now seem to understand the Indians perfectly. The Indians explain that some of their men were injured by Ralph Lane's colony, but this unpleasant incident is quickly forgiven: "they sayd, they knew our men mistooke them" (6.202). This part of the account is typically optimistic, and Manteo as interpreter disappears from the text once the initial, potentially threatening moment of first contact has passed. Manteo of course must have continued to interpret throughout the exchange between English and Indian, but he drops out of the text. Interpreters register when understanding a language is new or surprising; once they have appeared, then, they disappear, because by making language comprehensible, they make their own textual presence unnecessary.

Besides situations in which language is heard as strange and comprehension is novel, interpreters are also acknowledged in the text when travelers find themselves in disadvantageous positions in foreign courts. For example, on Anthony Jenkinson's journey into Persia for the Muscovy Company, only Jenkinson and his interpreter are allowed to enter the Sophy's court. He has to relinquish his parcels to be carried by the Sophy's servants, for, he writes, "None of my company or servants might be suffered to enter into the Court with me, my interpreter only excepted" (2.21). Here, the interpreter is mentioned precisely because his presence is an exception to the general bar on Jenkinson's servants; the interpreter is only made present in the text because the other servants are absent. The English visitors' distance from the Sophy similarly seems to produce another mention of the interpreter in Arthur Edwards' fourth voyage into Persia: "When he came first to the Sophies presence... bringing his interpreter with him, and standing far off, the Sophie (sitting in a seat roiall with a great number of his noble men about him) bad him come neere" (2.113). As in Jenkinson's visit to the court, here Edwards's small numbers—just him and his interpreter—are contrasted to a much greater number of the Sophy's followers. Being left alone with the interpreter sometimes brings the interpreter into the text.

An interpreter also appears at a tense moment in William Towerson's voyage to the coast of Guinea in 1577. Towerson's three English ships encounter the Spanish fleet, and afterwards Towerson banquets pleasantly with the Spanish admiral, with no mention of an interpreter. But after this audience, the interpreter appears in the text: "I being gone unto the boat, he caused one of his gentlemen to desire Francisco the Portugal, which was my interpreter, to require me to furle my flagge, declaring that hee was Generall of the Emperour's fleet" (4.115). Towerson refuses this order, and, after his ship is fired on by Spanish soldiers and he stands his ground, a Spanish apology resolves the standoff. Francisco the interpreter plays no special role in this affair, but it strikingly demonstrates how interpreters emerge in the text in moments of tension. Francisco's presence at the banquet is not acknowledged and he disappears after delivering the Spanish admiral's aggressive message.

So there are two main circumstances in which the English travelers whose accounts are gathered by Hakluyt acknowledge language difference: when they encounter the languages of people they consider savage and when they find themselves under stress and mention their interpreters. In both cases, when travelers write about language difference we can see a break in the epistemological optimism that often charac-

terizes encounters between the English and the other in early modern travel texts. These acknowledgements of language difference also seem to reassert distance between English and foreign as travelers put themselves back on familiar ground. I close, though, by briefly looking at a more extraordinary example in Hakluyt: the captivity narrative of Miles Philips. Philips, who narrates his adventures in the Spanish New World, is remarkably flexible in learning, using, and acknowledging foreign tongues. While this is in part a function of genre, since the captivity narrative is more plot-driven than the trade report, Philips's openness to learning and using new languages does more than simply reflect generic conventions. Philips is taken by the Inquisition and fails to speak prayers correctly because he only knows English (6.319). This is only a temporary failure, though. While serving his sentence, he learns both the "Indian language" and Spanish (6.323). He later serves the Spanish as an interpreter, befriends Indians, becomes rich running Spanish mines, and apprentices himself to a tailor. Ultimately, he escapes from Mexico, "presuming upon my Spanish tongue," which allows him to pass as a Spaniard. He finally gets passage back to England from Spain by claiming to have spent two years in Spain to learn the language (6.328 – 336). Language difference does not leave Philips lost or defensive, and he does not find alien languages strange, incomprehensible, or stressful. Rather, his language skills enable him to survive, prosper, and make it home to England and to English. Unlike other writers in the Principal Navigations, who use languages instrumentally but acknowledge language difference only when they are in positions of weakness, Philips's narrative emphasizes how language helps him to navigate new global networks of exchange.

【Note】

1. On the Scythians and history writing, see Hartos, *The Mirror of Herodotus*.

【Works Cited】

Davis, Randall. "Early Anglo-American Attitudes to Native American Languages." *Travel and Translation in the Early Modern Period*. Ed. Carmen di Biase. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006.

Fuller, Mary. Voyages in Print: English Travel to America, 1576 – 1624. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Hakluyt, Richard. *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques, and Discoveries of the English Nation*. 10 vols. London: J. M. Dent, 1927.

Hartog, François. *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*. Trans. Janet Lloyd. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Smith, Bruce. "Mouthpieces: Native American Voices in Thomas Harriot's True and Brief Report of... Virginia, Gaspar Pérez de Villagrá's Historia de Nuevo México, and John Smith's General History of Virginia." *New Literary History* 32 (2001): 501 – 17.

Olympias and Infidelity in the Alexander Romances: A Cross Cultural Study

Jena Al-Fuhaid

Abstract The literary tradition romanticizing Alexander the Great began with the pivotal text, Pseudo-Callisthenes (ca. 200 A. D.), which was translated and disseminated along two trajectories: Eastern and Western. This thriving literary tradition established Alexander as an immensely influential figure, a king whose greatness was to be aspired to and emulated. The admiration for Alexander was a truly cross-cultural phenomenon, reflected in the majority of the Alexander texts, from England to the Middle East. However, if medieval texts were alike in their glorification and claiming of Alexander, they were even more united in their attitude towards, if not their treatment of, Olympias. This essay argues that closely examining the alterations regarding the representations of Alexander and Olympias at the two most disparate points along the trajectories: the Middle English The Wars of Alexander (ca. 1400) and the Arabic Qissat Dhulqarnayn (ca. 1200) reveals the underlying cross-cultural congruity in the Medieval period by illuminating the extent to which Alexander became a universal figure, transcending cultural boundaries, and Olympias became a controversial, polarizing, and variable entity, a figure of paramount importance who is both preserved intact and fundamentally altered.

Key words masculine championship; cross-cultural literature; claiming; feminine morality

Author Jena Al-Fuhaid is a Ph. D student at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. She is interested in cross-cultural medieval literature, focusing primarily on Arabic, French, and Middle English. Email: jalfuhaid@yahoo.com

> "Long may you live, my lady, for you are pregnant with a boy child who shall be your avenger and become world conquering king of the whole civilized universe" (*Pseudo-Callisthenes* 28).

From the moment of Alexander the Great's conception in *Pseudo-Callisthenes*, the original Alexander romance (ca. 200 A. D), Olympias' status is inextricably tied to that of her unborn child. Although this conception is a crucial part of the Alexander romances, it is incorporated into the Eastern and Western traditions very differently. In the Western tradition, Olympias is deceived by the Egyptian Pharaoh Nectanebus into believing that he is the god Ammon. In the guise of Ammon, Nectanebus sleeps with Olympias and begets a son, Alexander. Alexander is accepted as a son by King Philip of Macedonia, but the dubious circumstances surrounding his conception create

a problematic situation in which he must continually defend both Olympias and his position as Philip's heir. In the Eastern tradition, Alexander's military triumphs and god-like representation are perfectly preserved, but Olympias' depiction is decidedly different from the Western portrayal of her. Any hint of infidelity and the ensuing taint of immorality in Olympias' characterization, including the adulterous encounter that produced Alexander, has been eradicated. Instead, she is described as an honorable Muslim mother, one to whom Alexander is understandably devoted.

The close relationship between Alexander and Olympias is all the more noteworthy due to its preservation throughout the widely disseminated Alexander romances, despite a substantial amount of textual variation. The development of the Alexander romance along both the Eastern and Western tracks shows distinct correlations between these textual variations and the cultural and religious values of the different regions. A study of these alterations illuminates both cross-cultural congruities and disparities in the medieval period. This essay will analyze the depictions of Alexander and Olympias in the two most disparate Alexander romances, the Middle English *Wars of Alexander* (ca. 1400 A. D) and the Arabic *Qissat Dhulqarnayn* (ca. 1200 A. D). I will establish two distinct points: first, the extent to which the claiming of Alexander as a member of various cultures and religions was an authorial technique that transcended cultural boundaries; and second, the immense impact of the religious and cultural standards of each region on the depictions of Olympias. It is significant that in examining the representations of Alexander and Olympias, we find that the Eastern texts erase an important feature of the Western texts, the use of Alexander's affection for his mother to obscure Olympias' infidelity. Therefore, in this paper I will argue that there is a fundamental difference in the cultural attitudes informing the depictions of Olympias: in the medieval West, standards of feminine morality and fidelity are largely determined by masculine championship, whereas Eastern attitudes towards feminine immorality are characterized by such rigidity that even the championship of Alexander the Great would be insufficient redemption.

The Dissemination of the Alexander Romances

The Greek *Pseudo-Callisthenes* is the starting point from which the Eastern and Western trajectories originated. *Pseudo-Callisthenes* was then translated into Latin multiple times. The first Latin version is believed to be *Res gestae Alexandri Macedonis*, which was written by Julius Valerius circa 325 A. D. This text was then adapted into *Epitome Julii Valerii* in the ninth century. The other most significant translations are Archpriest Leo of Naples' *Nativita et Victoria Alexandri Magni Regis* (ca. 953 A. D) and *Historia de Preliis*, a tenth century adaptation of Leo of Naples' text. These four texts were then translated, primarily into French and English, and disseminated across Western Europe. The medieval French texts, such as the *Roman d'Alexandre*, *Le Roman de Toute Chevalerie*, *Mort d'Alexandre*, *Roman de Perceforest*, and the prose *Roman d'Alexandre* became the basis for the Middle English Alexander romances, such as *Kyng Alisaunder*. Despite the pervasive French influence, some of the Middle English Alexander romances, such as *The Wars of Alexander*, are believed to have been directly based on the Latin Alexander romances rather than on the intermediary

French texts.

In contrast, the Eastern trajectory is more complicated. It is believed that Pseudo-Callisthenes was translated directly into a Persian text (ca. 500 A. D.), which has since been lost. This Middle Persian text was the basis for the Syriac text known as the *Christian Legend Concerning Alexander* (ca. 500 – 600 A. D.), which was then translated into Arabic. This Arabic text (ca. 800 A. D.) became the source of the Ethiopian text, *The Life and Exploits of Alexander the Great* (ca. 1300 – 1500 A. D.). Luitpold Wallach and some scholars argue that there is a different lost Arabic text which "must have been derived from a Latin version of the *Historia de Proeliss* (Wallach 410), but the overall scholarly consensus seems to support the order of the Eastern texts as *Pseudo-Callisthenes*, the Middle Persian translation, the Syriac Alexander Legend, the Arabic texts, and the Ethiopian re-Christianized Alexander texts.

Texts Used in This Study

The most distant points along this Eastern and Western trajectory of Alexander texts appear to be the Middle English and Ethiopian texts. Despite the initial appearance of disparity, however, the Ethiopian Alexander is described by Andrew Anderson "as a most Christian king, champion, and propagandist, almost a savior and messiah" (Anderson 107). The Ethiopian descendant from the Arabic texts simultaneously represents a step further along the trajectory but a return to a previous religious characterization of Alexander. Thus, the two most disparate texts are the Middle English Alexander romances and the Arabic Alexander romances.

My purpose in looking at the most disparate texts within this particular trajectory is two-fold: to study the similarities and differences manifested in the texts and the cultural and religious influences that contributed to these changes. This paper first focuses on the Middle English *Wars of Alexander*.[1] According to Walter Skeat, "The main part of the narrative follows, with tolerable fidelity, the Latin text known as the "Historia de Preliis" (Skeat xxi). But he adds that "the 'Historia de Preliis' was not the sole text which our translator consulted, and it is tolerably clear that another source [of the Middle English Wars of Alexander] was the Latin version of the story of Alexander by Julius Valerius" (Skeat xxii). *Qissat Dhulqarnayn*,[2] the Arabic text used for this paper, is drawn from two manuscripts that were "probably copied in the eighteenth or nineteenth century" (Zuwiyya 47).[3] The title, which was conferred by the editor, Z. David Zuwiyya, can be translated as the Story of Alexander. According to Zuwiyya, the particular manuscripts consulted are based on Arabic texts from the 7th through the 13th century.

The "Claiming" of Alexander

A predominant theme in most of the Alexander romances is the glorification and claiming of Alexander. I use the term claiming to illustrate a consistent pattern throughout the romances in which Alexander is described by the author as the founder of a particular city or a member of a culture. Alexander is glowingly depicted across both the Eastern and Western trajectories, albeit with slightly varying degrees of approval. The one notable exception to this literary adulation is the Zoroastrian Persians, who as

Minoo Southgates states, "briefly dismissed him [Alexander] as a cursed enemy of God" (Southgate 278). The claiming of Alexander takes place in most of the Alexander texts, most particularly in *Pseudo-Callisthenes*, *Epitome Julii Valerii*, *Roman de Perceforest*, *Qissat Dhulqarnayn*, and the Persian *Iskandarnamah*. The following account describes how widely disparate cultures use the romances to claim Alexander as uniquely their own.

A degree of Egyptian influence is clearly recognizable in *Pseudo-Callisthenes*, despite the author's anonymity. Richard Jasnow writes that "there is very good reason to think that portions of the Alexander romance derive from an actual written Demotic text about Alexander and Nektanebo" (Jasnow 103). As this Demotic text is not extant, this theory remains a hypothesis, but what can be asserted is that "the Nektanebo episode belongs to the earliest stage of the Alexander romance" (Jasnow 101). Thus, the very beginning of the Alexander tradition definitively illustrates the method by which Alexander is claimed. By replacing the Macedonian Philip with Nectanebus, the writer of *Pseudo-Callisthenes* establishes Alexander as Egyptian, most probably the son of an Egyptian pharaoh, but alternatively the son of Ammon, an Egyptian God. Telfryn Pritchard writes that "the unknown Alexandrine writer wished to promote the idea among the people that Alexander was in reality no foreigner but the son of a former king of Egypt, and that it was only right and proper for Alexander and his successors to be kings of Egypt" (Pritchard 125).

In his paper "The Earliest Elements of the Alexander Romance," Alan Samuel describes the alteration of ancestry which enables Julius Valerius to claim Alexander as an illustrious member of Greek society:

> The Latin of Julius Valerius adds [from Favorinus] a genealogy of Alexander which reaches back from Oceanus and Thetis and passes down through the families of Perdiccas or of Philip. It is quite traditionally Greek, implicitly makes Alexander a descendant of Achilles, and completely ignores the paternity of Nectanebo so strongly urged by the main thread of the narrative. (Samuel 432)

The claiming phenomenon is clearly indicated by this major deviation from the standard plot manifested in the romances thus far. To ignore Alexander's Egyptian paternity so completely can only demonstrate Julius Valerius' immense desire to claim Alexander.

One of the most dramatic transformations that Alexander undergoes is found in the Arabic Alexander texts. As Alexander Cizek points out, the alteration owes much to the writers [of the Arabic Alexander romance] "homologating some episodes from other writings or traditions" (Cizek 595), in this case, the Holy Qu'ran. Z. David Zuwiyya writes that "with the Quranic mention of Dhulqarnayn, the pagan Greek king [Alexander] quickly assumed the role of the Islamic conqueror at the head of the Army of God, on a mission to traverse the world, submitting its peoples, and delivering God's message" (Zuwiyya 7). While these are radical changes, they indicate the extent to which cultural and religious influences impact the presentation of Alexander, thus enabling the Arabs to claim him as well. Although the transformation of Alexan-

der is attributed to a verse (Q. 18 – 83 – 102) in the Quran, Brannon Wheeler argues that "a more discerning examination of the different texts shows that the later recensions of the Alexander stories are dependent upon the Quran as understood through the medium of early Muslim commentaries" (Wheeler 214). The commentaries served as a transition, with the Quranic exegetes establishing the connection using the same methods as most of the writers of Alexander romances. Wheeler writes that "by identifying Alexander with the Dhu al-Qarnayn of Q 18 – 83 – 102, the commentaries are able to make use of the images associated with Alexander in the context of the Quran and Islamic history" (Wheeler 213). From the exegeses, the writers of the Alexander texts created their own Alexander, known as Dhulqarnayn. Alexander was again definitively claimed, as possibly an Arab but most importantly as a Muslim hero, glorifying the religion of Islam.

The Persian romances are distinct from other Eastern texts because the claiming of Alexander is achieved by fundamentally altering his maternal parentage. This alteration, which makes a lengthy discussion of the Persian romances irrelevant in this paper, is created with the addition of a fictional history in which Philip is defeated by the Emperor of Persia, Darab. Under the terms of the surrender, Philip marries his daughter to Darab. The brief union comes to an unfortunate end:

> Shortly afterward, noticing that his bride has a foul breath, Darab sends her back to her father [Philip], ignorant that she is pregnant. Philip conceals her pregnancy, and when she gives birth announces that the child, Alexander has been born to him by a concubine. In this Persian version of his birth, Alexander is a half brother of Darius, and therefore has a right to the Persian crown. (Southgate 279 – 280)

This passage illustrates how Alexander is claimed as a Persian, the son of a Persian king, thereby making palatable Alexander's conquering of Persia and the Persian capitulation to his rule. The text also demonstrates the literary glorification of the Persians as a whole, with the depiction of them as "the bravest men in Alexander's army" (Southgate 280).

As John Boyle notes, *Pseudo-Callisthenes* "was disseminated in translations over a wider area in Europe and Asia than any work before it" (Boyle 32). The textual alterations listed above further confirm that despite extreme cultural and geographic distance, the mindsets of the writers and their purpose in translating and adapting the texts were strikingly similar. The Alexander texts were not written solely to record and preserve history but also to use the legend of Alexander to glorify their respective cultures and religions. These texts illuminate Alexander's transcendence of cultural boundaries in the medieval period.

The Intertwining of the Characters of Alexander and Olympias in *Pseudo-Callisthenes*

In most of the Alexander romances, the characters of Alexander and Olympias are ir-

revocably intertwined. Alexander's social position is fundamentally bound up with Olympias, but Olympias' status is even more strongly linked to Alexander, who both establishes her as the mother of a king and simultaneously undermines her status by providing a tangible reminder of her adultery. The following passage from *Pseudo-Callisthenes* indicates the interdependence of Alexander and Olympias in the original Alexander romance:

> And he [Nectanebus] put aside the date-tree wood staff, got up onto the bed and turned Olympias toward him and mated with her. Then he put his right hand upon her side and said: "Invincible and indomitable child. Long may you live, my lady, for you are pregnant with a boy child who shall be your avenger and become world conquering king of the whole civilized universe. (Wolohojian 28)

These lines demonstrate that the characters of Alexander and Olympias are intertwined from the moment of his conception. Alexander is a "world conquering king," but he is first and most importantly his mother's "avenger" (Wolohojian 28). The immense effect of this connection is that Olympias is placed in a precarious but immensely powerful position because of her illustrious, yet undeniably adulterous, offspring.

That Alexander both undermines and aids Olympias in maintaining her tenuous status is evident in the following passage:

> And days later, Alexander went in to him [Philip] and sitting near him said: "Philip, I shall call you by your name lest it seem hard for you to be called father by me ... did you act rightly in attacking your own son, Alexander, and wanting to kill him? And wanting to take another to wife, even though you were denied nothing by your former wife, Olympias? ... Now I beseech you to reconcile Olympias with you. I know that she will be persuaded for her son Alexander's sake, although you do not wish to be called his father." He said this and left. And he came to his mother, Olympias, and said: "Mother, do not be angry about what your husband has done to you; for your own faults are hidden to him, and I am the son of an Egyptian father. Now go to him and entreat him to be reconciled with you, for it is proper that the wife obey the husband." ... Speaking thus, he reconciled his parents, while all the Macedonians marveled over him. (Wolohojian 42 – 43)

That Olympias' position with Philip is threatened by Alexander is clearly indicated by the phrases "lest it seem hard for you to be called father by me," and "for your own faults are hidden to him, and I am the son of an Egyptian father" (Wolohojian 43). Alexander's status as her "avenger" (Wolohojian 28) and the implication that the reconciliation is solely due to Alexander's intercession is equally evident in lines such as, "I beseech you to reconcile Olympias with you," and "thus, he reconciled his parents" (Wolohojian 43).

The most binding aspect of Alexander's and Olympias' literary intertwining in *Pseudo-Callisthenes* is Alexander's affection for his mother, which is demonstrated

throughout the text. One notable indication of his love for Olympias is found in the lines of a prophecy given to Alexander: "Alexander, the years of your life are ended; and you are not to have your wish of reaching your mother, Olympias; instead, you are to perish in Babylon and not to enter Macedon" (Wolohojian 131). The negation of Alexander's wish indicates the accepted presupposition of his deep and lasting affection for his mother and is clearly one of the reasons for his assumption of the role of her "avenger" (Wolohojian 28).

Alexander and Olympias in the *Historia de Preliis*

The majority of the episodes from *Pseudo-Callisthenes* involving Alexander and Olympias are preserved in the previously mentioned Latin texts. The descriptions of Alexander's conception and the importance of Olympias' role in *Historia de Preliis* are quite similar to those of the Greek representations:

> Cum ergo surrexisset a concubitu eius, percussit eam in utero et dixit: "Hec conceptio sit victorialis et nullomodo ab homine subiugabitur." (Hilka 22)
>
> (When he had arisen from lying with her, he struck her stomach and said "May this conception prove victorious and in no way will it be subjugated by man.")

The repetition of the prophesying over Olympias' "utero" (Hilka 22) emphasizes her crucial role in the creation of Alexander. The Latin tradition also preserves both Alexander's defense and reproof of Olympias in connection with Philip's remarriage:

> Hec autem dicente Alexandro cepit Philippus rex flere et Alexander cum eo. Et intervallo facto egressus est Alexander et abiit loqui ad Olympiadem matrem suam et veniens ad eam dixit illi: "Mater mi, noli timere malam voluntatem patris mei, quia quamvis absconditum sit peccatum tuum, reprehension tua stabit. Bene etenim et iustum est ut uxor simper subiecta sit viro suo." Et hec dicens duxit eam ad Philippum. Videns autem illam Philippus vocavit eam ad se at osculatus est eam." (Hilka 55–56)
>
> (After Alexander had said this, Philip began to weep and Alexander with him. After an interval had passed, Alexander left and went to speak to his mother Olympias. When he came to her he said to her "Mother mine, do not have the bad will of my father, for however hidden your sin may be, your blame will remain. For it is right and just that the wife always be subject to her husband." With these words, he took her to Philip. When he saw her, Phillip called her to him and kissed her.)

The retention of this crucial passage in which Olympias is Alexander's "Mater mi" (Hilka 55), but is also reprimanded for her "peccatum" (Hilka 56) sets the stage for the preservation of this textual attitude of both adoration and disapproval towards

Olympias throughout the entire Western dissemination of the Alexander romance.

Alexander and Olympias in *The Wars of Alexander*

As in *Pseudo-Callisthenes* and *Historia de Preliis*, *The Wars of Alexander* illuminates the textual interdependence of Alexander and Olympias early in the work with a description of Alexander's conception. The passage from the text is as follows:

Quen he was laide be-lyfe his liknes he changes
Worthis agayn to a wee fra a worme turnys
The kisses he keenly the quene & clappis in armes
Langis sare to the layke & on-loft worthies
Quen he had wroght all his will hire wame then he touches,
And with a renyst reryd this reson he said
"This concepcion with kyngis sal be called here-efter
A verra victor a-vansid all the vayne werde. (382 – 389)

(When he was stretched out soon he changed his appearance
He becomes again a man, he changes from being a dragon
Then he kisses the queen and grasps her in his arms ardently
Sorely longs to play and climbs on top
When he had wrought his will, he then touches her womb,
And with a mysterious voice this prophecy he said
This conception shall be called among kings hereafter
A true victor exalted throughout all the vain world.)

This portion of the text implies that Alexander will be a conqueror because of Olympias' actions. It is with his hand on "hire wame" (Skeat 386), that Nectanebus prophesies Alexander will be a great conqueror.

Once Alexander is an adult, his actions further illuminate the connection between Olympias and himself and the extent to which his status is dependent upon her. When Alexander arrives home and finds that Philip "Had wed him another wife & wayfid his quene / Ane Cleopatras called a grete kyngis doghter / And laft Olympadas & openly for-saken" (Skeat 822 – 824),[4] he immediately champions his mother, temporarily renounces his allegiance to Philip, and ensures that Olympias and Philip are reconciled. Their reconciliation is chronicled as follows:

With that he fanges hire further to Philip hire ledis
And he comly hire kist & cordis with hire faire,
Anes with Olympadas & the tothire woydis
And lofes hire lely to his lyfes ende. (Skeat 876 – 880)

(With that he takes her and leads her forth to Philip
And he nicely kissed her and comes to an accord with her
He unites with Olympias and dismisses the other

And he loves her faithfully until his life's end.)

Alexander's role in the rapprochement is paramount and indicates his understanding of how closely the preservation of status as Philip's heir is linked to his mother's status as Philip's queen.

Whether or not Alexander's actions are partially due to the preservation of his inheritance, Alexander's genuine attachment to his mother cannot be overlooked. Upon hearing that his mother is ill, Alexander immediately abandons his war, risking accusations of cowardice, to hasten home to her. Alexander writes to Darius:

Bot I warne the, or I wynd & will thou knaw
That for na drede I with-draw ne doute of thi pride
For baisting of thi bobance ne of this breme wordis
Bot for to se that is seke my semely modire. (Skeat 2012 – 2017)

(But I warn you, before I go, and want you to know
It is because of no dread that I withdraw or fear of your pride
Or dismayal at your arrogance or your fierce words
But to see one who is sick, my lovely mother.)

By risking his reputation as a warrior and temporarily halting his ambition to conquer the world, Alexander demonstrates his love for his mother and his virtues of loyalty and devotion. The mutual affection of Alexander and Olympias is further shown by Alexander's final actions before his death, which are described as follows, "And afore hys deth, he wrote a letter unto hys moder / desiring hir to make no sorrow for hym" (Skeat 135 – 136).[5] These lines indicate that Alexander's last thoughts are for his mother and that Alexander is in no doubt of Olympias' reciprocal affection for him, as evidenced by his preemptive desire to spare her any grief.

Alexander/Dhulqarnyan and Olympias/Al-Ghayda in *Qissat Dhulqarnyan*

The textual interdependence of Olympias and Alexander is intact and strongly indicated in Qissat Dhulqarnayn, despite substantial alterations to the text regarding Alexander's characterization. The opening reference to Olympias in the *Qissat Dhulqarnayn* is:

و قا ل بعض الروات يقولون ا ن ذا القرنين من اهل الزنية و المواجنية فقال مقاتل و الكلبي انه كان
من اهل الخير و الشرف (8).[6]

(Some transmitters say that Dhulqarnayn was from an adulterous and shameless people. But both Muqatil and al-Kalbi say that his people were good and honorable.) (Zuwiyya 68)

The allusion to the adulterous conception indicates that the Arabic writers were fully cognizant of the original version of Alexander's life but found it wholly unacceptable

for the background of an Islamic hero. This alteration reveals how closely Alexander's status is linked to his mother's morality, specifically indicated in this instance by her infidelity. Thus, to create an appropriately respectable ancestry for Alexander and reputation for Olympias, the Arab writers refuse to acknowledge the original version. The Arabic text is even clearer than the English translation in its reference to Olympias using the word "اهل", most accurately translated as 'family' rather than 'people.' In some Arabic dialects it is used interchangeably with the word 'wife,' further emphasizing the connection between Alexander and his mother. Aside from this opening assertion of the "good and honorable" character of his "people," the possible immorality of Alexander's mother is never addressed (Zuwiyya 68).

The linking of Alexander's status as the king's heir to Olympias' reputation is also suggested by the absence in *Qissat Dhulqarnyan* of any passages found in the Western romances that describe the fraught relationship between Alexander and the king. The succession of Alexander in *Qissat Dhulqarnayn* is simply presented in the lines:

> ثم ان الملك قرب ذا القرنين و ادناه من نفسه وتولاه وقلده امر الملك وبرا اليه منه و قال انت اول بالملك مني و احق فيه (9).
>
> (Then the king brought Dhulqarnayn into his chambers, made him king.) (Zuwiyya 69)

This smooth transition from heir to king, and the absence of the episodes in which Alexander must defend and reinstate his mother to retain his status, illustrate the extent to which Alexander's position is tied to Olympias in *Qissat Dhulqarnayn*. In *Pseudo-Callisthenes*, *Historia de Preliis*, and *The Wars of Alexander*, Olympias' actions result in her status and consequently Alexander's status as Phillip's heir being questioned. In the Arabic texts, Olympias' position, morals, and fidelity, and consequently Alexander's position, are above reproach.

In *Qissat Dhulqarnayn*, Alexander's and Olympias' affection for each other is clearly demonstrated, which further links them in the Arabic texts. As in *The Wars of Alexander*, Alexander writes to Olympias when his death is imminent, opening the letter with the salutation, "إلى امي اعزها اله" (104), which Zuwiyya translates as, "To my mother, may God love her" (Zuwiyya 160). The word "اعزها" literally translates as 'beloved' or 'dear,' thus creating numerous possible interpretations of the phrase, such as 'to my mother, may Allah make her more dear,' or, 'to my mother, may she be beloved of Allah.' Despite the slight variations, all possible translations of the line clearly indicate Alexander's adoration of his mother. Olympias' response after receiving his letter, which amply demonstrates her reciprocal affection, is as follows:

> فلما وصلها قراته و جعمت تبكي ثم ضمخت الكتاب بالعنبر و حبسته عندها(105).
>
> (When it [the letter] reached her, she read it and began to cry. Then she a-

nointed it with amber and put it in a safe place.) (Zuwiyya 160)

This exchange illuminates Alexander's Muslim virtues of respect for and devotion to his mother and the love and affection between Alexander and Olympias in *Qissat Dhulqarnayn*, cementing the textual intertwining of the characters of Olympias and Alexander.

Thus, in *Pseudo-Callisthenes* and along both the Eastern and Western trajectories, Olympias and Alexander are irrevocably connected. Although Alexander and Olympias are outwardly separate entities, within both the Eastern and Western Alexander traditions they are fundamentally intertwined and mutually dependent.

While the textual interdependence of Olympias and Alexander and the glorification of Alexander overtly exemplify cross-cultural congruity in the medieval period, the differing representations of Olympias in *The Wars of Alexander* and *Qissat Dhulqarnayn* reveal the underlying cultural disparity. This is not because of Olympias' representations in themselves, but because the textual characterizations reflect the differing cultural standards governing feminine morality. In *The Wars of Alexander*, the attitude towards Olympias is a curious mixture of overt condoning and inherent disapproval. This attitude is epitomized by Alexander's feelings towards his mother. As he is the dominant force in the romance, Alexander's attitude towards Olympias becomes the attitude of the text. Alexander's championship and continued defense of Olympias, despite his disapproval of her actions, are what determines her status, as opposed to her actual actions.

In *The Wars of Alexander*, Olympias is deliberately presented in such a way as to indicate that she is an adulteress, in spite of the divine pretense. After Nectanebus states, "'Athill qwen,' quod Anec "as I am enfourmed / Ane of the grettist of oure godis if grace & of might / I fynd, or it be fere to fleschely the knaw" (Skeat 306 – 308),[7] Olympias says:

"Now certayn sire," sayd the qwene, "selly me thinke
Bot may I se this be soothe at ye me say here
Noght as a prophet ne a prest I prays sall thi selfe
Bot rehers the as hieghe gode & hie the for euire. (Skeat 326 – 329)

("Now certainly sire," said the queen, "I think this is strange
But if I can see what you have told me here is true,
I will praise you, not as a prophet or a priest
but as a high god and I will honor you forever.")

In these lines, Olympias exhibits her enthusiasm for divine adultery in promising to treat Nectanebus as a "heighe gode & hie the for euire" (Skeat 329). Her actions in the text are clearly immoral but have little bearing on her status. Regardless of Olympias' actual morality, Alexander's defense of his mother determines her position. When she has been set aside by Philip, Alexander states:

"Fadire," quod this fell knight, "quen he this fest entirs
The palme here of my first price I pray the resayfe
For the to the weding or I winde of my wale modire
And kaire me to a-nothire kyng to couple hire to wife
Forthe to felsen ne to fologhe fallis me na mare
Ne here to duell with thi douce deynes me na langer" (Skeat 823 – 830)

("Father," said this fierce knight, when he enters this feast
"The palm leaf of my first victory, I pray you will receive
Before I go forth to the wedding of my noble mother
And betake myself to another king to join with her in marriage
For it is no longer fitting that I help or follow you
Nor does it any longer seem fitting for me to remain here with your sweetheart.")

Alexander's later statements, "Dame, now is thar none other to do bot deme it thi seluen / For as thi foly was before so foloweth aftir" (Skeat 735 – 736)[8] and "Bees not a-glopened, madame ne greued at my fadire / If all ye synned him be-syde as your selfe knawis / thar-of na we may the wite it was godis will" (Skeat 874 – 876),[9] indicate that he is well aware of Olympias' previous indiscretion. Nevertheless, this "foly" (Skeat 736), matters little to her champion. Olympias remains Alexander's "wale modire" (Skeat 825). Phillip and the text bow to Alexander's affection for Olympias, emulating his attitude towards her, and she remains Alexander's adulterous but adored mother throughout *The Wars of Alexander*.

The Variable Determining of Feminine Morality in Western Medieval Literature

The masculine controlling of moral status within the Alexander romances indicates that Western attitudes towards feminine morality, especially regarding fidelity, are variable. The actual morality of a woman's actions, as would be impartially determined by societal standards, is largely immaterial; however, the male opinion of a woman's actions determines her status within the literature. This is not to say that chastity was not valued in medieval Western society. There was a long tradition valuing virginity, modesty, and chastity in women originating with the Virgin Mary. Nonetheless, the acknowledged admiration for chaste and virginal women existed within a social power dynamic that enables men to create women's status, regardless of their actual chastity. Infidelity or sexual indiscretion did not have a consistently prescribed outcome in Western society. Although morality and chastity were ultimately desired, they were not requisites for women being placed at the pinnacle of society, as evidenced by Olympias, and also by Igerne, King Arthur's mother. This variable treatment of feminine infidelity creates a certain disturbing privileging of masculine opinion throughout Western literature. By contrast, the presentation of Olympias in *Qissat Dhulqarnayn* illuminates the disparity between the Eastern and Western attitudes towards feminine immorality.

The Islamic attitude towards feminine immorality is extremely strict. The follow-

ing passage is a depiction of a well-documented incident from the life of the Prophet Muhammed (PBUH):

> A woman who had committed adultery is said to have come to the Prophet, confessed her offense, and asked that she be duly punished for it. Since adultery is a major offense (hadd), its punishment is death by stoning. The woman was pregnant. The prophet sent her away and told her to wait until she delivered. When she returned with the child in her arms, and again asked for her punishment, the Prophet sent her away a second time to nurse the child. Finally, she returned leading the child by the hand with a piece of bread in his mouth. Had the woman not returned and simply repented, she would have escaped punishment. But since she wished to expiate her sin, with her own blood, the Prophet ordered that she be stoned to death.

This Hadith reveals the underlying rigidity of the Eastern standards governing feminine morality. In a Muslim setting, despite Alexander's power and influence, any attempt to cloak Olympias' adultery, divine or otherwise, would be fruitless. In light of her infamous adultery, Alexander's defense and championship of Olympias would nonetheless be insufficient protection. Thus, the Islamic setting of the text and the characterization of Alexander as a devout Muslim hero necessitate the altered representation of Olympias' actions manifested in *Qissat Dhulqarnayn*; however, rather than erasing her presence in the text, the writers merely eradicate the adulterous conception of Alexander and capitalize on the textual intertwining of Alexander and his mother to exemplify two distinct points: 1) a positive side of Islamic culture: the high regard and deep respect for mothers in an Islamic society and 2) the new characterizations of Alexander and Olympias: Alexander as an Islamic hero, with the proper respect for and devotion to his mother, and Olympias as devout, caring, and moral, an ideal Muslim mother.

The religious influence on the depiction of the relationship between Alexander and his mother cannot be underestimated. Islam clearly indicates the exalted position of mothers in a Muslim society, as the Prophet Muhammed once said "Paradise lies at the feet of the mothers" (Murata ix). When examining the depiction of Alexander and Olympias' relationship in *Qissat Dhulqarnayn*, it is relatively easy to see that Alexander's interactions with his mother serve the purpose of illuminating his religiously appropriate devotion to her and that the Olympias in *Qissat Dhulqarnayn* has been deliberately constructed to personify the qualities of an ideal Muslim mother, worthy of Alexander's respect and affection. One example of this being: "Dhulqarnayn wrote his name on all the treasure and sent it to his mother in Alexandria" (Zuwiyya 158),

An Arabic version of Alexander's death, which further demonstrates Olympias' portrayal as an ideal Muslim mother, is found in Umara's *Life of Alexander*:

> Dhulqarnayn summoned his scribes and asked them to write his mother and to get help from the wise men of Persia. His letter read: "O mother, if crying

> helps to alleviate the pain of things we miss, then let the sky cry for its stars, the ocean for its whales, the earth for its children, the birds for their nests, and the human for himself. Every hour somebody's fate arrives and brings upon death. Mother, I shall depart this earth, but the place I will go to is better than the one I am leaving." Dhulqarnayn's coffin was taken to Alexandria where his mother saw it. She ordered the coffin opened to see his face and said: "You have provided for others more than yourself. You have built many cities and helped many people in your life. You are now in the hands of God, the Almighty. Your wisdom has reached Heaven and all the regions of the earth. You are now forever asleep and can no longer advise. Bless you in death as you were blessed in life." (Zuwiyya 166)

In this version of the text, Olympias is again a devoted and pious Muslim mother, but she is also the illuminator of Alexander's virtues. Her concluding speech serves as a eulogy for Alexander. Olympias reiterates his accomplishments and virtues with the phrases "built many cities," "helped many people," "your wisdom reached Heaven and all the regions of earth" (Zuwiyya 166), and ends by emphasizing his status as "blessed" (Zuwiyya 166). Her final speech simultaneously commemorates Alexander and emphasizes her motherly devotion to her son, who is now "forever asleep" (Zuwiyya 166).

Conclusion

Olympias' overall representation in *Qissat Dhulqarnayn* is flattering, albeit somewhat one-dimensional. The Arabic Olympias may lose her controversial qualities, but the most important aspect of her character, the intertwining with Alexander, is preserved intact. Although Alexander's devotion to his mother in the Western Alexander romances facilitates the preservation of her original characterization, Alexander's attachment to the sanctified Olympias of *Qissat Dhulqarnayn* is in no way diminished. The reasoning behind the differing characterizations of Olympias in *The Wars of Alexander* and *Qissat Dhulqarnayn* is indicative of the variant criteria for determining feminine morality. The Western method creates a certain amount of latitude for feminine conduct but bows to masculine decisions regarding women's infidelity. By contrast, the Islamic attitude towards feminine infidelity is predetermined by the Quran and the Hadith. This attitude negates the privileging of masculine opinions found in Western culture but results in an inflexible system of judgment. Despite the differing criteria for determining feminine morality and fidelity within the Alexander tradition, the cross-cultural congruity is not limited to the glorification of Alexander and the textual intertwining of Alexander and Olympias. The two characterizations of Olympias reflect both the overtly disparate cultural attitudes and the fundamental underlying likeness behind the efforts to preserve her. Olympias' characterization may be variable, but Alexander's devotion to his mother never fails. In order to retain this relationship, the Arabic writers greatly altered the texts, not to erase the character of Olympias, but to preserve her, just as the Western writers condone Olympias' adultery and moral indiscretions because of the textual importance of Alexander's attachment to her.

Alexander's devotion to his mother transcends cultural boundaries, and its preservation in the Alexander romances along both the Eastern and Western trajectories reflects the underlying congruity of the writers' attitudes in spite of the extreme cultural distance and disparity. Therefore, within the medieval Alexander tradition, Alexander and Olympias are irrevocably intertwined, and although the representations of Olympias in the texts are culturally variable, to Alexander she forever remains his "wale modire" (825), "اعزها الله" (104), "may God love her" (Zuwiyya 160).

【Notes】

1. This paper uses the Skeat edition. Re-edited from M. S. Ashmole 44, In the Bodlein Library, Oxford, and MS. D. 4. 12, In the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.

2. *Qissat Dhulqarnyan* is the name given to the text by the editor, Z. David Zuwiyya in his book *Islamic Legends Concerning Alexander the Great*, Global Publications, 2001. This text itself is drawn from two manuscripts: 1) MS 61 in the Real Academia de la Historia and 2) MS 5397 in the Biblioteca Nacional.

3. It has been established that *Qissat Dhulqarnayn* is based on texts written by six medieval Arabic authors, Ka'b Al-Ahbar (7th century), Wahb b. Munabbih (8th century), Abd Al-Malik Al-Mashuni (8th century), Abd Al-Rahman b. Ziyad (8th century), Al-Masudi (10th century), and Abu Abd Allah Muhammad b. Al-Shatibi (13th century).

4. Had wed him another wife and made her, a woman called Cleopatra, a great king's daughter, his queen, and left Olympias and openly forsaken her.

5. And before his death, he wrote a letter to his mother, desiring her to not grieve for him.

6. Quoted from *Qissat Dhulqarnayn*

7. "Dear queen," said Nectanebus, " I am informed that one of our greatest gods of grace and power is going to come and sleep with you."

8. Madam, there is no one to blame for this but yourself, for this folly has come after yours.

9. Do not be angry or grieved with my father for you have sinned against him, as you yourself knows, even if we say it was God's will.

【Works Cited】

Anderson, A. R. "Alexander's Horns." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 58, (1927):100 – 122.

Boyle, John A. "Literary Cross-Fertilization between East and West." British Society for Middle Eastern Studies, Vol. 4, No. 1(1977): 32 – 36.

Larry Benson. *The Riverside Chaucer by Geoffrey Chaucer*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987.

Cizek, Alexander. "Historical Distortions and Saga Patterns in the Pseudo-Callisthenes Romance." *Hermes*. Vol. 106, No. 4(1978): 593 – 607.

Hilka, Alfons. *Historia Alexandri Magni* (Historia de Preliis). Germany: Verlag Anton Hein, 1976.

Jasnow, Richard. "The Greek Alexander Romance and Demotic Egyptian Literature." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*. Vol. 56. No. 2 (1997): 95 – 103.

Pritchard, R. Telfryn. *The History of Alexander's Battles* (Historia de preliis-the J1Version). Canada: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval studies, 1992.

Samuel, Allen. "The Earliest Elements in the Alexander Romance." *Historia: Zeitschrift fur Alte Geschichte*, 35.4(1986): 427 – 437.

Skeat, Walter, ed. *The Wars of Alexander*. London: N. Trubner & Co, 1886.

Smithers, G. V. *King Alisaunder*. London: Oxford University Press, 1952.

Southgate, Minoo S. "Portrair of Alexander in Persain Alexander-Romances of the Islamic Era." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. Vol 97, No. 3(1977):278 – 84.

Wallach, Luitpold. "Yosippon and the Alexander Romance." *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, *New Series*, Vol. 37, No.4(1947): 407 – 22.

Wheeler, Brannon. "Moses or Alexander? Early Islamic Exegesis of Quran 18:60 – 65." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*. Vol. 57, No.3, (1998): 191 – 215.

Wolohojian, Albert trans. *The Romance of Alexander the Great By Pseudo-Callisthenes*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Zuwiyya, Z. David, ed. *Islamic Legends Concerning Alexander the Great*. New York: Global Publications, 2001.

The Mythical Method in Song and Saga, Verse and Prose: Part II

James Nohrnberg

Abstract Offering descriptions of a few works of prose fiction written in English from the 18th to the 20th Centuries, the present essay attempts to supplement T. S. Eliot's somewhat polemical notion of Joyce's "mythical method," which is here re-understood as a continuous element in certain select narratives, rather than as any kind of substitute for narrative method itself (as it apparently is in *The Waste Land*). The essay demonstrates the workings of this kind of (modified) mythical method by retailing novels that subordinate correspondence with (and allusion to) a somewhat mythic or archaic original to their own particular stories, even while wittily maintaining contact with a specific archetypal narrative, or "scripture," overtly or covertly acknowledged or disclosed by the text in the course of its own narration. The novels summarized and quoted from are Ian Fleming's *Dr. No* in relation to the St. George myth, George Meredith's *The Egoist* in relation to the legend allegedly found on willow pattern china, Henry Fielding's *Amelia* in relation to Virgil's *Aeneid*, and Mario Puzo's *The Godfather* in relation to the Davidic Succession Document in the Bible. The last two novels of Henry James in relation to the patriarchal marriage-saga in the Bible, and Pynchon's *Gravity's Rainbow* in relation to *Moby Dick*, bracket the discussion overall, and demonstrate de-mythicization and re-mythicization as the two poles and termini of the discourse.

Key words "Mythical method"; myth; plot; prose fiction; scripture disclosure-point; atavistic interpolant; willow pattern; epic; Aeneid; Davidic Succession Document

Author James Nohrnberg has taught at the University of Virginia since 1975, and previously at Toronto, Harvard, and Yale (from 1963). He has lectured on the Bible for Princeton's Gauss Seminars and Indiana University's Institute for Advanced Study. His books are *The Analogy of 'The Faerie Queene'* (1976, 1980) and *Like unto Moses: The Constituting of an Interruption* (1995). Besides Spenser and scripture, he has lectured and published on allegory, Homer, Dante, Boiardo, Shakespeare, Raleigh, Milton, Sir Thomas Browne, Tennyson, Pynchon, and his teacher Northrop Frye; and very occasionally he has published poetry. He has served in titled lectureships at Princeton, Hopkins, Loyola Baltimore, Emory, and Smith; at Purdue for a 2009 conference in his and Prof. Michael Murrin's honor; and on editorial boards of *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, *Spenser Studies*, and The Manchester Spenser. He holds The International Spenser Society's Colin Clout Lifetime Achievement Award, and spoke at all seven Spenser quadricentennials (1990 – 2009), in four different Eng-

lish-speaking countries.

T. S. Eliot's so-called 'mythical method' is a publishing author's practice of taking an ancient or received myth, legend, or traditional or archetypal or a historical story—from the point of view of literary realism a tall tale or fantastic legend—as the skeleton or organizing principle or scaffold or template or infrastructure or pintimento for a narrative or plot that is both ostensibly self-standing and in some sense or other 'modern,' or more contemporary, and yet can be mapped onto a kind of archaeological other or original.[1] Eliot thinks the post-Flaubertian mess of the contemporary novel's reflection of anarchic modern life might well need this kind of ancient stay against present chaos, or this means of reinventing the novel form. Eliot seems to deplore the Bahktinian unspecifiability of the omnigeneric novel, and sees this structured way of escape from it. Thus Eliot famously wrote:

> In using the myth, in manipulating a continuous parallel between contemporaneity and antiquity, Mr. Joyce is pursuing a method which others must pursue after him. They will not be imitators, any more than the scientist who uses the discoveries of an Einstein in pursuing his own, independent, further investigations. It is simply a way of controlling, of ordering, of giving a shape and a significance to the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history. It is a method already adumbrated by Mr. Yeats, and of the need for which I believe Mr. Yeats to have been the first contemporary to be conscious. It is a method for which the horoscope is auspicious. Psychology (such as it is, and whether our reaction to it be comic or serious), ethnology, and *The Golden Bough* have concurred to make possible what was impossible even a few years ago. Instead of narrative method, we may now use the mythical method. It is, I seriously believe, a step toward making the modern world possible for art.[2]

Of course Eliot's polemical-ideological description might work well enough for the collection of antique fragments and variously ventriloquized voices called *The Waste Land*.

Mythology in literature tends to disclose the sentimental under-presence of a prior culture in a later one: Graeco-Roman mythology in *The Faerie Queene* and in the similes of *Paradise Lost*; Germanic mythology in Wagner and Tolkien; Celtic myth in Yeats. But when an archetypal story is used as the framework of a novel's plot, why, after the building is up, go on consulting the blueprint—or why x-ray the statue? But with the mythical method the guides have been retained or incorporated as a visible dimension of the design, and they inevitably ask to be considered, as it were, stereoscopically. Ordinarily, the novel's contemporaneity, domesticity, intimacies, naturalistic bias, reportage, and everyday protagonists, would seem to replace ancient story, rather than depend on it. And yet there are examples of this dependence quite distinct from Joyce's *Ulysses*.

Offering longish and somewhat elliptical descriptions of three works of prose fiction, Henry Fielding's *Amelia*, George Meredith's *Egoist*, and Mario Puzo's *The God-*

father, the present essay will attempt to supplement T. S. Eliot's somewhat polemical notion of Joyce's "mythical method," which we will re-understand here as a continuous element and technique in our chosen narratives, rather than as any kind of substitute or replacement for narrative method itself (as it apparently is in Eliot's ennarable *The Waste Land*, whether or not this is the case with Joyce's *Ulysses*). We can demonstrate the workings of this modified mythical method by retailing stories that subordinate correspondence with (and allusion to) a mythic or archaic or legendary original to their own particular histories, even while they allusively and wittily maintain contact and correspondence with a specific and select archetypal narrative—as it were a "scripture"—overtly or covertly acknowledged or disclosed by the story during the course of its own telling. We will begin with contrasting examples of mythicized story in Ian Fleming and de-mythicized story in Henry James, and we will conclude with James' polar opposite in the re-mythifying fiction of Thomas Pynchon.

By means of the mythical method (whether a technique of writing or of reading), a contemporary story can be mapped onto and/or modeled after an older, received and reconceived one, but the telling of the new version is typically managed by dissimulating or disguising or abiding some or even much of the dependence on the older story, until at some critical juncture the narration can dramatically reverse into a disclosure of the superimposition of one story on another, by means of a pronounced intrusion of a recognizable or tell-tale element from the latent pattern into the manifest one.[3] If the parallels never meet, there seems to be no cat to be let out of the bag. The cat can only be released by means of some kind of interference-like slippage being allowed from the one discourse to the other; but first there has to be a cat, or rather a telltale hybrid. At that point the tale actually becomes more meaningful than before, or more significant, by virtue of its becoming the sign of (or index to) another significant tale: oftentimes a myth or "canonic story."

In what follows I wish to pinpoint some places in the texts of select fictions where the cross-over between ancient 'myth' (or *received story*) and modern 'novel' occurs: the disclosure of what's going on, or where we are, and of where we find ourselves, when we start reading not for the plot of the novel, but for that of the novelist, at the point of atavistic interpolation—or at that juncture when reading for the plot becomes reading for its plottedness by a prior paradigm. Coincidence hereupon turns into design; the fiction loses its innocence—or naïveté—and becomes ironic, insofar as this form of obliquity entails a double consciousness. Disabused of the pretense of the story's originality, we re-discover its ingenuity on a second register: what myth are the characters re-living, under what sign are they re-born?

Something transactional needs to happen if the reader is to recognize the pattern or template—when it dawns on him or her that he or she has been, as it were, "had," when he or she realizes that what seemed like a novel or original story is actually a kind of Dopplegänger for—or reincarnation or offspring of—the actual original: on which the secondary version now affords a kind of commentary. —Or vice versa. In any case, at some point one's consciousness of the text divides and doubles, when the latency of the subtext becomes more or less manifest and in want of appreciative attention for its own sake.

I. MYTH IN SOME SECULAR FICTIONS: IAN FLEMING's *DR. NO*, HENRY JAMES's *WINGS AND BOWL*

Despite its general tidal movement away from the participation of myth in religious belief, secular fiction can also lead us the other way, towards restoring a myth, rather than ironizing it parodically or euhemeristically. Ian Fleming's *Dr. No* has a midpoint chapter titled "Dragon Spoor," and the relevance of this phrase emerges two chapters later, when "The Thing" of the new chapter turns out to be a swamp-thing equipped with a flame-thrower:

> Half a mile away, coming across the lake, was a shapeless thing with two glaring orange eyes with black pupils. From between these, where the mouth might be, fluttered a yard of blue flame. The grey luminescence of the stars showed some kind of a domed head above two short batlike wings. The thing was making a low moaning roar that overlaid another noise, a deep rhythmic thud. It was coming towards them at about ten miles an hour, throwing up a creamy wake.[4]

Bond reassures his spooked native associate, "you can forget about dragons," but nonetheless he thinks to himself: "Have to fight it here. What'll its weak spots be? The drivers.... I'll go for its headlights... Must have some kind of giant tires... I'll go for them too." Of course, dragons are said to get their names from their eyes, and they are vulnerable to sudden thrusts at anatomical weak points. —Poke 'em in the eyes, kick 'em in the cajones. Elsewhere we learn that Bond has been decorated as a member of the Order of St. Michael and St. George, presumably making him a bit like that knight in Paolo Uccello's painting of St. George,[5] as found in the poem of U. A. Fanthorpe's *Side Effects*; the champion in question, speaking to the Lady—for she is surely in need of his services as a defender—claims that he has "diplomas in Dragon / Management and Virgin Reclamation." "Don't you want to carry out the roles / That sociology and myth have designed for you?" he plaintively asks.[6]

For a less campy example of a fictional groundplot that is folkish and also Biblical, and where we hardly expect it, consider Henry James's *Wings of the Dove* and *The Golden Bowl*. Both novels seem to have as their fable the stories in the patriarchal marriage saga as found in Genesis 12, 20, and 26, about a sojourning patriarch enriched by a wealthy local patron who learns that the patriarch's female travelling companion, with whom the patron himself thinks to bed down, is not the patriarch's sister, and thus not at her guardian's dispose, as the man has himself self-protectingly alleged; rather, she turns out to be the man's woman and sexual partner, and thus a future matriarch and mother in Israel. Mating with another man's sister is customary, and sleeping with his wife is taboo. But James's two novels have reversed the genders, and turned the dynastics into a plot to possess an inheritance of enormous means—rather than avoiding a potentially threatening design upon an elect genealogy. The conclusions that Merton Densher cannot marry the Kate Croy to whom he is secretly engaged, and that Prince Amerigo in London cannot enjoy his secret mistress Charlotte in American City, are nonetheless the same: Amerigo cannot sleep with the

recent mate of his wife Maggie's father, and Kate cannot marry the fortune her fiancé has inherited by his charming of her dead rival. A taboo has arisen, as if Kate had indeed become Densher's sister, or sister-in-law, and the dead Milly Theale become his wife in absentia. Amerigo has acquired access to a fortune and brought Charlotte near him only by making her the object of a similar incest taboo or prohibited degree.[7]

The implicit commentary on modern power-relations between the sexes makes the person in the middle, now male, into the pawn between two women, who are positioned as rivals for a legacy or a title or social security. In the Bible the impending transaction, the wife-sister swap, was "between men." In James the lover-husband swap is "between women." The men are now the bargaining chips: they are pawns between competing women. These are parallels that never meet; James never discloses any relation to the Bible, and without the atavistic interpolant, there is no *frisson*, and no dawning sense that one plot or fate is mirroring or guiding or determining another, and asking to be recognized. In James the only plot that takes some recognizing is the plots of the characters on each other.

II. THE EGOIST AND "THE WILLOW PATTERN"

> "You need not tell me you have a design in all that you do, Willoughby Patterne."
> — *The Egoist*, Chap. 34, Mrs. Mountstuart to the title character, shortly before reporting Lady Busshe's sardonic remark that her wedding china gift should have been the Willow Pattern

> "Similes have the merit of satisfying the finder of them, and cheating the hearer," said Laetitia.
> — *The Egoist*, Chap. 48, on Clara Middleton's comparison of herself to a perfectly still fisherman's float on the water during her interview with Vernon Whitford

For an example of mythic interference or interface at the level of the fable, that is, a decisive intrusion or intervention coming from the pattern and asserting its presence in the latter-day text, consider George Meredith's *The Egoist*, from Henry James's own fictional era. The key moment in the doubling of the plot is surely this quote, in an interview between Mrs. Mountstuart and the hero, Sir Willoughby Patterne, discussing the rejection of Mrs. Mountstuart's rival Lady Busshe's wedding gift of china to Willoughby's fiancée Clara, whom Mrs. Mountstuart has oddly but insistently characterized as "a rogue in porcelain." Sir Willoughby says:

> '... She makes a mouth at porcelain. Toujours le porcelaine! For me, her pettishiness is one of her charms, I confess it.' ...
> [The lady takes up the theme:] 'Sir Willoughby, in any case, to quote you, here we are all upon the road, and we must act as if events were going to happen [namely the marriage]; and I must ask her to help me on the subject of my

> wedding-present, for I don't want to have her making mouths at mine, however pretty'...
> [Willoughby says:] '"Another dedicatory offering to the rogue in me!" she says of porcelain.' [Clara is reporting her distress at the progress towards the marriage she has realized she does not want.]
> [The lady replies:] 'Then porcelain it shall not be. I mean to consult her; I have come determined upon a chat with her. I think I understand. But she produces false impressions on those who don't know you both. "I shall have that porcelain back," says Lady Busshe to me, when we were shaking hands last night: "I think," says she, "it should have been the Willow Pattern." And she really said: "he's in for being jilted a second time!"'

Sir Willoughby restrained a bound of his body that would have sent him up some feet into the air. He felt his skull thundered at within. 'Rather that it should fall upon her!' ejaculated he, correcting his resemblance to the high-cast culprit as soon as it recurred to him.[8]

The china pattern's name locks into alignment with our high-cast hero's own. But what can Willoughby possibly mean? *What* "high-cast culprit"? What terrible fate should overtake "her" rather than himself? We will have no idea what this is all about if we do not know who the high-cast person is. He is the Chinese duke in the story of a maiden betrothed to him by her father, and in love with her father's banished secretary, to which we must add another maiden wasting away with love for the same nobleman. And that's the story that has provided the donée—or fable, or groundplot—for the novel as a whole. Lady Busshe, Sir Willoughby, and the narrator all have shown they know what "the Willow Pattern" actually is. Knowing what it is in Victorian England is the key to knowing where it is in this Victorian novel.[9] The story is now an etiological tale in its own right, an explanation for how the willow pattern came to be.

> Once there was a wealthy mandarin, who had a beautiful daughter. She had fallen in love with a humble accountant, angering her father. He dismissed the young man and built a high fence around his house to keep the lovers apart. The Mandarin was planning for his daughter to marry a powerful Duke. The Duke arrived by boat to claim his bride, bearing a box of jewels as a gift. The wedding was to take place on the day the blossom fell from the willow tree. On the eve of the daughter's wedding to the Duke, the young accountant, disguised as a servant, slipped into the palace unnoticed. As the lovers escaped with the jewels, the alarm was raised. They ran over a bridge, chased by the Mandarin, whip in hand. They eventually escaped to the safety of a secluded island, where they lived happily for years. But one day, the Duke learned of their refuge. Hungry for revenge, he sent soldiers, who captured the lovers and put them to death. The Gods, moved by their plight, transformed the lovers into a pair of doves.[10] (Wikipedia)

In a modern edition of Meredith's novel (Wordsworth Classics, 1995) Alfred Sutro's preface reports that "[Meredith's] tale is loosely based on the story depicted in the design of Willow Pattern china (whence the hero's name), where, for all the wrong reasons, a mandarin wishes to marry his daughter to the rich old man who lives across the bridge, but she falls in love with a poor gardener."[11] Willoughby is "a despotic prince" (ch. xxx, p. 18), while his secretary fills the role of the poor employee—he is "said to have been based on Meredith's friend Leslie Stephen." Like his counterpart on the plate, Sir Leslie would become famous for his writing.

In the story for the china pattern, the wedding gift of the rejected nobleman was stolen by the runaway bride. In the novel, it is the porcelain—Lady Busshe has brought it as a wedding gift—which is rejected with the groom, and the lady's cunningly suggested substitute gift is the china pattern based on the story of the rejected nobleman. Here is a story pattern that might be more acceptable to Clara than the unacceptable Patterne, for the china pattern supplies Patterne's rejection, in so far as it is a precedent for it.

It seems possible (to investigators) that Copeland and Spode or somebody like that merely made up the story after the china pattern had been created (i.e., to suit its imagery of edifice, branch, cottage, tree, bridge, boat, etc.) and to glamorize and sell a product as a 'romantic' and 'traditional' one. But if the pattern really was originally an export from China, later imitated by the English, then an East Asian provenance for the story, and perhaps the pattern also, becomes more plausible. Ideally, at least for my purposes here, the story would exist or pre-exist in a myth, legend, or poem, so that the Englishing of it would be an instance of ancient or timeless poetical myth or tradition transformed into (a) modern porcelain, (b) commercial prose about it, and (c) contemporary novel. But without a Chinese original, this putative genealogy becomes itself a fiction about a fiction. That is, the copy proves to be the original, and the supposedly ancient original has only been feigned or "manufactured" to be the source from which the copy derives.

No matter. For the recession of the classic story from public view, and its re-emergence there, is the burden of the following discovery of it in England by a supposed on-stage visitor from China, a magician named Chim-Pan-See, who had come to London to see the Great Exhibition of 1850. Here are some of his opening words, addressed to his English audience, from an operetta or long skit of 1851, called "The Mandarin's Daughter"[12]:

> So of course when I heard of your great Exhibition,
> I was speedily found in a state of transition,
> On my dragon I came—but, conceive my surprise!
> Round a public house kitchen when casting my eyes,
> I saw upon table, stand, dresser, & shelf,
> In Earthenware, China, stone-hardware, and delf [sic],
> Drawn longways & shortways, drawn outside and in,
> On plate, cup and saucer, dish, basin, tureen,
> A picture, which is but a full illustration

> Of an olden love story well-known in my nation.
> But still more my surprise, on [and] eclipsing my pleasure
> At finding the English so ready to treasure
> The legends of China, to find that unknown
> Was the story from which all the picture had grown:
> And when I told the story they said "You be blowed!
> That's the old Willow Pattern of Copeland & Spode."[13]

In other words, the play has given the story's principals both voice and audience, and thereby can hope to free them from the two-dimensional prisons of the mute plate as a silent script. The play, moreover, shows that the loss and recovery of the story behind the plate can become a literary motif in its own right. The manifest design of the plate is controlled by the latent design of the story, and the recovery of the story is a story in itself. The plate cannot speak, except in a jokish text by Dickens, "A Plated Article," where a piece of the china in question itself self-describes "that amusing blue landscape, which has, in deference to our revered ancestors of the Cerulean Empire, and in defiance of every known law of perspective, adorned millions of our family ever since the days of platters."

Meredith's heroine, who is insistently compared to a piece of porcelain by the novel's other old lady, revenges the female sex of the tale, by pre-jilting or pre-divorcing her somewhat villainous and blissfully egotistical fiancé. The decidedly willful hero being named Sir Willoughby Patterne, his denomination practically declares his will's subjection to an inherited archetype. But unless Patterne marries there is no possibility of the continuing of the house and line of Patterne. (The neurasthenic and seemingly exhausted woman Willoughby is finally forced to marry may in fact not be able to reproduce.)

The paternalistic egoist's dread of being virtually pre-cuckolded by being jilted for another suitor is the driving force of the novel. And indeed the betrothal period is one traditionally fraught with purity and danger—very different instances are Hero's peril in *Much 'I Do' about Nothing* and Mary of Nazareth's pregnancy in Matthew's Gospel, when taken with Deuteronomy 22:13ff. on raped fiancées as damaged goods (see also grounds for divorce in "some uncleanness" in Deut. 24:1–4).[14] But as in the example given of the last two James novels with their biblical analogates, the place in the earlier story occupied by the autocratic and willful Willoughby does not confer on him the paternal and patriarchal power implicit in his great name: in the end, like Merton Densher and Prince Amerigo, Willoughby is being traded among women. The shadow of infidelity or defilement of one kind or another is allowed to pass over Meredith's Clara Middleton for much of the novel, in parallel with the sickliness always hovering over the somewhat joyless and lovelorn Laetitia—whom Willoughby the Reject must eventually take to wife, to prevent his having no marriage at all. No such dénouement exists in the legend in the other versions I have seen. But the threats of Clara's shaming and Laetitia's ill health dissolve with the eventual exoneration of their lives from the straitjackets of the china pattern, Willoughby's paternal-

ism, and the House of Patterne. [15]

III. FIELDING's AMELIAD

> . . . nothing can be more evident than that exclusive of revelation, man cannot be considered as a creature left by his Maker to act at random and live at large up to the extent of his natural power, as passion, humor, willfulness happen to carry him, which is the condition brute creatures are in; but that from his make, constitution, or nature, he is in the strictest and most proper sense a law to himself. He hath the rule of right within; what is wanting is only that he honestly attend to it.
>
> —Joseph Butler, *Five Sermons*: "Upon Human Nature, III," sec. 3[16]

Late nineteenth century Meredith might not illustrate T. S. Eliot's implied thesis of the modern world's need of myth to organize or make sense of an anarchy the naturalistic novel was no longer up to dealing with, and Fielding's last novel *Amelia* seems to suggest that the archetypal fictions are not necessarily up to the mythical method's Eliotic taskeither.

The greatest long narrative in English before Fielding was *Paradise Lost*, and a famous epigram by Dryden suggests Nature had combined Virgil and Homer to create the great poem's author. Milton had indeed modeled much of the generic technique of *Paradise Lost* on the two Classical poets, especially in superstructure and subplot. A telling example of his touching base with the *Aeneid* has Aeneas's affair with Dido haunt Adam's initial relations with Eve. Adam and Eve consummate their marriage under the sign of Dido and Aeneas's congress in the cave—earth again "gave sign," *and that day has been the first of death and of woes the cause* (*Aen.* IV, 167, 169 – 70), words that Milton suppresses, where Faltonia Proba's famous cento had once sutured some of them in—namely, at the Fall. [17] Just as surprisingly, Milton's Adam has courted Eve in the shadow of Aeneas's rendezvous with Dido's shade in the underworld: Adam's cry in the imperative, "Return, fair Eve, / Whom fli'st thou? Whom thou fli'st, of him thou art" (*PL* IV, 481 – 82) are the first words of the first man to the first woman (and indeed they christen her), but they chime with Aeneas's final words to Dido in Virgil's Hades: "Stay thy step and withdraw not from our view. Whom fleest thou? The last word Fate suffers me to say to thee is this!" (*Aen.* VI, 465 – 66). Then Dido turns away, and flies to Sichaeus, while Eve, responding more positively to the same sentiments, rejoins Adam. In other words, both Dido and Eve return to their true husband. So of course Milton's Adam will speak to his innamorata not only with the voice of Aeneas, but also the accents of the God (or the Son) speaking to the same party: "What thou seest, / What there thou seest, fair creature, is thyself" (*PL* IV, 467 – 68). We recall Proba's lines climaxing her poem's invocation: "be at my side, Lord, set my thoughts / straight, as I tell how Virgil sang the offices of Christ."

These Miltonic re-writes of Aeneas's Sidonian Dido as Adam's Edenic Eve anticipate Fielding's treatment of his heroine Amelia, in a novel where the mythical method as an independent historical phenomenon apparently comes into its own rather deci-

sively. Amelia begins with a reference to the *Iliad* while actually re-casting the openings of the *Aeneid* and the *Odyssey* on the divine or human causes of the protracted adversities that the narrative will report as having been suffered by the married protagonists, Amelia and her husband Captain Billy Booth. We could hardly notice the parallel to the epic proposition of the work's subject without some grounding in the classics, but given that prerequisite, we can also hardly escape it. A year after the novel's publication Fielding himself wrote that he had taken Virgil for a model, and in 1936 George Sherburn opined that "the using of Newgate Prison to parallel the palace of the Carthaginian queen and the cave where was consummated the *furtivum amorem*" was "[A] touch worthy of James Joyce."[18] Indeed, Fielding's seductress, Mrs. Matthews, almost turns into a daylight version of Joyce's Circe. Bella Cohen is a dominatrix under whose tutelage the Ulyssean Bloom becomes the new womanly man, and a regendering of heroic epic is also the semi-conscious burden of Fielding's *Amelia*.

Fielding's initial, formal *propositio* replaces Virgil's hostile goddess Juno with the goddess Fortuna, and just as Juno finally consents to the marriage of Aeneas to Lavinia and the defeat of Turnus, so Fortune must have finally consented to restore Amelia's purloined fortune to her: an enrichment which enables Booth to leave the army, where his loss of his commission is the main burden of his misfortune, along with his naïveté and misplaced trust in noble friends, and a somewhat spineless conduct derived from his twin beliefs that "all men act entirely from their passions,"[19] and that we are atoms in the void whose godless lives are shaped by chance and not design. In other words, Booth's failure to believe in Providence is a failure to believe in the same authorial force and control that governs Roman destiny, inspires Virgil's *Aeneid*, and co-authors Fielding's novels.

Booth's senior advisor and patron, Dr. Harrison, is Fielding's Anchises figure, and so he "dies" in the third book, meaning only that Booth loses him as a counselor because of Harrison's new appointment as an educator; but Harrison's opposition to Booth's philosophy is repeatedly presented in the text, and is always at work to change Booth's mind, though only Dr. Barrow's sermons on behalf of the Christian religion finally convert Booth from his epicurean subscription to a belief in the power of Fortune: near the end of the novel, where these sermons have the force of the divine intervention that finally secures Aeneas's win over Turnus. The resemblance is structural—but not telling. Indeed, after the third book, the parallel between Virgil's and Fielding's narratives becomes rather difficult to demonstrate: the scent goes cold.[20] The half-pay captain may have a little "Iliad" in his tour in Gibraltar and a little "Odyssey" in his time abroad from England, but he has no "Aeneid" subsequently, beginning from Book IV, because he has no historical destiny, no Rome to found or empire to plant the seeds of, and only a floundering personal existence to keep afloat. But of course he has a social existence as well as a private one, and his own condition reflects that of his society—a society he derives and follows from, rather than leads and creates. His mistakes reproduce the vices of the company he keeps. The heroism to which he is called is the heroism of everyday duty, even if he answers the call only inconsistently. The *Aeneid* teaches honorable perseverance in a cause; in Fielding

this becomes merely the cause of preserving virtue and honor in themselves in the face of such unreformed evils as the current bail bond system and penal code.[21] But Booth—unlike his author—is no reformer of laws and institutions, only their hapless victim.

But the critical interference of the model with the copy is insisted upon by a chorus of pointed quotes from classical texts. The kind of disclosure-point that we might look for, first intuited as an atavistic interpolant, is illustrated by that place in the novel, in Book VI, where Virgil's verses are counterpointed against the action found in the prose, which concerns threatened marital fidelity and trust—a narrative seemingly under the influence of the separation scene in *Paradise Lost*.[22] The learned lady Mrs. Bennet says that Virgil calls the practice of second marriages "a violation of chastity, and makes Dido speak of it with utmost detestation: ..." She then quotes Dido at length in six lines of Latin.[23] The recital "not a little staggered Booth," who is here in the position of Aeneas in the underworld, in that the lines come from Virgil's fourth book, but are honored in his sixth, when Dido returns to her husband—or rather his shade—and so unmans Aeneas. In Book IV Booth is credited with "the general knowledge of that fury which possesses a woman scorned, *Furens quid foemenia posset*," that is, the fury that woman is capable of, when she is scorned as Dido was by Aeneas, i. e. as Mrs. Matthews was deserted by Captain Booth, who "had more particular reasons to apprehend the rage of a lady who had given so strong an instance how far she could carry her revenge."[24] She had murdered her husband. Mrs. Bennet believes she had done the same thing, before she became Mrs. Atkinson: i. e., she is as much like Mrs. Matthews as the Amelia for whom she professes such an affinity. Her name-change seems to betoken—if not epitomize—woman's essential mutability.

It is the last and by far the longest Latin quote in Fielding's sixth of twelve books as offered by a learned and mistreated lady, Mrs. Bennet, which makes much of our point. Mrs. Bennet is recommending the policy of Dido when she is insisting in Virgil's fourth book on her faithfulness to Sichaeus. This is Fielding's way of remembering Dido's return to her husband among the shades in the underworld of the sixth book of Virgil. Mrs. Bennet goes on to tell her cautionary tale as a warning to Amelia: it is the story of a woman who was betrayed into betraying her faith to her husband by a determined seducer. The husband dies young, and Mrs. Bennet thinks of herself as having killed him, even while she clings to the knowledge of the good of marital faithfulness—Dido's defaulted determination to be loyal reanimated by the loyal Dido's shade. As the quote comes near the end of Fielding's Book VI, it is at the half-way point where it must have dawned upon early readers that the novel might have followed the Virgilian epic consistently in earlier books.

Mrs. Bennet's defense of female education earns her audience's polite but superficial concurrence: "yet it may be a question whether they did not assent rather out of complaisance than from their real judgment."[25] The reader is perhaps warned by this reaction not to be so stupid as to fail to translate the Latin, or the Latin story. But Booth himself, despite his strength in the classics, mostly denies (even if he unconsciously is flattered) that Colonel James, from Book VII onwards, has designs on Amelia—designs that cast James as a kind of Turnus in relation to Amelia's Lavinia.

That is, Booth is an unwitting Aeneas who, on the one hand, believes more in luck and chance than free will, and, on the other, never has any clear idea of what Providence has in store for him, since he doubts its existence. The careful reader, however, is in a potentially different position. The amount of time Booth has spent in prison with bailiffs is an index of the extent of his enthrallment by his philosophy, but also by the evils of the present social system. The first sentence of the first chapter uses the word liberty twice, for the extra-territorial jurisdictions falling to the district of Westminster in which Captain Booth is deprived of his liberty for much of the novel.[26] But something insistently aleatory in Booth's life-story keeps us from ever knowing if the teleological imposition of the *Aeneid* on the novel could ever have really converted Booth's haphazard story of redemption into the illustration of a destiny. The whole second half of the novel seems to depart from the pre-established parallel with the *Aeneid*, because Booth cannot recover the military commission or profession that would have made him more of an Aeneas in the midst of a campaign, and less of a plaything of fortune in the midst of a corrupt society. The undeterrable Mrs. Matthews has a novel-long leverage on Booth that the perished Dido does not retain over Aeneas, and Amelia's guilty secret of Colonel James's unwanted attentions operates similarly to encumber a marriage that in the *Aeneid* exists only in the national and notional future. Turnus as a potential dynastic rival is replaced by James as a potential sexual rival, and where the *Aeneid* is about the sacrificial cost of founding Roma, the Ameliad is about the maturity and good faith required for preserving conjugal amor.[27] Where Aeneas will get his marriage back only posterior to his epic, Captain Booth has his in place prior to the action of his novel. The epic telos, once again, is lacking, and likewise the epic "cause" or etiology. And Booth has no Iulus, even if Amelia more or less does.

Various internal characters' quotations of Virgil and other classics for either authority or prestige function in Fielding's novel to ask both whether a Classical education can possibly be of any advantage to a woman, and if it can conduce to anyone's practice of virtue, or sustain his or her good nature. This leads us to wonder about the relevance of the comparison of the Booth of Fielding's prose to the Aeneas of Virgil's verse, with Booth's imprisonment as Carthage, Mrs. Matthews as its Dido, and Amelia as a kind of incarnate Creusa-Lavinia whose unfailing marital support the original Aeneas hardly had at all. Is a genuine thematic purpose served by one's recognizing Dr. Harrison as Anchises or Sergeant Atkinson as a faithful Achates, or indeed any of the citation of Virgil and the Virgilian underpinning, when there is essentially no Boothiad? Atkinson knows no Virgil, and it is his piety, more than the hero's, which saves the day. And if Virgil is in fact so significant, why would Fielding make the marginal spouse figures of the epic, Creusa and Lavinia, into the title role of the novel, where there is only a big blank in Virgil? The fainting, blushing, and vulnerable Amelia is far from a bloodless shade, even if she seems to live her life very much in the shadow of her careless and blunder-prone husband and indeed that of anyone who chooses to impose on her; she gets much of her saintly persona from her being the kind of angel in the house who can say and do virtually no wrong, but maybe not enough else. Her notable lack of wardrobe seems to bespeak the exposed

and defenseless character of her kind of virtue in a frequently pitiless world, a place she can ameliorate but not yet fundamentally change.

We are told that Fielding's heroine is based on his wife Charlotte, who died young, ten years after eloping with Fielding, and to whom the novel is dedicated. Thus her large role in the novel is a poignant post-mortem memorial tribute to what Charlotte might have been in Fielding's whole life. In other words, it is Fielding himself—not Booth—who was a kind of widowed Aeneas, with Amelia as his lost Creusa. (Milton may have created Eve out of a similar autobiographical re-write and would-be recuperation of psychic losses, given that the first words the man says to the woman are the last words Aeneas says to Dido.) Fielding's title tells us his novel wants to compete with Pamela; take away the Sh of *Shamela* and you have most of our titular heroine's name, just as if you took away Pamela's hypocrisy you might have a virtuous heroine worth naming. But the early Mrs. Matthews is a kind of resource and solace, and an adaptable woman of special abilities, albeit possessed of markedly predatory instincts; she only becomes the wholly vindictive villainess after she has given us a demonstration of some of the worldly wisdom that Amelia will seem pointedly unable to acquire, despite her mask in Mrs. Atkinson/Bennet-as-Matthews or Moll.

Meanwhile, Booth himself seems incompetent for any purpose that would effectively animate his assigned role as the Aeneas who was instrumental in realizing a Roman destiny after the loss of Troy. Booth's good service at Gibraltar is the corresponding history (an anachronistic one, as often noted), but this war veteran just wants to recover an appointment in the army, in order to reform his own social and economic fortunes—he's not much like Aeneas seeking New Troy and relief from the onus of defeat in the Trojan War, as opposed to merely losing at the card table. Is Fielding's tentative recuperation of the *Aeneid* then wholly ironic and likewise super-structural? Is *Amelia* a comparative—or at least a virtual—epic, or is it more like a mock-epic? On the serious side, Fielding is perhaps making something of Virgil's own epic point, namely that faithfulness to an ideal of piety or marital fidelity is not merely a private or domestic matter, but rather a societal one, even if it is a losing battle in a corrupt world, at least without a miracle like Amelia into the equation. Then the refounding of Troy as Rome is comparable to the recoupment of the idealized happiness and benefits of marriage as marriage.[30] But Dr. Harrison himself, the alter ego of the author in the novel, is rebuked for utopian notions of virtuous government taken from classical periods: "'To apply maxims of government drawn from the Greek and Roman histories, to this nation, is absurd and impossible. But if you will have Roman examples, fetch them from those times of the republic that were most like our own. Do you not know, doctor, that this is as corrupt a nation as ever existed under the sun? And would you think of governing such a people by the strict principles of honesty and morality?'" (Bk. XI, ch. 2; p. 467) Surely the analogy with the *Aeneid* skates on the same thin ice.

The morality of the individual in his marriage is an index to—and constitutive of—the morals and morale of his society. People need to honor their status: spouses should be faithful, and nobles—regularly depicted in the novel as heartless, selfish,

and callous cads—should feel obliged to be noble, that is, to patronize merit, rather than serve their own private and selfish self-interest. Mrs. Matthews threatens marriage in the way that the queen of Carthage threatened the future of Aeneas's Rome. Wifely Amelia, disdainer of masquerades, which she successfully avoids, is Booth's supremely loyal and all-forgiving friend; such a stalwart domestic partner is irreplaceable not only by the spouse, but by his or her society. But Booth himself hardly seems to have done anything to deserve this paragon, except to elope successfully with her, against the odds of marrying her with her guardian's permission. The elopement requires no masquerade, but there is nonetheless a suggestion that Booth aspires by it (and perhaps by his devotion to the Classics) to change his class. Amelia, after all, may be heir to a fortune.

It could be that Booth retires from the military because legendary epic warriors and the heroic code cannot make a bourgeois society great, while faithful spouses and their prosaic virtues perhaps might hope to make it good. Hence the novel's concern with dueling, a practice that perpetuates the viciousness of violence and war and the warrior code and the officer class in the private sphere, while family life is the fruit of peace and amnesty in the public sphere—and the fruit of peace is the social success of families and friends. Dueling offers heroic status to arguments over honor, but at the expense of trivializing the collective purposes mobilized and celebrated in epic—to say nothing of dueling's immoral legitimatizing of attempted murder.[31] Dueling may stand in for the Ate-driven Turnus of Fielding's novel, because it also seems like a mere relic of military epic, a "furioso" remainder no longer qualified to be the substance of the domestic epic that replaces military epic—as has already happened in *Paradise Lost*, where Satan seems like a disgruntled and frustrated would-be duelist at the end of Book IV. In any case, duel-prone Booth is less the pious father of Rome than his frequently pregnant and home-bound wife is England's mother.

The regular citation of Virgil by Fielding's speaking characters, and their appeal to his relevance, tacitly bruits the relevance of Classical studies to contemporary life, even while it questions it. When Fielding's Dr. Harrison is lecturing Amelia on the immorality of any allowance to be made for dueling, he cites Helen's foolish injured vanity when Paris is embarrassed in his duel with Menelaus, and then rebukes her concern with her husband's honor or at least his reputation with "I do know your meaning . . . and Virgil knew it a great while ago. The next time you see your friend Mrs. Atkinson"—she being a kind of Virgilian and academical chorus—"ask her what it was made Dido fall in love with Aeneas?" —Or, for that matter, what made Fielding's Mrs. Matthews fall in love with Captain Booth, or what made Mrs. Bennet—latterly Mrs. Atkinson—succumb to the nameless lustful and ignoble Noble Lord. We presume the answer is commiseration with—or pity for—a soldier down on his luck. Such a question makes it obvious that Fielding wanted his reader to keep in mind his original refashioning of pious Aeneas and the lovelorn queen. But while Widow Dido's husband Sichaeus has been killed by his political enemies, Mrs. Matthews's husband has been knifed to death by his wife: Mrs. Matthews herself. Again, dynastic epic has translated itself into domestic novel.[32]

It is the unhappy Mrs. Bennet, remarried as Mrs. Atkinson, who is able to fore-

warn Amelia of the designs on her of both the sinister, off-stage Noble Lord and the oppressively re-introduced Colonel James—which is to say, of the emergence of the two would-be seducers as the "Turnus" challenging Aeneas-Booth for his Lavinia-Amelia, and threatening to turn him into Shakespeare's Othello, with Sergeant Atkinson as his Casio. The parallel with Turnus is strained at best, because Aeneas challenges, in the name of destiny, the prior claim of Turnus, while the would-be seducer James's prior claim is only that of his already being a frequently successful predator. Indeed, the Colonel's own wife is party to his intrigues—she has the role of Lavinia's mother Amata, Turnus's human sponsor. But whereas Amata's opposition to Aeneas is caused from the outset by divine intervention, the collusion of James's wife in the undoing of his conquests is only gradually insinuated with the emergence of his evil record as a successful philanderer. Mrs. James is perhaps more her husband's victim than his goad or prime mover—the reverse of Mrs. Matthews, who is again this same reverse of Virgil's Dido. Mrs. Matthews does not allow herself to become a victim. In Mrs. James's case, we cannot be sure.

Fielding's domestication and partial re-gendering of the dynamics of epic conflict may accord with his avowed favoring of a prosaic history over a fabulous mythos. But the challenges and disasters of the card-table can hardly replace those of the battlefield, unless the effect is that of mock-epic. Indeed, the novel's ending turns the *Aeneid* upside down: Mrs. Atkinson only half-learnedly crows over Booth's final good luck as that of Turnus in *Aeneid* IX, and Booth is entertained by Colonel James "without Booth ever knowing a syllable of the [rival's] challenge [to a duel] even to this day." The happily deceived Booth has been equally oblivious to the danger posed by James through most of the second half of the novel because he is totally insensitive to the meaning of his wife Amelia's reluctance to involve herself with the Colonel, which should have told Booth what was going on. While at the end of the novel Amelia's evil sister Miss Harris flies off to France like Turnus's sister Juturna, leaving the field to Amelia, and so finalizing Fielding's *Ameliad*, Booth himself perversely delays the happy ending by his diversionary recital of a dream of a coach and four, which must inevitably recall the ostentatious purchase of just such a coach early in the history, to the ruin of his virtuous attempt at farming. Nor does he delay the revelation (with the detour into the dream) in order to prevent his wife's too sudden surprise (as he speciously claims), since he provokingly increases her anxiety by accepting a loan he surely knows she thinks he cannot repay, the loan being kind of treacherous assistance he has foolishly sought previously. In short, at the end of the novel we are entitled to doubt that Billy Booth has grown any wiser, or less the victim of his own unthinking whims, inclinations, and folly—and the plaything of that manipulative female called Fortune.

Dante calls Virgil's *Aeneid* a tragedy—it's a tragedy in verse, like *Paradise Lost*. But Fielding's sudden and improbable happy ending, amidst so many threats to it, characterizes *Amelia* as a comedy—and yet only technically; rather it is a tragi-comedy, a deeply ironic and insistently mordant history in prose, in which only a *deus ex machina* can rescue it from the effects of the protagonist's inadequacies, helplessness and fecklessness, despite the plot elements for the final developments having been

planted from the novel's beginning. The beset Captain is generous of heart and enchanted by his wife, and his somewhat Candide-like naïveté is set off by the author's episodic illustration of the evils of the law courts, of the laws themselves, of routs and masquerades, of the patronage system and markets in preferment, of gambling and dueling, of the mistreatment of stalwart soldiers, and of the arrogant aristocracy, self-serving clergy, and bribe-taking officialdom. Scenes from Hogarth, so to speak, adorn the house of this fiction at every turn, and over its entire twelve books they repeatedly encumber and drag upon the protagonist's simple quest for an honest and sociable happiness. Bleary-eyed Moll's missing nose in chapter one also mars Amelia's damaged looks in Booth's recital of his wife's history thereafter, and the same monster's pox also afflicts Mrs. Bennet, according to her comparable recitation. But many if not most of the married couple's reverses are co-operated in by the conduct of the feckless and gullible male protagonist, who despite his good and ingenuous heart and despite being a soldier of demonstrated merit, proves a drinker, gambler, and promise-breaker—a weather-vane with little judgment, a somewhat sadistic and unfaithful husband, and an incorrigible fool with his own and his wife's money; his private vices and deficiencies could never add up to anybody's public virtue. They can only keep him perpetually behind the eight ball of the world's callousness and whichever of his own passions is currently uppermost.

The funeral that appears at the end of each book of the *Aeneid* may have some slight structural resemblance to the savage deductions that the narrator tends to put at the end of many of his chapters as road-blocks to any optimism about the world's operation in favor of the novel's comparatively innocent protagonists. Fielding has not altogether disregarded the medieval reading of the *Aeneid* as an allegory of the developmental pilgrimage of life,[33] but book by book the desultory rake's regress of the *Ameliad* more accurately characterizes life as a history of repeated set-backs, mistakes, and discouragements. That too, of course, is a possible reading of the overall burden of the *Aeneid*, and may well account for the ironic English Augustan's choosing Virgil's epic as his vehicle, and then steadily jettisoning it, like Gibbon describing the Antonine enlightenment before coming to the fall of Rome he was to make so memorable and proverbial.

IV. MARIO PUZO's *DAVIDEIS*: FROM DON QUIXOTE TO DON CORLEONE

When a character in literature or a performer in the entertainment industry finds a large audience, then the culture that gave him or her ear begins to be authored by that character. Falstaff is not only witty, but the cause of wit in other men, and of the demand for more Falstaff. The success of *Don Quixote* creates a rival Quixote. We observe the same process—the same phenomenon—in Mario Puzo's novel, *The Godfather*, which was eventually followed by *The Sicilian*, as his characters become somewhat mythic. I read *The Godfather* forty years ago, when it was published and when I began teaching the Bible in New Haven—a city reputed to have an active Mafia. I was mainly reading Puzo's novel for its lurid socio-historical plot, but after it began to dawn on me that I had read such a history of a dynastic intrigue for a throne before, I found myself reading as much for the parallel as for the plot, or the arche-

typal shadow of a plot, because apparently they were on the same track and had in view the same destination.

The Godfather is an instance of "the mythical method," with its prose narrative partly controlled by an atavism in verse. The verse (as in the phrase "chapter and verse") is that of the King James Bible, where we find the Davidic Succession Document, the mythos in question. Like the Bible story, Puzo's tale can be taken for a quasi-historical account of the bureaucratization of a family-style patriarchy, told from inside the family by an omniscient and cunning narrator knowing all the hearts and bedrooms of the principal agents. In both cases, the reader is turned into a privileged voyeur, in the wake of the narrator and his co-conspirators. Who saw David looking at Bathsheba? Who saw Vito kill Fanucci?

A passage from II Samuel critically relevant to Puzo's novel also gave Faulkner the basis for title of *Absalom, Absalom* (where the beset Davidic patriarch corresponding to the Godfather is Thomas Sutpen):

> And the king said unto Cushi, Is the young man Absalom safe? And Cushi answered, The enemies of my lord the king, and all that rise against thee to do thee hurt, be as that young man is.
> And the king was much moved, and went up to the chamber over the gate, and wept: and as he went, thus he said, O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! Would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!

And here is the comparable moment from the Mafia novel:

> Don Corleone asked only one question at the end [of a report to him]. "Is it certain that my son is dead?"
> Clemenza answered. "Yes," he said....
> Don Corleone accepted this final verdict without any signs of emotion except for a few moments of silence. Then he said, "None of you are to concern yourselves with this affair. None of you are to commit any acts of vengeance, none of you are to track down the murderers of my son without my express command... Our Family will cease all business operations until after my son's funeral."[34]

Not the same "my son" at all, one might say, and without any Faulknerian enhancements. But of course not. The emotional father inside the Don is what he consistently represses; he only says "my son" three out of the five times he found in the Bible, nor he does say it histrionically, or poetically, or rhetorically.

Although it is in prose, certain idiomatic or coded phrases in the novel have the force of oral formulaic in verse epic: "Moustache Petes," "a ninety caliber pezzonovante" (a bigshot), "do the job" (have sex with a woman), "pay off" (exact retribution), "an offer you can't refuse" (incentive to yield to coercion, persuasion against your will), "to be a fool" (to court harm). This last, innocent-looking one is a vital clue to the novel's underworld *realpolitic*. For here is a second piece of the Bible's versified prose, with a snatch of atavistic poetry, as found in II Samuel:

> So Joab and Abishai his brother slew Abner, because he had slain their brother Asahel at Gibeon in the battle.
> And David said to Joab and to all the people that were with him, . . . mourn before Abner. And king David himself followed the bier.
> And they buried Abner in Hebron: and the king lifted up his voice, and wept at the grave of Abner; and all the people wept.
> And the king lamented over Abner, and said, Died Abner as a fool dieth?
> Thy hands were not bound, nor thy feet put into fetters: as a man falleth before wicked men, so fellest thou.
> . . . all the people and all Israel understood that day that it was not [the will] of the king to slay Abner the son of Ner.
> And the king said unto his servants, Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?
> And I am this day weak, though anointed king; and these men the sons of Zeruiah be too hard for me. (II Sam. 3:33 –34, 37 –39)

And here is the modern prose, in which Don Corleone gives up the war between Mafia families, which has been precipitated by the murder of a drug-dealer crucial to the future livelihood of the other Families:

> Don Corelone sighed. “”How did things ever go so far?” he asked rhetorically. “Well, no matter. A lot of foolishness has come to pass. It was so unfortunate, so unnecessary. . . . Tattaglia has lost a son, I have lost a son. We are quits. What would the world come to if people kept carrying grudges against all reason? That has been the cross of Sicily, where men are so busy with vendettas they have no time to earn bread for their families. It's foolishness. So I say now, let things be as they were before [the war]. I have not taken any steps to learn who betrayed and killed my son. Given peace, I will not do so.”[35]

Foolishness gives death a chance to make a fool of you.

The word fool, Hebrew *nabal*, appears three times in the David story, but each time in connection with a victim of David's rise to power, or with David's powerlessness to prevent an offender's death. Saul's general Abner dies as a fool dies, when he is murdered by David's *caporegimen* Joab; Tamar's rapist is warned he shall be as one of the fools in Israel, and he is murdered by her brother Absalom; and Nabal, whose very name means fool, is offered protection in the Mafia sense by David, and he dies of a heart attack when he learns that his wife has accepted an offer he thought better of refusing. “Foolishness” as a term for blind folly occurs once in II Samuel, when God himself intervenes decisively to favor David's cause and acts to “turn the counsel of Achitophel into foolishness” and thus cause Absalom's foiled advisor, his *consiglieri* Achitophel, to commit suicide. Puzo's next novel was called *Fools Die*. The closest analogue is surely that same rhetorical question from David's elegy over Saul's

foiled general Abner, "Died Abner as a fool dieth?" (2 Sam. 3:33, AV)

"Have I ever been taken for a fool?" Don Corleone asks his godson Fontana in the book's very first chapter. Solomon in Ecclesiastes says: "I applied mine heart to know and to search, and to seek out wisdom, and the reason of things, and to know the wickedness of folly, even of foolishness and madness" (Eccl. 12:3). "Be not hasty in thy spirit to be angry: for anger resteth in the bosom of fools" (Eccl. 7:9). "The words of a wise man's mouth are gracious; but the lips of a fool will swallow up himself" (Eccl. 10:12). The Don is looking for something Solomonic in his counsels. Thus the Don's idea of his enmity to foolishness occurs in the crucial council with the other Dons. The critical sentence containing the operative term is: "A lot of foolishness has come to pass." It hearkens back to Abner's and David's having been made fools of (by Joab) in ending the war between Saul and David.

Being an enemy of what he calls foolishness, Vito is also the friend of those accepting offers it would be foolish of them to refuse. On the penultimate page of *Fools Die* the first-person narrator prides himself on still being alive: "[T]hat's more than I could say for ... poor Jordan. I understood Jordan now. It was very simple. Life was too much for him. But not for me. Only fools die." "Merlyn had his troubles," Jordan once said to the narrator—who is the self-named John Merlyn—when Jordan first met him. "Yeh, but he never died," Merlyn replies.[36] Even though he has won big in Vegas, the suicidal Jordan can't take it—life itself. Vito, his name implies, can. He takes the name Corleone at age twelve when he is sent from Sicily to America to save his life. Lion-heart is like David, lion of Judah, who killed a lion in his youth. Vito's son Michael will be sent back to Sicily for the same kind of reason, because he deliberately assassinated a policeman in New York.[37] At the end of *The Sicilian* we learn that this long episode in Michael's life teaches him that survival on dishonorable terms is preferable to foolishness on honorable but lethal ones. In *The Godfather*, "[a]n Irish as a *Consigliere* had been the only foolishness the Don had ever perpetrated. No Irishman could hope to equal a Sicilian for cunning" (p. 396).[38] Amerigo Bonsera had not been so smart about dealing with the rapists of his daughter: "The judge sentenced them to three years in prison and suspended the sentence. They went free that very day. [He] stood in the courtroom like a fool and those [rapist] bastards smiled at [him]. And then [he] said to [his] wife: 'We must go to Don Corleone for justice'" (p. 30). Vito rebukes this penitent, who had failed to rely on him in the first place: "'You spend money on lawyers who know full well you are to be made a fool of,'" the Don says (p. 32). "'You lived like a fool and you have come to a fool's end.'" The Don similarly rebukes his godson Johnny Fontane on the same day; "Don Corleone paused to ask in a patient voice, 'Are you willing to take my advice this time?...'" (p. 37). It is the kind of offer the once foolish Amerigo has the good sense not to refuse.

The words successor and succession are used in *The Godfather* often enough to make them *leitworter* also.[39] So far as the narrative is concerned, the successor to the Don serves as the novel's abiding question. David had four sons, and an abused daughter: Absalom, Amnon, Adonijah, Solomon, and Tamar (sister to Absalom, and abused by Amnon). Vito Corleone has four sons, and an abused daughter: Son-

ny, Fredo, his son-in-law Carlo Rizzi, Michael, and Connie (wife to Carlo, who abuses her repeatedly). Are these symmetries merely superficial, like there being rivers in Henry V's Monmouth and likewise in Alexander's Macedon? If the Corleone family succession is to be hereditary, the successor nonetheless will be neither the womanizer-hotelier-chef Fredo, nor the aggressive but gunned-down Sonny, nor the always-suspect son-in-law Carlo. They are like the disqualified Amnon, Absalom, and Adonijah, while Michael is like the wise Solomon—because Michael is the one with the Ivy League education. (His sponsor Tom Hagen can recognize the portrait of Alexander Hamilton in a bank, and Michael is engaged to an Adams of Massachusetts—the Queen of Sheba, in her way.)

"Succession in control of such an enterprise as the Family was by no means hereditary" (395), the narrator-historian advises us, in allowing for the possible accession of the *caporegimen* Tessio, who finally gets himself killed in the place of David's ambitious general Joab and David's ambitious son Adonijah. Michael dispatches Tom Hagen from New York to work in Las Vegas, but leaves him out of the inner circle—because he got fooled. Hagan here is like the priest Abiathar, whom Solomon thrust out from being priest in Jerusalem, and banished to house-arrest in his birthplace in Anathoth, though it is Carlo who thinks he is being sent back to work in his native Nevada, after a kind of house-arrest like Shimei's in Jerusalem. Carlo is garroted on his way out the door to Nevada. Readers of David's story will wonder what fate overtook Abiathar after his exile to Anatoth from Jerusalem—was it like Shebna's fate after he was lured from his residence in the same place?

At the center of the biblical Succession Document the reckless Absalom usurps the kingship. While the Don is out of action—out of commission in the hospital—Sonny enjoys a troubled regency comparable to Absalom's usurpation. And in the end, like Absalom, he becomes a casualty of an internecine war. In the Bible Amnon the rapist gets himself killed by his half-brother relatively early; in the novel, the brother-in-law of Carlo the wife-abuser takes more time, revenge being a dish (we are told) more enjoyable when eaten cold.

The climactic turn-of-the-page in this page-turner comes with the gangland murder of Sonny Corleone, heir apparent of the Don—"See how they have massacred my son" (257), says the Don, when his son's shot-up remains are being displayed to a mortician from whom Vito is now calling in the favor from which the novel has virtually begun. The mortician and his wife were humble folk whom the legal system had humiliated—indeed, made fools of, as the narrator himself insists—and whose cause Don Corleone befriended. The novel winds up after the non-violent death of the retiring Don, who is planning for the succession of the elect son—the Don's favorite Michael, who proves a shrewder character than the violence-prone Sonny—and who will move the family business to Las Vegas, where it can go legit. Distinguished by his Dartmouth education and his Smith College-educated Yankee wife, Michael transfers the rackets to Nevada, as Solomon, proverbial for his learning, built the temple and his palace in Zion. A man of war who had shed much blood, David could not build the Temple (according to 1 Chronicles 22: 8); a man of respect, Michael can buy it. With a few more mop-up murders of rivals and traitors, Michael is anointed as the

new Don, and secured in his father's old position. The opening chapters of I Kings tell the same story.

Thus the main frame for the story of the Don's Family is one of two pieces from the Hebrew Bible that have made it into the old *Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces*, the so-called Court History of David. Few will have suspected that the Corleone family business, olive oil, relates to the anointing that makes David a royal, but during his exile from Saul's court, David obviously does run a protection racket, in the Paran of 1 Samuel 25. He is sought out by a wise wife who sees he will be king, and he is spurned by her spouse, a fool or churl named Fool, or Nabal, who shortly dies after refusing protection from the local racketeer. Another grateful client-petitioner at Connie's wedding provides the Don with bread for all occasions—Abigail supplies David with loads of bread in 1 Samuel 25.

David kills Goliath in the service of Saul, the Lord's Anointed, but a king whom God has abandoned; David is best friends with Saul's son, who figures as the novel's Jonathan, though the relation is doubled by reappearing in the next generation, where a Jonathan and David friendship exists between Tom Hagen and the Sonny Corleone who brings the orphan home. Jonathan's name turns up elsewhere as David's conscience and publicist, the prophet Nathan, and Hagen, as Vito's lawyer, has Nathan's role too. Vito takes over the olive oil business, from having been a mere grocery store truck driver for it, after he kills the neighborhood hood who has himself muscled in on it. He is best friends with the grocery store owner's son, Genco Abbandando. The olive oil is called Genco Pura, because Vito honors the genetic rights of his friend Genco, as David honored Jonathan's. (The Don cannot save Genco from his enemy Death, any more than David can save Jonathan from the Philistines, but the respect the Don accords Genco's last hours and his survivors comports with David's elegy over Jonathan and his protection of Mephiboseth.)

But God abandons Saul and therefore Jonathan, and it is David who is the descendent in the line of Judah, and God's choice. Likewise, "Destiny had decided that Vito was to become a don and had brought Fanucci to him to set him on his destined path" (201). This Fanucci is a local extortionist, so re-read: "Yahweh had decided that a Judahite was to become a king, and had brought Goliath to him to set him on his destined path." Like the Philistines, Fanucci has been exacting tribute from the locals who have rackets of their own. This would-be big-shot has suffered a near fatal neck wound from young bloods who resented his predatory ways. The Philistines' idol Dagon loses its head in the presence of the ark and has to be patched up. Vito, the future Godfather, kills Fanucci with a gun—he had been trained on the wolf-gun he became skilled at using at age nine hunting with his father in Sicily. He has not mastered a shepherd's slingshot, but a shepherd's shotgun (203). "The deadly Sicilian shotgun was the favorite weapon of the Mafia" (326). But it was once the shepherd's weapon against wolves. The Don knows its use from his childhood. Like King David, Don Corleone is a shepherd with an underdog's lethal weapon, and he too becomes a big-shot.

The future Don's reputation for aid to the oppressed and redress of grievances

grew in his community. Again, like David: "And every one that was in distress, and every one that was in debt, and every one that was discontented, gathered themselves unto him; and he became a captain over them" (Samuel 22:2). Captain in the English Bible, *capo* in *Puzo*. Eventually Saul dies, after making war on David, and David integrates the kingdom of Israel into the kingdom of Judah. Vito integrates the rackets of one Maranazo into his own, after ordering Maranazo's murder. "And now that the Don had ordered his business affairs, he found that he had trouble at home." The trouble is his obstreperous son Sonny, who thinks his destiny is also in the family business; he becomes a *capo*, but he is a hothead whose mismanaged anger costs him his life. In the meantime, the Don conceives a plan to reduce mob violence: "Like other great rulers and lawgivers in history Don Corleone decided that order and peace were impossible until the number of reigning states had been reduced to a manageable number.... And so he mounted what was in effect a colonial war against" the local criminals, who weren't operating inside Mafia Families (220). He is aided by the fearless and violent Luca Brasi, who emerges as a murderous henchman like David's hit-man Joab. The secret of restraining an irrational and violent man like Brasi is carefully discussed.[40] His murderous dedication to Vito is like Joab's to David, who always feels the sons of Zeruiah are nearly out of his control.

Some of the parallels become more exact when Carlo Rizzi marries the Don's daughter and physically abuses her. This drives her brother Sonny into a murderous rage, and he stays away from its object. But one day he finds his sister made a mess of by her husband's assaults, and he goes down to the bookmaking shop where the bully is doing his part in the family business, and administers a humiliating beating of him in the street. This intervention serves in place of Absalom's murder of his half-brother Amnon at the sheep-shearing festival in II Samuel 13. That is, Sonny has the part of the avenging brother Absalom, Connie the part of the raped sister Tamar, and Carlo the part of Absalom's half-brother, the family rapist; Carlo, comparably, feels powerful because "one of the Corleones was his doormat" (236). But Carlo doesn't die, unlike Amnon; he lives to finger Sonny to the Family's rivals. Nor does Carlo refuse the hand of the kingpin's daughter, he apparently desires it; indeed, the novel begins with the marriage in question. And yet Puzo has touched base with the original story, because one of the Don's petitioners at this marriage is a mortician named Good-Night America, and his petition concerns a daughter whose marriage prospects have been ruined by the violence of a would-be rapist. Here then is the rest of the Princess Tamar story, as found in her and Prince Amnon's chapter in II Samuel (ch. 13), and transposed to Carlo's and Connie's wedding-day. The mortician Amerigo "went to the police like a good American," and the perpetrators of the outrage got off in the courts. So apparently did Amnon. But the Don's serviceable goons subsequently carry out the vengeance on the perps that David *failed to* take on Amnon.

Sonny, in his role of the novel's Absalom, becomes the temporary head of the family, by default, because the Don is nearly murdered and is seriously laid up; so Absalom became king in Israel, when he took over the throne from David, by usurpation. Sonny dies during the Mafia war while coming to avenge his sister; he is ambushed at a tollbooth, while trapped in a Buick. The Buick doesn't altogether stop

here, however, if it turns out Puzo has reversed Absalom's killing of Amnon, for Puzo's Amnon has aided in the killing of Puzo's Sonny, and he will eventually pay the price of the bad blood that was always between them. Carlo went on abusing his wife Connie after Sonny beat up on him, so at first it seems that Sonny does not succeed in killing him as Absalom killed Amnon for raping his sister Tamar. But Carlo is finally paid off by Sonny's brother Michael for Carlo's betrayal of Sonny to the rival Barzini Family—the betrayal that had enabled Sonny's murder.

At the end of the gangland war culminating in the death of Sonny Corleone, and after making his peace with the other Dons, as David made peace with the Absalomite party, the Don's mind turns to his semi-retirement; he keeps to his house where he "plays the fool in his garden," as David in his senescence slept with Abishag, using her as a kind of electric blanket. But the Don also turns to bringing his son Michael home from hiding in Sicily, to make him the Don in his place. Such an office brings responsibilities, self-protection from traitors among them. David had instructed Solomon in the same arts. So advised and prepared, Michael undertakes the murderous retaliation his father has foresworn. From the moment of his resolve to assassinate the police captain, Michael has been, in Tom Hagen's eyes, the reincarnation of the Godfather. Hagen's recognition is like Nathan's prophetic prediction of the Davidic succession, or Nathan's confirmation of it—at Solomon's birth.

In the Bible, the Joab who kills Absalom is eventually killed by Solomon for supporting Solomon's rival Adonijah's bid for the throne. But Solomon executes Joab, at David's behest, not for giving the coup de grace to Absalom, and not for supporting Adonijah, but for killing two enemy generals who had each been promised not only amnesty, but also Joab's place (Saul's former general Abner and Absalom's former general Amasa), and thus making a fool of David. Nonetheless, Carlo becomes like Adonijah, because he has all along hoped the Family would let him become royalty, and his aspirations, like Adonijah's, are foolishly grand. Carlo's actual killer is an earlier Joab-figure, the merciless Clemenza, who kills Carlo in a parallel to the way Benaiah, Joab's replacement under Solomon, kills Adonijah. And such a Benaiah-figure emerges in the story: Albert Neri, who replaces the hit man Brasi as the enforcer Benaiah replaces Joab. Carlo's isolation in his house on the family mall is comparable to the house-arrest of David's enemy Shimei in Jerusalem: their departures from their houses, under temptation, are their death-sentences. The new Brasi, former policeman Albert Neri, isn't the one assigned to kill Carlo, but he kills the Don of the rival Barzini family in the same clean sweep that kills Carlo, whom the Barzinis had "turned." The death of the capo Tessio, likewise "turned," is also engineered in this purge—he has to go, like Joab or like Carlo, for having joined himself to the same proscribed rival house.

But, in the centerpiece of the whole intrigue, why would one identify Puzo's Sonny as David's son Absalom? —Because "his crop of bushy, curly hair," mentioned at his first introduction into the novel (15), makes him look even taller than he is. The same paragraph indicates his prodigious sexual endowment. Neither his "bushy" hair nor his member gets caught in the New Jersey tollbooth where he is ambushed and killed. But the slot of the toll booth and the Buick automobile out of

which Sonny's body slams while he is on the rampage about the abuse of his sister are nonetheless shadowed by the biblical Absalom, who dies in flight from battle, riding on a mule, his magnificent hair trapped in the branches of an overhanging tree. Then comes the job of reporting the death to the father, which is handled in Puzo's novel with the same kind of tact as the reporting of Absalom's death to David ("He must, Hagen knew, tell the news" [p. 268]).

The internal organization of the Corleone Family resembles that of David's party. The "capos" Tessio and Clemenza split power and authority like Abiathar and Zadok, or Joab and Benaiah, or Joab and Abishai (in the war against the Amonites and the Syrians). Luca Brasi, the early counterpart for Joab, is later turned into Albert Neri, the cop-turned-hit man who replaces Brasi in the regime of Michael Coreleone, as Benaiah under Solomon replaced Joab. Benaiah "slew an Egyptian, a goodly man: and the Egyptian had a spear in his hand; but he went down to him with a staff, and plucked the spear out of Egyptian's hand, and slew him with his own spear." This single verse from the end of II Samuel is the basis for the episode in which the turncoat cop Neri, disdaining to use a gun, receives the knife-thrust of a negro criminal into the palm of his hand and a split second later bashes the aggressor's head in with his flashlight. Neri is a "special," Benaiah is a "mighty man," and out of "the thirty," he is one of The Three, which means the same thing. Curiously, Albert Neri, who becomes the head of security at Michael's hotel in Vegas, is said to be "no fool" (420), while Saul's general Abner son of Ner, thanks to Joab's treachery, died as fool dies.

To review: virtually retired, David commissions Solomon to kill Shimei and Joab; comparably, the Don plans with his son Michael for the reconsolidation of the Corleones' power under Michael, and for the revenge of the murders of family members dear to Michael. Both purposes require further murders—after the death of the present kingpin. Solomon was known for his wisdom; Michael has the Ivy League education. Solomon made political marriages outside of Israel; Michael marries a White Anglo-Saxon Protestant whose ancestors were the Adams family. Michael is critical in advancing the Don's plan to transfer the rackets and the next generation of the family to Las Vegas: Solomon built the Temple in Zion, the Don's family muscles in on the gaming industry. As the Don initiates the crucial buy-out of Moe Green's Las Vegas hotel operation, so David captured the city of the Jebusites, and bought the site for Solomon's Temple.

New York, Las Vegas, Hollywood—heady stuff. But much of the Hollywood part is gratuitous to the Davidic vehicle for the novel, unless we decide that it is a substitute for the repressed sexuality of the straightlaced Don, with Johnny Fontane and Sonny and Fredo all as Davidic skirt-chasers, and many starlets as Bathsheba and David's several concubines. The various son-figures in the novel are all womanizers, Michael—like his father—excepted. (The Don is generally the friend of monogamous Uriah-types, not their betrayer.) And there seems to be no biblical parallel for the celebrated episode in which the severed head of his prize horse turns up in the bed of the threatened Hollywood studio head and producer Woltz, who has indignantly re-

fused to give the Don's godson—the singing heart-throb Johnny Fontane—a prize part in a new picture.[41] In the Bible, however, Saul's son Ishbosheth rebukes Saul's former general Abner for having gone into the dead Saul's concubine. "Am I a dog's head, which against Judah do shew kindness this day unto the house of Saul thy father, to his brethren, and to his friends, and have not delivered thee into the hand of David"—Abner asks the enfeebled son of Saul—"that thou chargest me with a fault concerning this woman?" (II Sam. 3:8). Ishbosheth is warned about his fate, and not so obliquely. The consiglieri Tom Hagen and Woltz, say nothing like that to each other, but the family lawyer's offer of help with impending labor union troubles (corresponding to David's kindness to the House of Saul) is rebuffed by the unsavory Hollywood bigshot, and the foolish man thereafter wakes up in bed with the bloody head of his prize horse, in place of his preferred bedmates, namely thirteen-year-olds with maidenheads. In other words, Hagen has silently asked the same black-mailing kind of question Abner threateningly asked Ishibosheth about the Saulide capo's treatment as a decapitated animal, and Woltz, like Abner, is rebuked (though silently) for forbidden sexual traffic. The intimidated and wised-up Woltz accepts the Don's so-called help, and surrenders the movie part to the Don's godson, who becomes Hollywood royalty. In the Bible Abner switches sides from Saul's house to David's, and Saul's protection-less son, Ishbosheth, is thereafter beheaded in his bed. Unsavory violence, in both Woltz' and Ishbosheth's cases, is the negotiating tool of last resort.

V. EPILOGUE: "AND I ONLY AM ESCAPED ALONE TO TELL THEE"; MELVILLE's MOBY DICK AND PYNCHON's GRAVITY's RAINBOW

Do we really need the David story to elicit and articulate the understructure of Puzo's novel, its skeletal plot? Perhaps the question should be put differently—or more "mythically." Why did Puzo's novel resonate with the public in the blockbuster way that it did? What was the corresponding historical subtext? The rise of an ethnic family to power, the legacy of the sons, the violent death of brothers, the assassination of the assassin, the transfer of operations from one territorial seat to another, the chaos engulfing a divided society, the mood of Good-Night America? Why the seconding of the Italian Godfather by a *consiglieri* and a mouthpiece supposedly Irish? Were the Corleones in fact being discerned inside the silhouette of the a-borning myth of the Kennedys' lost Camelot? Or could the Five Families be re-read as the five ethnic groups competing for turf and power in the five boroughs?

This all seems slightly satiric, if not deeply ironic—as if the mythical Great American Novel of whatever stripe were always teetering on the brink of self-parody.[42] Melville's Ahab with his prosthesis readily lends himself to re-depiction as Captain Hook in James M. Barrie's *Peter Pan*, Hook's marine nemesis being a crocodile who has swallowed the metal clock ticking in its stomach. This trans-Atlantic comment on *Moby Dick* as a boy's book may be compared to the rendezvous with German rocketry in *Gravity's Rainbow*. The body of the novel's fool-hero Tyrone Slothrop incorporates an "erectile plastic" (the "peculiar polymer" Impolex-G) used in the manufacture of the V-2 rocket, the implant of which sympathetically causes Axis missiles to target the

scenes of his sex-life in World War II London; the white whale tracked by Slothrop is the black box—the "Schwarzgerät" ("black device," or death chamber, on the 00000 rocket). Slothrop is mythicized as Rocketman, on the model of Plasticman, introduced in 1943 in boys's comics. Melville went to sea and thought about the Leviathan and Richard Chase's account of the Essex; Pynchon worked at Boeing and thought about Werner Von Braun and the V-2 files in his employer's archives (certain episodes in the novel have been dated by a singular photograph of Von Braun with a broken arm in a white cast).

In Mailer's Great American War Novel, *The Naked and the Dead*, General Cummings plotted the human sexual climacteric on the arcing and the collapsing of civilization in homage to Spengler's similar model of a missile's trajectory. Thereafter a modern Bible scholar—George Mendenhall—linked the meteorological seal on God and Noah's peace-treaty, the rainbow in the heavens, with the bow on the disc of the Assyrian war-god in the Near Eastern firmament on carved reliefs of Assyrian conquest.[43] Mythicized history imitates historicized myth: where the god Asshur trained his rain of arrows on ancient Near Eastern conquests and subject nations, a general named Schwarzkopf conceived an Operation called Desert Storm. Pynchon's Slothrop turned into Rocketman, and the U. S. Army's General Schwarzkopf into "Stormin' Norman." —Because of their dense black hair, it is thought, the ancient Assyrians were known in their world, and to themselves, as the black-heads. For some months, it appeared, General Schwarzkopf was America's Assyrian god.

As for *Moby Dick*, it ends upon a chapter for which the epigraph is, "And I only am escaped alone to tell thee" (Job 1: 1 – 5). Melville's protagonist has drowned with echoes of the fate of Dante's Ulysses, but the book began with the invitation to call its narrator by the name of the folkish outcast Ishmael, and it ends upon the invitation to identify that same narrator as now the messenger who thrice reported the collapse of a pious man's estate in the land of Uz. The epigraph mythicizes the narrator's audience ("thee") as itself in Job's shoes, with Ishmael as the messenger of mischance, that is, the reader becomes the object of that legendary test of wisdom conducted by those ultimate, mythic agents from Job's prose introduction, namely God and Satan. God's own final poetry in Job implies that only the Creator can land the Leviathan with a hook (Job 41:1), but a quasi-mythic stature attaches to the monomaniacal but mortal sea-captain who thinks he can do the same thing with a harpoon. And once Ahab has become himself a cultural myth, his artificial limb can be transformed not only into Captain Hook's prosthesis, but also the peculiar plastic operating in the body of Pynchon's Tyrone Slothrop. For Ahab's peg-leg was ivory from a whale like Ahab's nemesis, and the peculiar plastic is otherwise to be incorporated as insulation in the rocketry of the Axis enemy in World War II. Old myths need never say die when it is so apparent they will be revived through the multiple literary mutations and transpositions of the poetic and prosaic that may be compared to the exchanges we have noted between myth in verse, and history in prose. Or vice versa.

【Notes】

1. See T. S. Eliot, "Ulysses, Order, and Myth," *Selected Prose of T. S. Eliot* (London: Faber and Faber, 1975) 174 – 179. The essay presented here was originally Part II of a two-part lecture. Starting from citations of Jesse Weston and Sir James Frazer in relation to 'the mythical method' of Eliot's *The Waste Land* and Joyce's *Ulysses*, and reflections on structural uses of myth in literature generally, the first part of the paper proceeded through a series of poetical examples of mythical subplots: Milton's Satanic 'Telegoniad,' Tennyson's 'Columbian' Ulysses, Milton's Columbian Satan and his politicized and industrialized 'war in heaven.' The present paper takes up from the conclusion of Part I: "when Raphael's narrative in *Paradise Lost* has arrived at the point from which Milton-as-epicist himself began, namely Satan's fall from heaven, the poet says 'half yet remains unsung.' That half, in our case, would concern not the heroes of epic and romance, but the protagonists of the domestic novel and prose fiction. Even within Milton's epic itself, the brave warrior from the aristocratic past becomes the lethal spoiler-seducer from the bourgeoisie future."
2. T. S. Eliot, "*Ulysses*, Order, and Myth," in *Selected Prose*, 177. Eliot's review was first published in *The Dial* in November, 1923. For pithy commentary on this passage, see Denis Donaghue, "Yeats, Eliot, and the Mythical Method," *Sewanee Review*, Spring (1997), Vol. 105, Issue 2: 206 – 227.
3. Chaucer's exasperated Wife of Bath tears out three pages out of her husband's compendium of misogynistic treatises, from which he has gotten all the stuff originally from St. Jerome's *Adversus Jovinianum* that is vexingly insulting to women; but the nearly authorial annotations of the scribe for the Ellsmere manuscript puts it all back in, and reiterates the source, in the manuscript's margin. Here is a parable of intertextual/intratextual relations of the general kind that we are exploring here. See *Canterbury Tales*, Wife of Bath's Prologue, ll. 669 – 680 ("... Seint Jerome, / That made a book agyne Jovinian..."), 788 – 91 "... thre leves ... / Out of his book...").
4. *Dr. No*, ch. 12, "The Thing": 104. Fleming's lightsome chapter titles perform the alerting function in several instances, such as "Amidst the Alien Cane," where the reference is to the seduction scene in the Book of Ruth, via a phrase about Ruth among the alien corn, which is varied from Keats by the Caribbean setting. (There may be a second joke here, Ian Fleming being the name of an actor in a Somerset Maugham film vehicle called *Quartet*, the second playlet of which is titled "Alien Corn.")
5. The honor is known as the C. M. G. See Ian Fleming, *From Russia with Love*, 37: "'Myths are built on heroic deeds and heroic people. Have they no such men?' ... It was Colonel Nitikin of the M. G. B. who broke the silence. He said hesitantly, 'There is man called Bond,'" to be read with the Russian comments on Bond's dossier on p. 42; "'The fact that this spy was decorated with the C. M. G. in 1953, an award usually given only on retirement from the Secret Service, is a measure of his worth.'" A few pages earlier (38) one of these Russian spymasters, plotting Bond's assassination, recalls Bond's fairly recent interference in plot in which a German named Drax was killed. (Drax is variant of the words drake and dragon.) Discounting his legendary qualities, the hero at the same time makes himself sound like one of Spenser's heroes as commissioned by Gloriana: "'It's like this. I'm sort of a policeman. They send me out from London when there's something odd going on somewhere in the world that isn't anybody else's business' ... Bond told the story in simple terms, with good men and bad men, like an adventure story of a book" (94). The second chapter of *Dr. No*, "Choice of Weapons," needs to be read with Erich Auerbach's chapter "The Knight Sets Forth," in *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, tr. Willard R. Trask, pp. 123 – 42. See also Angela Jane Weisl, *The Persistence of Medievalism: Narrative Adventures in Contemporary Culture*, with especial reference to the canons and plot forumulas of romance in the cinematic ventures of *Star Trek* and *Star Wars*.
6. U. A. Fanthorpe (1929 – 2009), *Side Effects* (Cornwall, UK: Peterloo Poets, 1978). The pic-

ture and the opening of the poem are on the book's cover, the author's first. The dragon's section of the poem (I) there includes "I don't mind dying / Ritually, since I always rise again."

7. For this analysis and the biblical analogies see David McWhirter, *Desire and Love in Henry James: A Study of the Late Novels* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP 1989).

8. *The Egoist: A Comedy in Narrative*, intro. Lord Dunsany, 364 – 65 (in ch. xxxiv). (All quotations of the novel and their page numbers are from this edition.)

9. The relation is noted and studied in Robert D. Mayo, "*The Egoist* and the Willow Pattern" 71 – 78; reprinted in Robert M. Adams, ed., *The Egoist* (NY, London: Norton, 1979) 453 – 60; the cover of the Norton edition reproduces the china pattern.

10. Wikipedia, *sub* "Willow Pattern." See E. Cobham Brewer, *The Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*, 1303: "To the right is a lordly mandarin's country seat. It is two storeys high to show the rank and wealth of the possessor; in the foreground is a pavilion, in the background an orange-tree, and to the right of the pavilion a peach-tree in full bearing. The estate is enclosed by an elegant wooden fence. At one end of the bridge is the famous willow-tree, and at the other the gardener's cottage, one storey high, and so humble that the grounds are wholly uncultivated, the only green thing being a small fir-tree at the back. At the top of the pattern (left-hand side) is an island, with a cottage; the grounds are highly cultivated, and much has been reclaimed from the water. The two birds are turtle-doves. The three figures on the bridge are the mandarin's daughter with a distaff nearest the cottage, the lovers with a boat in the middle, and nearest the willow-tree the mandarin with a whip.
The tradition. The mandarin had an only daughter named Li-chi, who fell in love with Chang, a young man who lived in the island home represented at the top of the pattern, and who had been her father's secretary. The father over-heard them one day making vows of love under the orange-tree, and sternly forbade the unequal match; but the lovers contrived to elope, lay concealed for a while in the gardener's cottage, and thence made their escape in a boat to the island home of the young lover. The enraged mandarin pursued them with a whip, and would have beaten them to death had not the gods rewarded their fidelity by changing them both into turtle-doves. The picture is called the willow pattern not only because it is a tale of disastrous love, but because the elopement occurred 'when the willow begins to shed its leaves.'"

11. *The Egoist*, prefatory statement: "[Meredith's] tale is loosely based on the story depicted in the design of Willow Pattern china (whence the hero's name), where, for all the wrong reasons, a mandarin wishes to marry his daughter to the rich old man who lives across the bridge, but she falls in love with a poor gardener." In Meredith's version of the story, the collusion between the nineteen year old Clara Middleton's learned father and the no longer young Willoughby is abetted by the seduction of the girl's sponsor with samplings of the finest of the rich man's port—"wrong reasons" enough, it comically appears.

12. My attention to this stage-piece was drawn by Patricia O'Hara's study "The Willow Pattern That We Knew: The Victorian Literature of Blue Willow," *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 36, no. 4., 421 – 43. This quote is the epigraph for her very instructive essay, in which Meredith's novel figures as *chef d'oeuvre*.

13. *The Mandarin's Daughter! Being the Simple Story of The Willow-Pattern Plate, A Chinese Tale* [1851] (London: Thomas Hailes Lacy, nd [apparently 1876]). Meredith's narrative suggests that Clara and her eventual husband, in flying off to the Alps for their honeymoon, are the lovebirds of the legendary immortalization and metamorphosis of their originals, eternally flying together in the sky of the plate. Meredith describes the blossoms on a branch in prose so rich he appears to be hopelessly in love with nature's ephemeral beauty (as Lord Dunsany thinks, in his introduction to the Oxford World's Classics edition), rather than toying with the urgency in the old story, where the falling of the blossoms determines the fatal date of the unwanted wedding.

14. The shadow of female sexual violation as treated in the deuteronomic texts hovers over such sentences as Vernon's verdict on Willoughby's tyranny: "A man of full growth ought to know that noth-

ing on earth tempts Providence so much as the binding of a young woman against her will" (ch. xxx; p. 321). There is something of a doubled Proserpina figure in the two women under Willoughby's power, the sickly Laetitia ("the modest violet" of ch. iii, p. 18 who becomes the "faded creature" of ch. xxiii [p. 235]) and the flourishing Clara, whom Willoughby dreams of reducing and discarding in revenge for her reluctance to marry him: "Ten thousand Furies thickened about of him at the thought of her lying by the roadside without his having crushed all bloom and odour out her which might tempt even the curiosity of the fiend, man" (pp. 235 –36). Clara is also compared to Andromeda by the narrator's disavowal of Whitford's capacity for the role of Perseus: "he was not the hero descending from heaven bright-sworded to smite a woman's fetters off her limbs and deliver her from the yawning mouth-abyss" (ch. xvi; p. 158).

15. Willoughby determines to marry his long-time admirer, the brainy, portionless poetess and not altogether glamorous or vivacious Laetitia Dale, because "At least she would rescue him from the claws of Lady Busshe, and her owl's hoot of 'Willow Pattern,' and her hag's shriek of 'twice jilted,'" (ch. xxviii; p. 292).

16. Joseph Butler, *Five Sermons*, intro. Stuart M. Brown 45 –46.

17. But the *Tellus ... dant signum* of the same passage (*Aen.* IV, 166 – 67) is attached to the Fall: twice ("Earth felt the wound, and Nature ... gave signs of woe," "Earth trembled ... and Nature gave a second groan": PL IX, 782 –83, 1000 –01). In the Cento *Vergilianus de laudibus Christi* of Faltonia Betitia Proba (ca. 322 – 70), God pronounces a death sentence on Eve, after condemning her with the sad old age, disease, and labor he has just cursed Adam with: "These evils will always be yours. And you, o savage wife, not ignorant *of ill*, *of all these ills are the head and the cause*" (*Haec tibi semper erunt*, *tuque*, *o saevissima coniunx*, *non ignara mali*, / *caput horum et causa malorum* [lines 263 –65]: comparing Virgil, Aen. IV, 169 –70, *ille dies primus leti primusque malorum / causa fuit*).

18. Twentieth Century Views/Spectrum Books reprints George Sherburn's essay in *Fielding*: *A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Ronald Paulson: "*Fielding's Amelia*: An Interpretation," pp. 146 – 57.

19. Bk. I, ch. 3: "he did not believe men were under any blind impulse of direction of fate; that that every man acted merely from the force of the passion which was uppermost in his mind, and could do no otherwise" (p. 24). The discussion of "impulse of fate" here appears to take a phrase from the assertion of Milton's God that he has not influenced the Fall or compromised free will: in *Paradise Lost* III, 120. Booth's notion is reasserted at Bk. III, ch. 4, "he was convinced every man acted entirely from that passion which was uppermost" (p. 103), and quoted at Bk. XII, ch. 5 (where Booth says, "men appeared to me to act entirely from their passions" [p. 522]; Dr. Harrison agreeing, though perhaps only momentarily, then opines that hope and fear being the strongest of these passions, religion with its rewards and punishments has a firm footing in the truth). Fools and wisemen most often act alike, because they act "from their uppermost passion," even according to the narrator (Bk. VIII, ch. x; p. 355); and likewise they act "from self-love," which seems to be that same "uppermost passion," according to Booth, lecturing Amelia in a philosophy she considers little short of atheism: "all men, as well the best as the worst, act alike from the principle of self-love. Where benevolence is the uppermost passion, self-love directs you to gratify it by doing good"—but where "ambition avarice, pride, or any other passion governs the man, ... the miseries of all men affect him no more they would a stock or a stone" (Bk. X, ch. 9; p. 458).

20. The scent has not grown so cold that there are none able to find and study it throughout the novel: i. e., Lyall H. Powers, "The Influence of the *Aeneid* on Fielding's Amelia," in *Modern Language Notes*, 330 –36; Maurice Johnson, "The Noble Model" 139 –56; Eustace Palmer, "Amelia—The Decline of Fielding's Art," in *Essays in Criticism* 135 –51; and John E. Loftis, "Imitation in the Novel: Fielding's Amelia" 214 –29.

21. See Rebecca West, *The Court and the Castle*: *Some treatments of a recurrent theme* (New Ha-

ven: Yale Up, 1957) 94 – 99, for the relation of Fielding the reformist magistrate to the abuses and criminality in *Amelia*.

22. The nature of an atavistic interpolant is illustrated by the place in the novel, in Book VI, where Virgil's verses are counterpointed against the action found in the prose, which is all about threatened marital fidelity and trust—already felt in the influence in the text of the separation scene in *Paradise Lost*.

23. Mrs. Bennet, the lady learned in the classics, says Virgil calls the practice of second marriages "a violation of chastity, and makes Dido speak of it with utmost detestation: ..." She then slightly misquotes quotes Dido at length in six lines of Latin (Bk. VI, ch. 7), from *Aen.* IV, 24 – 29. The recital "not a little staggered Booth," who is here in the position of Aeneas in the underworld, when Dido's ghost returns to her husband and leaves Aeneas stunned (*Aen.* VI, "concussus"). The question of whether the author of the *Aeneid* or his poem's gods could ever assign an unjust fate to a pious man—Riphaeus—is taken up in no. 600 of Henry Fielding's alleged essays in Martin C. Battestin, ed., *New Essays by Henry Fielding: His Cantributions to the Craftsman* 271 – 83.

24. *In Book IV, ch. v; p.* 166.

25. *Bk. VI, ch.* 7, *at the end.* Caveat lector.

26. *For these observations see David Blewett, "Introduction," Henry Fielding, Amelia, pp. xi-xiii, where the legal and philosophical implications of Booth's loss of liberty are suggestively expounded.*

27. *Or "Aemeliad." Though Amelia is never spelled* Aemelia, *she is early on called "Miss Emily" by intimates, and Booth calls her "my dear Emily" late in the novel (Bk. X, ch.* 9; *Penguin edn., p.* 458).

28. *Though epic narrations are more historically oriented than myths, epics follow myths in explaining, etiologically, the why and how of something important or decisive that once happened.*

29. *This idea has its own history. A bogus and satirical advertisement circulated shortly after the publication of Fielding's novel begins as follows: "This day is published, / (In four Volumes Duodecimo, with the help of Dedication, / Introductory Chapters, long Digres- / sions, short Repetitions, polite Expletives of Con- / versation, genteel Dialogues, a wide Margin, and / large Letter, Price but* 12*s.*) / *SHAMELIA, a Novel": quoted from Wilbur Lucius Cross, The History of Henry Fielding, in* 2 *vols.*, 2:335 – 36.

30. *This is in agreement with Robert Alter, on the argument being made by the novel's Virgilian substrate, though there is no obvious speech by an authorial mouthpiece in its behalf (with the possible exception of Mrs. Bennet's recourse to Virgilian authority for her opposition to second marriages)*: Fielding and the Nature of the Novel, *chap.* 5.

31. *The duel in an affair of honor that Pierre is unhappily goaded into in* War and Peace, *points a similar moral. We are gratified that Fielding's sinister braggart soldier is the loser, and ultimately comes to a violent end (the rakish scoundrel Dolukhov, on the other hand, is among the soldiers ultimately rescuing Pierre from prison in Napoleon's Moscow).*

32. *Fielding's domestic novel at least once edges towards a nightmarish Dostoyevskian tale: Sergeant Atkinson, who has a long-running crush on Amelia, wakes up from a dream and thinks he has strangled his apparently blood-soaked wife; he has been dreaming that he was dispatching Amelia's would-be seducer Colonel James (Bk. IX, ch.* 6; *pp.* 384 – 86). *(In other words, the conflicted Sergeant would throttle his impulses to kill his own wife and go to bed with the Captain's.)*

33. *Dante,* Convivio, *IV. xxiv, advances the notion (taken from Fulgentius the Mythographer's* Exposition of the Content of Virgil According to Moral Philosophy) *that the Aeneid narrates the moral coming-of-age of an everyman.*

34. The Godfather, *p.* 270.

35. *P.* 285. *For further instances of foolishness, see note* 38, infra.

36. Fools Die, *p.* 530 *and p.* 50. *Merlyn muses: "'Jordan won over four hundred grand ... And then he kills himself....' 'Foolish,' I said"* (141). *At his big win, Jordan discovers, "He really*

was a hero" (27). But heroism, he might have warned himself, could get you killed: "Jordan had no illusions about himself... [he being a] degenerate gambler. That is, a man who gambled simply to gamble and must lose. As a hero who goes to war must die. Show me a gambler and I'll show you a loser, show me a hero and I'll show you a corpse, Jordan thought" (12). We compare what Merlyn says, upon the death of his Simon-pure brother: "I knew that I was alive ... at the core of my brother's virtue was that he feared neither his enemies nor those he loved. So much the worst for him. Virtue is its own reward and fools are they who die ... I would sin, beware and live forever" (442–43). "Merlyn knew ... [f]rom the very beginning Jordan was to have died in Las Vegas" (36), and death makes a fool of the majority of Merlyn's associates—few of them survive the novel.

37. *The sequel,* The Sicilian, *in which Puzo takes up the years and events of Michael Corleone's Sicilian exile, also ends on this note. Michael ultimately discovers his father has used him to effect a defensive betrayal of an admired Spartacus-like hero in the Old Country (who did not doubt "that he had some magnificent destiny before him. He shared the magic of those medieval heroes who could not die until they came to the end of their long story, until they had achieved their great victories" [101–02]). Michael plaintively asks his father, "'Does that mean that ... you used me like a fool, a Judas goat?'" Don Corleone answers, "'You are alive and he [the local hero] is dead. Always remember that and live your life not to be a hero but to remain alive. With time, heroes seems a little foolish.'" ... "It was the first lesson Michael received from his father and the one he learned best." (397–400.) —The lesson, in other words, that fools die.*

38. *There are many examples of "fool." — Vito to his fearful wife, before his successful murdering of Fanucci, whom "he thought ... was a crazy fool" (198): "Do you think you've married a fool?" (201). The Don considered threats the most foolish kind of exposure" (219). Tom Hagen knew, at the murder of Sonny, he "was ... no fit Consigliere for a Family at war. He had been fooled" (266). The Don to the other Dons: "We are all men who have refused to be fools ... we have to be cunning like the business people" (290). Michael: "The Corleone Family is a lot stronger than anybody thinks, but I hoped to make it foolproof" (411). The Don to Michael: "There are men in this world ... who go about demanding to be killed. ... I have seen a man, a fool, deliberately infuriate a group of dangerous men, and he himself without any resources" (423). Michael's wife to Tom Hagen: "... Michael lied to me ... he made a fool of me" (441). The Don to Hagen: "It has to be foolproof when [Michael] comes home" (296). Michael accusing Carlo of treachery: "That little farce you played out with my sister, did Barzini kid you that would fool a Corleone?" (431). Mama Corleone says the retired Don "just plays the fool with his garden" (390), and Vito dies there saying "Life is so beautiful," but his preceding thought is: "Prudence. Prudence" (407). The Don to his associates: "Now, any man should be allowed one foolishness in his life. I have had mine ... I'm being prudent, I've always been a prudent man, there is little I find so little to my taste as carelessness in life" (p. 294: we are unsure what the Don's foolishness is—his amusement in his garden, as opposed to the prudent, fortress-like estate around it?)*

39. *"If the Godfather had lived, he might have assured his son's succession; now it was by no means certain" (410). Rival families deem Michael a "mediocre successor" (396). "Sonny ... would guard the Family's empire, ... and since the position was not hereditary to an absolute degree, cement his claim as heir to the Corleone Empire" (259). Upon the early murder of the patriarch Don Aprile, Puzo's novel* Omerta *settles the family business succession question near the outset, but the analogous bequest structures and choices are illustrated.*

40. *Brasi, who has come under the Don's protection, is a virtual Molech. He has had his own newborn child thrown into a furnace, as Michael learns second hand in Sicily. Solomon (idolatrously) honored the murderous Ammonite god with a temple (1 Kings 11:5–7).*

41. *A record called* Sinatra Souvenir *was produced in* 1961 *by a record company called Fontana. The same company (or label) had also produced* The Frank Sinatra Story, *in* 1958. *"The part is foolproof," says Puzo's Johnny Fontane, speaking of the role that will win the singer-turned-actor an Os-*

car (*p.* 166; *Fontane's godfather secures the part for him*).

42. *The postwar imagination of this hypothetical novel particularly haunted the career of Norman Mailer, as the story of Puzo's Mailer-like character Osano in* Fools Die *illustrates. A similar tribute is implicit in the Faustian thrust and arc of the rocket in Pynchon's* Gravity's Rainbow, *which owes something to General Cummings's Spenglerian and sexual reflections in his memorandum in Part Three, ch.* 6, *of Mailer's* The Naked and the Dead (*pp.* 494 –96: "*Spengler's plant form for all cultures ... The fall is always more rapid than the rise ... the curve of sexual excitement and discharge ... It is the curve of the death missile as well as an abstraction of the life-love impulse ... the life viewpoint is what we see and feel astride the shell. ... In the larger meaning of the curve, gravity would occupy the place of mortality...*").

43. *George E. Mendenhall*, The Tenth Generation: The Origins of the Biblical Tradition(*Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP*,1973)43 –48.

【Works Cited】

Alter, Robert. *Fielding and the Nature of the Novel.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Auerbach, Erich. "The Knight Sets Forth." *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature.* Trans. Willard R. Trask. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1953. 123 –42.

Battestin, Martin C., ed. *New Essays by Henry Fielding: His Contributions to the Craftsmap 1734 –1739 and Other Early Journalism.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1989. 168 –74.

Blewett, David. "Introduction." *Amelia.* Henry Fielding. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1987. xi-xiii.

Brewer, E. Cobham. *The Dictionary of Phrase and Fable.* Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions 1993.

Brown, Stuart M. Introduction. *Five Sermons.* Joseph Butler. The Library of the Liberal Arts, Number Twenty-One. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1950. 45 –46.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. Wife of Bath's Prologue, ll. *Canterbury Tales. The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer.* Ed. F. N. Robinson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957. 669 –680.

Dickens, Charles. [and W. H. Wills]. "A Plated Article." *Selected Journalism 1850 –1870.* Ed. David Pascoe. New York: Penguin, 1997. 340.

Dunsany, Lord Edward. Introduction. *The Egoist: A Comedy in Narrative.* By George Meredith. London: Oxford University Press, World's Classics, 1959. 364 –65.

Eliot, T. S. *The Waste Land. Poems*: 1909 –1925. London: Faber and Faber. 1929. 63 –92.

Fielding, Henry. *Amelia.* Ed. David Blewett. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1987.

Fleming, Ian. *Dr. No.* New York: New American Library, 1993. p. 104.

Fleming, Ian. *From Russia with Love.* New York: New American Library, 1962. 37.

St. Jerome. *Epistola Adversus Jovinianum.* Ralph Hanna III and Traugott Lawler, eds. *Jankyn's Book of Wikked Wives.* vol. 1. The Primary Texts. The Chaucer Library. Athens, Georgia, 1997.

Johnson, Maurice. "The Noble Model." *Fielding's Art of Fiction.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1961. 139 –56.

Joyce, James. *Ulysses.* London: The Bodley Head, 1937 (rprnt. 1955).

Lacy, Thomas Hailes. *The Mandarin's Daughter! Being the Simple Story of The Willow-Pattern Plate, A Chinese Tale.* London. 1851. < www. worc. ac. uk/victorian/victorianplays/Vol05 xivMandarins. pdf >

Loftis, John E. "Imitation in the Novel: Fielding's Amelia." *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature*, 31. 1977. 214 –29.

Mailer, Norman. *The Naked and the Dead.* New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1948.
Maugham, W. Somerset. *Quartet.* Gainsborough Pictures, 1948.
Mayo, Robert D. "The Egoist and the Willow Pattern." *English Literary History*, IX. 1942. 71 – 78.
Meredith, George. *The Egoist*. Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 1995.
Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Alastair Fowler. London: Longman, 1971.
O'Hara, Patricia. "The Willow Pattern That We Knew: The Victorian Literature of Blue Willow." *Victorian Studies*, Vol. 36, no. 4. 1993. 421 – 43.
Powers, Lyall H. "The Influence of the Aeneid on Fielding's Amelia." *Modern Language Notes*. Vol. 71. 1956. 330 – 36.
Proba, Faltonia Betitia. *Cento Vergilianus de laudibus Christi. The Golden Bough, the Oaken Cross: The Virgilian Cento of Faltonia Betitia Proba*. Trans. Elizabeth A. Clark and Diane F. Hatch. American Academy of Religion Texts and Translations, 5. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1981.
Puzo, Mario. *Fools Die*. New York: New American Library, 1979.
Puzo, Mario. *The Godfather*. New York: Penguin Group: Signet, 1978.
Puzo, Mario. *Omerta*. New York: Random House, 2000.
Puzo, Mario. *The Sicilian.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.
Pynchon, Thomas. *Gravity's Rainbow*. New York: Viking Press, 1973.
Sherburn, George. "Fielding's Amelia: An Interpretation." *Fielding: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Ronald Paulson. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962. 146 – 57.
Sinatra, Frank. *The Frank Sinatra Story*. Fontana[Records, UK], 1961.
Sinatra, Frank. *Sinatra Souvenir*. Fontana[Records, UK], 1961.
Virgil. *Aeneid.* Trans. W. F. Jackson Knight. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1956.
Weisl, Angela Jane. *The Persistence of Medievalism: Narrative Adventures in Contemporary Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
"Willow Pattern." *Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia*. Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. 28 July 2010.

The Epic Decision: From Homer to Milton

Peter Hufnagel

Abstract Milton's *Paradise Lost* draws upon the classical epic tradition, while seeking to revise it in Christian terms. Adam's tragic choice in Book IX is modeled on Achilles' in Homer's *Iliad*. Achilles chooses to live a short but heroic life rather than a long but inglorious life. Confronted with Eve's transgression in Book IX, Adam makes a similar choice—to join Eve in sin and thereby expose himself to the possibility of death. Following the Bible, Milton must present this act negatively as a fall, but he nevertheless portrays Adam's decision in epic terms and hence as heroic. Viewing Milton's characters in light of Hegel's theory of recognition in his *Phenomenology of the Spirit* helps to analyze the ways in which Eve and Adam seek to establish their autonomy as human beings. In Hegel's—and Milton's—terms, they cannot be fully human until they leave the sheltered, animal-like state of Eden and risk death. In line with Milton's claim in *Areopagitica*—"I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue"—his notion of the fortunate fall is fundamentally Protestant. What appears to be Adam's turn away from God turns out to be a heroic path toward a new spirituality, a path of Protestant struggle.
Key words tragic choice; epic tradition; fortunate fall; recognition; human self-consciousness
Author Peter Hufnagel is Dean of the Faculty and Chair of the English Department at the Miller School of Albemarle.

> For nature had now driven him [Adam] from the safe and harmless state of childhood—a garden, as it were, which looked after his needs without any trouble on his part ([Genesis] 3:23)—into the wide world, where so many cares, troubles, and unforeseen ills awaited him. In the future, the wretchedness of his condition would often arouse in him the wish for a paradise, the creation of his im-agination, where he could dream or while away his existence in quiet inactivity and permanent peace. But between him and that imagined place of bliss, restless reason would interpose itself, irresistibly impelling him to develop the faculties implanted within him.
>
> —Immanuel Kant, "Conjectural Beginning of Human History"[1]

In Book 18 of the *Iliad* the first epic hero, Achilles, makes a decision that defines him as a human being and sets the mark for all other Greeks to reach for. Achilles, the greatest Achaean warrior, a man who can single-handedly change the outcome of the Trojan War, is presented with a tragic choice—he must choose between two goods.[2] He has just been informed that his dear friend, Patroclus, a man "I loved

beyond all other comrades,/ loved as my own life" (*Iliad*, 18: 95–96), has been killed at the hand of Hector, the Trojan prince.[3] Achilles sits mourning with his mother by his side and must decide whether to return to battle and avenge Patroclus's death, or pack up his things and return to his homeland of Phthia. If he chooses to return to battle, his mother warns him,

> You're doomed to a short life, my son, from all you say! For hard on the heels of Hector's death your death Must come at once. (*Iliad*, 18: 111–113)

On the other hand, if Achilles chooses to leave Troy and return to Phthia, he will live a long, prosaic life pasturing horses. If he leaves, he will more than likely have all the comforts of a quiet life—a plot of land, a garden, horses, a wife and children, and, in a sense, happiness—but he will be forgotten. Achilles' choice is clear—either live a long mundane life or a short glorious one. His reply to his mother may be seen as more than just Achilles's personal decision. One could argue that it is the standard to which all ancient Greeks were supposed to look for guidance in their own lives—a gospel of antiquity. The warrior culture for which Homer wrote his epic must reply just as their heroic ancestor did: "Then let me die at once" (*Iliad*, 18: 114).

The epic is more than just a story written to entertain audiences. Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were not merely derivatives of the ancient Greek warrior culture; they are the source out of which classical culture emerged. The "epic shows a tendency to become a 'scripture' of its culture. Such a poem is in fact not so much a cultural production as a cultural producer."[4] Therefore, Achilles's tragic choice becomes the guiding light for the heroes of the classical world. They are expected to choose to win honor fighting in faraway battles over living a quiet life at home. It is for their culture the noble choice, the morally right choice—what the gods expect of them.

A choice that defines a culture in the epic is not limited to Homer. In Virgil's *Aeneid*, Aeneas must make a similarly difficult decision. He must decide whether to leave his lover, Dido, and the comforts of Carthage to continue his journey to found Rome. Aeneas must choose between love and Roman piety. Naturally, setting the mark for Roman citizens, Virgil has his hero abandon Dido. This decision is in line with Rome's expectation that its citizens will place patriotism over personal satisfaction and glory. Still, Virgil does not present it as an easy or emotionless choice for his hero. Aeneas is a torn man when he leaves Dido:

> But though he longs to soften, soothe her sorrow
> and turn aside her troubles with sweet words,
> though groaning long and shaken in his mind
> because of his great love, nevertheless
> pious Aeneas carries out the gods'
> instructions. Now he turns back to his fleet.[5]

In the Dido episode Virgil, in effect, writes the scripture that Roman citizens should adhere to—in the Roman Empire duty and piety come before personal ambition and e-

motion.

When one turns to *Paradise Lost*, one would expect to find an epic decision comparable to the ones in *The Iliad* and *The Aeneid*. Milton was consciously trying to fit his poem into the epic tradition, but he was also adapting it to new, Christian purposes. *Paradise Lost* should thus feature a scene where the hero has to choose between God and some other value, and in Christian terms that other value should be seen as lesser. In *The Iliad*, Achilles, in accordance with the classical warrior culture, chooses a hero's death over a shepherd's life, and in *The Aeneid*, Aeneas chooses to found Rome in accordance with Roman piety and civic-mindedness rather than enjoy life with Dido. One would naturally expect, then, that in a Christian epic Milton would have a hero piously choose God's will over some other value in accordance with Christian teaching, which prescribes always choosing the path that leads to God. To a large extent Milton fulfills this expectation in *Paradise Lost*. One of the heroes of Milton's epic is the seraph Abdiel. At the end of Book V, he has to choose between following Satan's lead in rebellion or remaining loyal to God. Milton presents Abdiel as consciously choosing God over Satan and thus piety over personal glory: "Unshaken, unseduced, unterrified/ His loyalty he kept, his love, his zeal" (V. 899 – 900).[6] In Book III, Milton offers another model of the hero when the Son of God courageously is willing to sacrifice himself and risk death so that the will of God may be fulfilled.

But things look different when one turns to the heart of Paradise Lost—the story of Adam and Eve, the Fall of Man. The opening of Book IX is one of the places where Milton most self-consciously aligns himself with the epic tradition, and it is the one place where he invokes the concept of tragedy: "I now must change/ Those notes to tragic" (IX. 5 – 6). It is no doubt intentional that this tragic moment is in the same location in the narrative as Achilles's tragic choice: Milton places Adam's tragic choice in the ninth book of a twelve-book epic, and Homer's Achilles makes his decision in the eighteenth book of a twenty-four-book epic. But unlike Homer's Achilles, Milton's Adam seems to make a choice that goes against the moral code of conduct Milton is supposedly championing in his epic. The question is, then, why does Milton have his hero turn his back on God and deliberately disobey His commandment in order to eat from the Tree of Knowledge and fall with his wife, Eve? Why does Milton have Adam abandon God and not Eve (as if Aeneas had abandoned Rome and not Dido)? The immediate answer to this question is of course that this is how the events unfold in Genesis, and Milton is committed to the Biblical text.[7] But the question remains: How did Milton interpret this Biblical account? Although he does not contradict it, he does elaborate upon it and explores the motives of Adam and Eve at much greater length than the Bible does. In the process, Milton gives his own interpretation of the story of Adam and Eve, one which may not be wholly orthodox.

Analyzing the choices Adam and Eve make will help us understand Milton's deeper intentions in writing his great Christian epic. By having Adam choose to fall with Eve and portraying his decision in the noblest possible terms, Milton seems to depart from orthodox interpretations of the Fall and offer his own, personal understanding of good versus evil, right versus wrong, and moral versus immoral. Like the classical

epics that came before it, *Paradise Lost* seeks to play an active, not a passive role in its culture. It does not simply reflect traditional Christian teaching, but attempts to reinterpret it and set out on a new path. In short, *Paradise Lost* is in Nohrn-berg's terms a "cultural producer," meant to be a "scripture" for future generations. The ultimate goal of Milton's Christian epic is to show readers a new and better path to spiritual enlightenment. At first it appears that the fall of Adam and Eve pulls them a-way from God. But in Milton's reinterpretation of the story, the Fall truly is a 'fortu-nate fall' and ultimately sets Adam and Eve on the path to fulfilling the destiny God has in mind for them—a very Protestant destiny, as we shall see.

Adam's tragic choice is much like that of Achilles in the *Iliad*.[8] When Adam re-turns from his day's labor, he finds out that Eve has eaten from the Tree of Know-ledge and he "Astonied stood and blank, while horror chill/ Ran through his veins, and all his joints relaxed" (IX. 890 – 891). Adam understands immediately the con-sequences of Eve's transgression. He is horrified because he knows that Eve is now doomed—the only question that remains for him is whether or not he can live without his beautiful wife. Like Achilles, Adam now has the choice between two destinies. He may obey God's commandment, refuse to eat from the Tree, and therefore aban-don Eve. If he chooses this path, he will never die and live life in the comfort and security of Eden—just as Achilles would have lived a tranquil life in Phthia. On the other hand, if he decides that he cannot possibly live without Eve and eats the forbid-den fruit, he will live what many would regard as a short but glorious life sacrificing himself for the woman he loves. Adam's decision is no less heroic than the one Achil-les makes when he decides to return to battle, since the consequences of each are es-sentially the same.

Milton's hero snaps out of his inward silence and comes to the conclusion:

> Certain my resolution is to die;
> How can I live without thee, how forgo
> Thy sweet converse and love so dearly joined,
> To live again in these wild woods forlorn?
> Should God create another Eve, and I
> Another rib afford, yet loss of thee
> Would never from my heart; no no, I feel
> The link of nature draw me: flesh of flesh,
> Bone of my bone thou art, and from thy state
> Mine never shall be parted, bliss or woe. (IX. 907 – 916)

Adam does not hesitate when he realizes that he must choose between God and Eve. Living a cloistered life in the comforts of Eden without his wife is unacceptable to him. Adam needs Eve to be a complete human being; Adam needs Eve in the same way Achilles needs Troy. Achilles cannot become fully himself without risking his life in battle, as James Nohrnberg argues:

> Achilles needs Troy in the way that a "bonus baby" needs the Big Leagues or the world champion needs the National Association of Boxing: he may want it on his own terms, but he cannot do without it. Achilles asserts that he has an alternative back in horse-pasturing Phthia; but like the pastoral scenes depicted in many of Homer's epic similes, the alternative is only hypothetically there. Entertaining ideas about an alternate self is of course part of self-consciousness as a whole, but a totally self-invented life would be quixotic at the least, if not just plain mad.[9]

For Adam too, the thought of life without Eve is only hypothetically there. While Achilles needs Troy the way an athlete needs a playing field, one could say that Adam needs Eve the way a chivalric knight needs a damsel in distress. Choosing to fall with Eve forces Adam to 'become a man.' The Fall itself is fortunate because it enables Adam and Eve to become fully human. Achilles is an incomplete character until he returns to battle knowing that he will die shortly after he kills Hector. Likewise, Adam and Eve are incomplete human beings until they choose to reject the easy-going life in Eden and step out into a world of challenge and obstacles. They basically spend most of their time gathering food, eating, and sleeping—one might describe them as grazing like cattle. There are no obstacles to overcome or challenges in Eden. In the prelapsarian world Adam and Eve are not fully human—they are not recognizably different from the rest of the animal kingdom. By aligning Adam's choice to fall with Achilles' choice to return to battle, Milton sets up this point. The Fall completes the creation of man—the Fall makes man fully human.

This conception is not a pure creation of Milton's imagination. He appears to have taken the idea out of the story's original source—Genesis. In Chapter 3 of Genesis, God questions Adam and Eve about why they ate from the Tree of Knowledge. Adam is quick to pass the buck, blaming Eve for giving him the fruit and God for giving him Eve. Likewise, Eve quickly points her finger at the serpent, saying, "the serpent beguiled me and I ate" (Genesis 3: 13).[10] At this point Adam and Eve have both disobeyed God and failed to take the blame for their actions—they have fallen out of the grace of God and lost their place in Eden. One would expect God to turn immediately to their punishment. But instead, God first deals with the serpent.

> Because you have done this,
> Cursed be you
> of all cattle and all beasts of the field.
> On your belly shall you go
> and dust shall you eat all the days of your life.
> Enmity will I set between you and the woman,
> between your seed and hers.
> He will boot your head
> and you will bite his heel. (Genesis 3: 14 – 15)

This passage can easily be glossed over as merely the punishment God inflicts on the

serpent for his part in tempting Eve into eating the fruit. But if we think about it for a second, it should seem a bit odd and inappropriate. Why should a human being reading Genesis care how the snake is being punished as result of the Fall?

The answer to this question is that the serpent's punishment is included not so that we understand why farmers stomp on the heads of snakes in the field, but instead to highlight the first distinction between animals and humans in Genesis. Robert Alter points out that "it is the first moment in which a split between man and the rest of the animal kingdom is recorded."[11] Milton takes this Biblical moment very seriously in Book IX of *Paradise Lost*. Just as in the original source, in Milton's epic, Adam and Eve are not separated from the rest of the animal kingdom until they disobey God's commandment and fall out of His grace. The question is, then, what is it about the nature of the Fall that makes Adam and Eve fully human? What is it that they do that makes them intrinsically separate from the "fish of the sea and the fowl of the heavens and the cattle and the wild beasts" (Genesis 3: 26)? To answer this question it will be helpful to use Hegel's theory of recognition to explain Adam and Eve's transformation. It may seem odd to interpret a seventeenth-century English epic in the terms of a nineteenth-century German philosopher. But in the opening of his *Phenomenology of the Spirit* Hegel gives an account of the origin of human self-consciousness. He is in effect telling the story of man's "fall" from his original state—how he left a state of ignorance or "innocence" and entered a state of self-consciousness. Thus as foreign as Hegel's terms may seem to *Paradise Lost*, he is actually dealing with similar material. His analysis can help us to understand the meaning of the Fall in Milton.[12]

Hegel's "first man" shares with the animals certain basic natural desires, such as the desire for food, for sleep, for shelter, and above all for the preservation of his own life. Adam and Eve, before the Fall, live an existence that does not extend beyond these natural desires. What distinguishes man from all other animals, according to Hegel, is that he desires more than just real, "positive" objects—a flower or a neatly kept garden—he also desires objects that are totally non-material. Man above all desires the desire of other men, that is, to be admired by others or to be recognized. For Hegel, an individual cannot become self-conscious, that is, become aware of himself as a separate human being, without being recognized by other human beings. Man's sense of self-worth and identity is intimately connected with the value that other people place on him. While animals exhibit social behavior, this behavior is instinctual and is based on the mutual satisfaction of natural needs. Humans, on the other hand, have social behavior that can be explained only by the fact that they crave recognition. Achilles stormed the Trojan army so that his virtues would be praised by people throughout history—he chose to die because he knew that he would be recognized as the greatest warrior who ever lived. It was his desire for recognition that made him strive to be stronger, faster, and fiercer than anyone else—it is what distinguished him from the masses. It is this same desire that fuels Eve's choice to eat from the Tree of Knowledge. Eve, in Book IX, is searching desperately for a way to distinguish herself, to have Adam recognize her talents and virtues. Up to this point, it could be argued, Adam, while he loves and is immensely attracted to Eve, does not fully appreciate or recognize her as separate from himself. Eve must get him to

recognize that their existence in Eden cannot be based simply on their mutual satisfaction of needs. What Eve wants Adam to understand is that just because she has been created out of his rib, they are not the same being—they are not "enjoined" (IX: 207), but individuals. By the beginning of Book IX Eve can no longer live as a "pair" with Adam. She needs to find an outlet to express her individuality. In order to do this she must find a way to sever herself from Adam's constant companionship. She cannot be recognized for individual accomplishments if she is doing everything as a team with Adam.

At the beginning of Book IX Eve suggests that she and Adam separate—divide the labor—in the hope of accomplishing more work. This is her first opportunity to show that she is capable of doing a task on her own, but before she can do this she must convince Adam to separate from her for the day. Her conversation with Adam is well-planned and rhetorically smooth. She begins to show one of her individual virtues—rhetorical skill—before she even splits from Adam.

> Adam, well may we labour still to dress
> This garden, still to tend plant, herb and flower.
> Our pleasant task enjoined but till more hands
> Aid us, the work under our labour grows. (IX. 205 – 208)

Eve lets Adam know right away that she is planning to separate from him. She addresses him by name, dropping her previous rhetoric, in which she often referred to herself as an extension of Adam. Book IV offers a good example of the self-deprecating way Eve viewed her relationship with Adam in the past:

> To whom thus Eve replied, O thou for whom
> And from whom I was formed flesh of thy flesh,
> And without whom am to no end, my guide
> And head, what thou hast said is just and right. (IV. 440 – 443)

Earlier in Milton's epic Eve thought of herself as part of Adam—inseparable—and the manner in which she addresses him illustrates this belief. By Book IX this is no longer the case. She calls him by his individual name and does not suggest that they are physically the same being.[13] Eve then goes on to explain her plan:

> Or hear what to my mind first thoughts present,
> Let us divide our labours, thou where choice
> Leads thee, or where most needs, whether to wind
> The woodbine round this arbour, or direct
> The clasping ivy where to climb, while I
> In yonder spring of roses intermixed
> With myrtle, find what to redress till noon. (IX. 214 – 219)

Eve suggests that Adam work on a new method to prop up vines in the garden while

she looks for the best way to prop up flowers. In her search to find a way to distinguish herself, Eve does the most natural thing—she organizes a competition to see who will arrive at noon with the best new gardening technique. Since gardening is all she knows, it is quite natural that the competition she thinks up involves tending to plants. Eve is trying desperately to bring a little action and excitement into Eden, to come up with some task that will result in a winner who will be recognized as doing better work.

Ultimately, the best way to prove her individual virtues is to spend the day alone and fend off the devil's temptations on her own. If she is able to avoid the danger that lies in the garden, then she believes she will be recognized as a capable individual. In search of recognition Eve successfully convinces Adam to work alone. Eve leaves Adam's side ready to do battle with an evil spirit. Eve claims, "Frail is our happiness, if this be so,/ And Eden were no Eden thus exposed" (IX. 340 – 341). She cannot be happy unless she is challenged individually—unless she is given the chance to fight on her own. In her own way, Eve resembles Achilles storming out of the Achaean camp. She is well aware that if she lives a passive and comfortable life, her virtue is meaningless and she will go on forever unnoticed. She asks herself how virtue can be good if it is never tested. Like Achilles, Eve needs a challenge and an enemy. But Eve finds that the enemy and the battle she must fight are more complex than anything Achilles faces. The Trojan army attacks Achilles with swords and spears—weapons against which Achilles can defend himself. By contrast, Satan launches his attack against Eve with praise and flattery. Satan attacks Eve with exactly what she wants to hear. He recognizes her as an individual who is worthy of praise. Satan's barrage of acclaim and appreciation of Eve is so flawlessly in line with what she desires to hear that it has been suggested that it is Eve as much as Satan, who actually ventriloquizes the serpent:[14]

> Wonder not, sovereign mistress, if perhaps
> Thou canst, who art sole wonder, much less arm
> Thy looks, the heaven of mildness, with disdain,
> ...
> Fairest resemblance of thy maker fair,
> Thee all things living gaze on, all things thine
> By gift, and thy celestial beauty adore
> With ravishment beheld, there best beheld
> Where universally admired; but here
> In this enclosure wild, these beasts among,
> Beholders rude, and shallow to discern
> Half what in thee is fair, one man except,
> Who sees thee? (and what is one?) who shouldst be seen
> A goddess among gods, adored and served
> By angels numberless, thy daily train. (IX. 532 – 534, 538 – 548)

Satan delivers to Eve exactly what she has set out to find—individual recognition. He

addresses her as the "sovereign" mistress and goes on to praise her beauty, saying that she deserves to be "universally admired." The serpent makes Eve feel like a "goddess," an "Empress," "Queen of this universe" (IX. 568, 684). Satan's repeated use of the language of sovereignty reveals what is really on Eve's mind. She would like to switch positions with Adam and rule over him for a change. When she hears Satan call her "Fairest resemblance of thy maker fair," she must be smiling to herself. For once someone thinks her superior to Adam. Once the serpent has successfully won Eve over by recognizing her virtues, she is putty in his hands. To her he seems to be the most brilliant and charming being on earth. Whatever he suggests, Eve will be eager to try in order to maintain this newfound appreciation with which the serpent has provided her. Eve's choice is clear: she can either refuse the forbidden fruit and return to her cloistered and unappreciated existence in Eden, or risk her life and quench her appetite for recognition. Naturally, "she plucked, she ate" (IX. 781).

Unlike Eve, Adam is content in Eden. He has no desire to step out of the comforts of the garden and risk losing his protected existence. Why should he want to? Since Adam is already seen as the superior being in Eden, there is not much reason for him to desire recognition. But Adam is forced to step out of his cloistered, animal-like existence when Eve eats from the tree. He is forced to become a man. Again, Hegel's theory of recognition is helpful in understanding how Adam asserts himself in Book IX as a man. Besides his desire for recognition, Hegel's "first man" differs from the animals in a second and much more fundamental way. This man wants not only to be recognized by other men, but also to be recognized as a man. And what constitutes man's identity as a man, the most fundamental and uniquely human characteristic, is his ability to risk his own life. For by risking his life, man proves that he can act contrary to his most powerful and basic instinct, the instinct for self-preservation. He is demonstrably capable of acting in ways that totally contravene his natural instincts and contravene them not for the sake of satisfying a higher or more powerful instinct, but in a way, purely for the sake of contravention. This is one reason why Achilles is willing to risk his life in battle and also why Adam sacrifices eternal life in paradise to be with Eve. For Homer and for Milton, the desire for recognition is a driving force in human history. The Fall is the first step pushing human history onward. Eve's desire for recognition and Adam's willingness to actively risk his life make them fully human for the first time—these impulses separate them, just as in Genesis, from the rest of the animal kingdom. But the question remains—what kind of human being does Milton want his heroes to be? And why should his answer necessarily be in defiance of God's command?

In a letter to Master Samuel Hartlib regarding the education system in England, Milton wrote that a good teacher should inspire his students with "the study of learning and the admiration of virtue, stirred up with high hopes of living to be brave men and worthy patriots, dear to God and famous to all ages." With this kind of teaching, the students "may despise and scorn their childish and ill-taught qualities, to delight in manly and liberal exercises," with the result that the teacher infuses "into their young breasts such an ingenuous and noble ardour as would not fail to make many of

them renowned and matchless men" (*Of Education*, 230–231). In choosing to be an epic poet, Milton is acting as this kind of educator for an entire civilization. The traditional epic set the standard for a society to live by—it is the epic poet's responsibility to educate his fellow citizens on how to be virtuous in their socio-political and religious world. The objective of Milton's epic is to engage Christian readers and help them to be better Christians. When Milton describes an educator as one who should inspire students to be "manly" and "renowned and matchless men," he is not suggesting that the teacher instruct students to "turn the other cheek," but rather is referring to the classical model of virtue and manliness. People should be willing to go to battle and risk their lives for what they believe in. It seems to be this kind of person whom Milton most admires and whom he attempts to make the model for his readers to emulate.

In the closing books of *Paradise Lost*, the angel Michael shows Adam a vision of the future. Michael relates to Adam the story of biblical heroes who remain true to their personal religious convictions even in the face of widespread condemnation. These heroes are willing to risk their lives to stand up for God and their belief in a truth that goes against social norms. Michael emphasizes the actions of Noah and Enoch, who both risk death in their obedience to God. When Milton wrote a tragic drama he chose the Biblical hero Samson, a man dedicated to God and willing to die in order to begin the delivery of Israel from the Philistines. There is no doubt that Milton was fully invested in characters who stand up for their convictions. In *Areopagitica*, Milton writes,

> I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat. Assuredly we bring not innocence into the world, we bring impurity much rather; that which purifies us is trial, and trial is by what is contrary. (*Areopagitica*, 247–248)

Milton clearly favors the person who is not afraid to take risks and enter unfamiliar territory. On the other hand, Milton seems to despise weak people who are so afraid of failure that they cloister themselves away so that they never have to face an adverse situation. In other words, Milton praises individuals who revolt against the community to promote their own personal convictions, and he looks down upon people who fear leaving the comfort of following prescribed laws and traditions.

We have been examining Adam's epic choice and questioning why he turns his back on God if Milton is trying to instruct readers on how to be better Christians. The answer to this question is that by rejecting the orthodox path—following God's commandment—and, instead, risking his life to be with the woman he loves, Adam does, in fact, become a better person in Christian terms as Milton understood them. Adam's decision to leave the cloistered and childlike world of Paradise in favor of a new existence full of strife can be seen as a step away from an older Catholic conception of virtue that Milton rejected and toward his Protestant ideal. Milton portrays Adam's choice to fall in the noblest possible terms by aligning his decision with the

classical epic tradition. He does this to show that Protestant virtue—striving for personal improvement—is more impressive than the cloistered virtue of Catholicism. In other words, a Protestant who is virtuous while living a full and complete life—including getting married and having sex—is more impressive than a Catholic monk who maintains his virtue by hiding from the world and sexual experience. This is a crucial point in understanding Milton's epic as well as seeing how Adam's choice, in fact, makes him better spiritually, a more complete human being. In Milton's scheme, Adam and Eve both reach a higher level of spirituality once they have fallen because it is only after the Fall that they realize their individual virtues and then use them to complement one another and strive for a higher synthesis.

The concept that the love and sex of a husband and wife result in spiritual and religious experience is a distinctly Protestant idea in Milton's view. It is only after the Fall that Adam and Eve's relationship is elevated to the level of a spiritual experience. It is true that before the Fall they say that they love one another and do have sex, but this prelapsarian love seems more like love out of necessity, rather than love because of a higher or more spiritual completion. The prelapsarian love is comparable to love in an arranged marriage—they must love and have sex with each other because they have been placed together by someone else. Indeed, in Eve's account of her first meeting with Adam, she emphasizes how God had to lead her to her mate, against her will:

> but follow me,
> And I will bring thee where no shadow stays
> Thy coming, and thy soft embraces, he
> Whose image thou art, him thou shall enjoy
> Inseparably thine, to him shalt bear
> Multitudes like thyself, and thence be called
> Mother of human race: what could I do,
> But follow straight, invisibly thus led? (IV. 469 – 476)

By contrast, the fallen love Adam and Eve share is more like the love between a couple who are brought together in completion through marriage. In particular, Adam's decision to join Eve in the Fall means that he consciously chooses her as his mate, rather than having her just handed to him by God as a companion.

After all the quarrels Adam and Eve undergo subsequent to their fall, and all the mutual recriminations, one might think that their love had been weakened, but Milton shows them having found a new bond and a new sense of purpose. Eve claims that what they have gone through, and their common enemy, should bring them closer together:

> While yet we live, scarce one short hour perhaps,
> Between us two let there be peace, both joining,
> As joined in injuries, one enmity
> Against a Foe by doom express assigned us. (X. 923 – 926)

Adam eloquently accepts Eve's plea for reconciliation, and thinks ahead to their future together as allies:

> But rise, let us no more contend, nor blame
> Each other, blamed enough elsewhere, but strive
> In offices of Love, how we may lighten
> Each other's burden in our share of woe. (X. 958 –961)

Milton's portrayal of Adam and Eve after the Fall is a vivid example of his belief that a man and a woman can complement each other, smoothing out one another's faults and enhancing each other's strengths. The Adam and Eve who emerge out of the Fall are the ideal couple that Milton advocates in his *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. They share a new love that is more true and spiritual—a love that is like that of Spenser's couple in his *Amoretti*—the meshing and unification of the erotic and the spiritual.

Before the Fall, Adam turned to the angel Raphael for advice about his sexual appetite and his immense attraction to Eve, thus relying on an authority figure to guide his personal, religious, and erotic life. In Book VIII when Adam asks the angel about his desires, Raphael recommends that he refrain from carnal passions and search for a pure love that rejuvenates and expands his mind as much as his body. He goes on to say that, while Eve is very beautiful on the outside, she is less worthy than Adam on the inside. He continues to suggest that Adam rise above his carnal passions. Just as Raphael links Adam's powerful physical attraction to Eve with the need to avoid Satan's temptation, the Catholic Church links sexual appetite with temptation and sin. Milton rejects this religious doctrine in *Paradise Lost* by having Adam reject the advice of Raphael and God in order to be with Eve. The result is that Adam and Eve attain a higher level of spirituality together. This is the spiritualized paradise that Michael ultimately promises them:

> then wilt thou not be loath
> To leave this Paradise, but shalt possess
> A paradise within thee, happier far. (XII. 585 –587)

Here paradise ceases to be a literal place on a map, and becomes very much in Protestant terms a mental state, something spiritual rather than material.[15] Adam and Eve's love for one another increases just as their desire to become more truly religious in Protestant terms increases. Adam and Eve find a new paradise in their love and devotion to one another, turning away from Eden's cloistered walls hand in hand to set out on a new Protestant adventure—seeking spiritual fulfillment together as a human couple. In Milton's Christian poem, the epic decision humanizes the protagonists, in sharp contrast to what happens in Homer's *Iliad*, where in pagan terms Achilles' choice takes him to the level of the gods. Milton reshapes the classical epic, which had celebrated demigods raised above the ordinary level of human beings, so that his poem now offers an Everyman and an Everywoman in the most basic activity of mar-

riage as the pinnacle of virtue.

Milton intended *Paradise Lost* to be an epic that sets the standard for Christians to live by. Like Homer's *Iliad* and Virgil's *Aeneid*, Milton's epic is meant to be a "cultural producer"—a beacon for Christians to follow in their own lives. As we have seen, Milton carefully planned the central epic decision of his poem to be one in which the hero must choose between God and Eve. At first it seems that Adam has chosen the path that leads him away from spiritual fulfillment and away from the divine, but this turns out not to be the case. Kant offers a similar interpretation of the story in Genesis:

> Morally, the first step from this latter state [of ignorance and innocence] was therefore a fall; physically, it was a punishment, for a whole host of formerly unknown ills were a consequence of this fall. The history of nature therefore begins with good, for it is the work of God, while the history of freedom begins with wickedness, for it is the work of man. Hence the individual must consider as his own fault, not only every act of wickedness which he commits, but also all the evils which he suffers; and yet at the same time, insofar as he is a member of a whole (a species), he must admire and praise the wisdom and purposiveness of the whole arrangement.[16]

Like Milton seeking to "justify the ways of God to men" (I. 26), Kant interprets the Fall as a story of the growth of human freedom. In Kant as well as in Milton, while Adam's choice is not the orthodox one, it is ultimately revealed to be the best path to a higher level of spirituality. The epic decision turns out to be not one that rejects God, but one that shows a new, Protestant way of becoming closer to God.

【Notes】

1. Lewis White Beck, ed., *Immanuel Kant: On History*, trans. Emil L. Fackenheim (Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963)59.

2. Hegel's theory of tragedy is that the hero is forced to make a decision between two goods—either decision will result in negative consequences. For Hegel's theory of tragedy, see Anne and Henry Paolucci, eds., *Hegel: On Tragedy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962). This volume includes A. C. Bradley's helpful essay "Hegel's Theory of Tragedy" (367 – 388).

3. I quote the *Iliad* from *Homer: The Iliad*, trans. Robert Fagles (New York: Penguin, 1990), with book and line numbers cited in the body of the essay.

4. James Nohrnberg, "The *Iliad*," in *Homer to Brecht: The European Epic and Dramatic Traditions*, eds. Michael Seidel and Edward Mendelson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977)4.

4. The ideas of this paper grow out of a course I took with Professor Nohrnberg in 2005; I also wish to acknowledge his helpful comments on an earlier version of this essay.

5. *The Aeneid of Virgil*, trans. Allen Mandelbaum (New York: Bantam, 1961), Book 4, ll. 540 – 545.

6. I quote *Paradise Lost* from *John Milton: The Major Works*, eds. Stephen Orgel and Jonathan Goldberg (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1991), with book and line numbers cited in the body of the essay. All quotations from Milton are taken from this edition, with work and page numbers cited in the body of the essay.

7. For Milton's relation to the Biblical story, see J. M. Evans, *Paradise Lost and the Genesis Tradition* (*Oxford*, *UK*: *Clarendon Press*, 1968).
8. For a thoughtful discussion of Book IX of *Paradise Lost* in relation to the classical epic tradition, see C. M. Bowra, *From Virgil to Milton* (London: Macmillan, 1963)199 – 210.
9. Nohrnberg, The *Iliad*,9.
10. I quote the Bible from *Genesis*, trans. Robert Alter (New York: W. W. Norton, 1996), with chapter and verse numbers cited in the body of the essay.
11. Alter, Genesis, 13 (Alter's note to this passage).
12. My understanding of Hegel is largely based on the account of his philosophy given in Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Free Press, 1992) 143 – 61. Fukuyama's account is in turn largely based on Alexandre Kojève, *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel*, trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. (New York: Basic Books, 1969). The account of the "genesis of man" in Hegel's *Phenomenology* actually grows out of a tradition in German idealism of developing its view of human origins in terms of commentary on Genesis. As my epigraph indicates, this tradition begins with Kant's essay "Conjectural Beginning of Human History." For an account of the role of Genesis in German idealism, see M. H. Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism*: *Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1971)204 – 206 for Kant, 225 – 237 for Hegel; the fact that Abrams refers to Kant's work as "secular theodicy" (206) suggests the connection of German idealism to Milton's project in *Paradise Lost*.
13. This point was made by James Nohrnberg in a course lecture, April, 19, 2005.
14. James Nohrnberg, course lecture notes, April 19, 2005.
15. On this point, see Northrop Frye, *The Return from Eden*: *Five Essays on Milton's Epic* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), 54, 110.
16. Kant, "Conjectural Beginning" 60.

【Works Cited】

——*Genesis*. trans. Robert Alter. New York: W. W. Norton, 1996.

Abrams, M. H. *Natural Supernaturalism*: *Tradition and Revolution in Romantic Literature*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1971.

Bowra, C. M. *From Virgil to Milton*. London: Macmillan, 1963.

Evans, J. M. *Paradise Lost and the Genesis Tradition*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Frye, Northrop. *The Return of Eden*: *Five Essays on Milton's Epics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press, 1992.

Homer. *The Iliad*. trans. Robert Fagles. New York: Penguin, 1990.

Kant, Immanuel. Conjectural Beginning of Human History. trans. Emil L. Fackenheim. *Immanuel Kant*: *On History*. ed. Lewis White Beck. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1963.

Kojève, Alexandre. *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel*. trans. James H. Nichols, Jr. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Milton, John. *The Major Works*. eds. Stephen Orgel and Jonathan Goldberg. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Nohrnberg, James. *Class lecture*. April 19, 2005.

Nohrnberg, James. "The *Iliad*" in *Homer to Brecht*: *The European Epic and Dramatic Traditions*, eds. Michael Seidel and Edward Mendelson. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

Paolucci, Anne and Henry, eds. *Hegel*: *On Tragedy*. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Virgil. *The Aeneid of Virgil*. trans. Allen Mandelbaum. New York: Bantam, 1961.

The Fight Over the Body in *Paradise Lost* Book IV

Ty Buckman

Abstract This essay identifies and explores the significance of a common configuration of characters in three intertextually-linked works, beginning with the apprehension of Satan by the good angels over the sleeping Adam and Eve in Book IV of *Paradise Lost*, proceeding to a reference to a confrontation between the Archangel Michael and Satan in a single verse in the New Testament *Epistle of Jude*, and concluding with a related scene from Book XVI of Homer's *Iliad* in which Zeus oversees a fight over the body of his son Sarpedon.
Key words John Milton; *Epistle of Jude*; Homer's *Iliad*; pseudepigrapha; the body in literature
Author Ty Buckman is Professor of English Literature at Wittenberg University in Springfield, Ohio, USA. His scholarship generally focuses on Spenser and the English epic tradition and he is currently at work on a study of syncretism in Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. Email: tbuckman@wittenberg.edu

I.

In Book IV of *Paradise Lost*, after much deliberation and connivance, Satan manages to steal into Adam and Eve's bower after they have said their evening prayers and fallen asleep. The angel guard sent to protect the pair discovers Satan, "Squat like a toad, close at the ear of Eve" (4.800), dictating to her a dream that she will recount in the next book. One of the angels then demands of Satan:

> Which of those rebel spirits adjudged to hell
> Comest thou, escaped thy prison, and transformed,
> Why sat'st thou like an enemy in wait
> Here watching at the head of these that sleep? (823–6)

After arguing for awhile with the angel patrol—and only answering the first of their questions—Satan makes an appeal of sorts:

> If I must contend, said he,

Best with the best, the sender not the sent,
Or all at once; more glory will be won,
Or less be lost (851 –4).

Thus he is brought before Gabriel, who questions and provokes him until Satan, enraged, prepares to do battle with the entire squadron of angels. The narrator tells us that "dreadful deeds might have ensued" (990 –1), but instead,

The eternal to prevent such horrid fray
Hung forth in heaven his golden scales (995 –7).

Gabriel notices the scales and invites Satan to "read thy lot in yon celestial sign" (1011). When he does, and notes "His mounted scale aloft" (1014), Satan leaves off the dispute with the angels and flees. Thus ends both Book IV and the sequence of events that began with him whispering in Eve's ear.

Satan's first encounter on earth foreshadows the major action of the poem. Satan has successfully begun the corruption of Eve which he will complete in Book IX, and he has contended with his rival angels to no result, as he will again in Book VI. Finally, divine intervention puts an end to his threat, as it will later in the War in Heaven. But more important for the purposes of this essay is what we might term the configuration of the concluding scene in Book IV: the angels arguing with Satan over the helpless Adam and Eve, while Milton's God determines the outcome.

II.

One of the shortest books in the Christian New Testament is *The Epistle of Jude*, whose 25 verses were designated a "disputed" book by Eusebius in his early 4th century *Historia Ecclesiastica*[1]. *Jude's* tenuous canonicity in the eyes of some early bishops and later reformers was in part a function of its author's uninspired choice of sources; *Jude* has the distinction, for example, of being the only book in the New Testament to quote directly from the *Book of Enoch*, a text held in high regard in the first and second centuries but eventually classed among the pseudepigrapha[2]. The theme of the epistle concerns the dangers of false teaching and the judgment that awaits those who are led astray; its style is marked by frequent allusion, inelegant and occasionally incoherent metaphors, and a scolding tone.

In the epistle itself, Jude warns his readers to beware of certain "ungodly men" (4) who have denied the true teaching of the apostles and won over many to their error.[3] To lend force to his caution, he offers several illustrations of the fate of the un-

believing, recalling the generation that perished in the wilderness after having been delivered from Egypt and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. In a remarkable passage, he then writes:

> Likewise also these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee (9).

The scene described here in this single verse has as its source a first-century C. E. apocryphal text known as the *Assumption of Moses*, or sometimes rendered as a two-part text, *the Testament of Moses* and the *Assumption of Moses*. These examples of Old Testament pseudepigrapha were lost in the eleventh or twelfth century and partly rediscovered in the latter part of the nineteenth century, but Milton could have encountered a description of the battle over Moses' body from summaries and allusions in Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and other early church authorities.[4] A. R. C. Leaney, in his commentary on *Jude*, offers the following account of the relevant part of the *Assumption of Moses* as it is described by these later writers:

> Moses has died and Michael is sent to take his body. The devil tries to refuse to allow this on the ground that he rules over the material world (of which the body of Moses would be a part), or on the ground that he could accuse Moses (the great function of the devil being to accuse men before God) of having struck the Egyptian (Exod. 2: 11 f.) and so being a murderer. (90)[5]

Before looking at Jude more closely for what it may tell us about *Paradise Lost*, it is worth pausing to consider what might have drawn Milton to this obscure corner of the New Testament. Three verses prior to Michael's battle with Satan, Jude describes the punishment of the fallen angels thus: "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chaines under darknesse, unto the judgment of the great day (6)[6]. At least one critic has noted the apparent echo of Jude 6 in Book IV just prior to the appearance of the golden scales, as Gabriel threatens:

> . . . if from this hour
> Within these hallowed limits thou appear,
> Back to the infernal pit I drag thee chained,

And seal thee so, as henceforth not to scorn
The facile gates of hell too slightly barred (963 –67)[7].

Jude 9 also provides one of only two occurrences in the Bible of the word "archangel."[8] Of particular interest in light of the action of Book IV of *Paradise Lost*, *Jude* 4 warns against deceivers and false teachers: "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of olde ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the onely Lord God, & our Lord Jesus Christ." The headnote to *Jude* in the Authorized Version summarizes this threat in terms that also recall Satan's first visit to Eden: "Hee exhorteth them to bee constant in the profession of the faith. [...] *False teachers are crept in to seduce them*: for whose damnable doctrine and manners horrible punishment is prepared" (emphasis added). Finally, and more generally, *Jude* 9 pictures Michael and Satan standing over the body of Moses, with Michael looking to God to rebuke his arch-rival. This clash of angelic authorities with its rich dramatic potential and almost iconographic representation of the supernatural is, with the exception of the *Revelation to St. John*, rare in the New Testament.

We should begin our analysis of *Jude* 9 by noting that the dispute between Michael and Satan is essentially verbal. This fits nicely into the logic of *Paradise Lost*, in which, as Abdiel describes it,

he who in debate of truth hath won,
Should win in arms, in both disputes alike
Victor (VI: 122 –4).

Debate precedes and, indeed, predicts the outcome of physical combat in Milton's reformulation of the rules of epic battles. Similarly, in *Jude*, "contending with the devil" means deciding between making "a railing accusation," or deferring to the divine prerogative. The author of *Jude* lauds Michael for choosing the latter, and the construction of the passage emphasizes as decisive his answer to Satan, "The Lord rebuke thee."

'Rebuke' has a narrow range of meaning but a deep resonance for the angels in *Paradise Lost*. To the angels, a rebuke is a species of correction that assumes and demonstrates the inferiority of the one being rebuked. The word 'rebuke' itself occurs only three times in the whole of the poem, and two of these are in reference to arguments between Satan and a good angel. In the first example, Uriel harangues Satan for molesting the Happy Pair, but Satan chafes against the "grave rebuke" (IV:

844) of his former subordinate. In another scene, this time in Book VI, the battle has paused in good epic fashion for the champions of each side to fight and possibly decide the outcome of the whole battle through single combat. When Michael ends a long, stern, Homeric lecture by smashing Satan's crown, the fallen rebel is carried on shields to his chariot,

> Gnashing for anguish and despite and shame
> To find himself not matchless, and his pride
> Humbled by such rebuke, so far beneath
> His confidence to equal God in power (VI: 340 –3).

Rebuke is unbearable to Milton's Satan because it denies him the very status and dignity that he claimed as the reasons for his rebellion in the first place. In a sense, his view is consonant with the spirit of *Jude*, where Michael is praised for leaving the rebuking of Satan to God. But Milton chooses not to follow Jude's warnings about reviling angelic authorities, and as a result his good angels do not show deference to Satan. Ithuriel, Zephon, Gabriel, Abdiel, and Michael all do not hesitate to berate the infidel for his betrayal of their "grand Sire." But even in the midst of arguing with them, Satan always maintains that he should not have to, that he should, by right of his prelapsarian place, be above their rebuke.

But Satan soon learns that he is not. The pretender to the heavenly throne is repeatedly stung by the realization that those who were his subordinates are now able to stand before him and accuse him. We see this in his argument with Ithuriel and Zephon in Book IV, where Satan refuses to accept the idea that his "lustre" could be "visibly impaired" (IV: 850). Satan seems to believe, with *Jude*, that it is the Lord who is supposed to be rebuking him, not his angelic peers. However, though Satan aspires to be the rival of God, he can hardly manage to be the rival of his fellow angels, as even lowly Abdiel can stun him, or Ithuriel send him yelping with the touch of a spear.

During his encounters with the good angels Satan learns that he will probably never have the power to confront the Father directly. Indeed, by Book IX, he has become afraid even of human Adam:

> of courage haughty, and of limb
> Heroic built, though of terrestrial mould,
> Foe not informidable, exempt from wound,
> I not; so much hath hell debased, and pain

> Enfeebled me, to what I was in heaven (IX: 484 –8).

But when he is arguing with the angels in Book IV, he still is flushed with pride and unwilling to let a rebuke stand uncontested.

If this is Milton's relation to Scripture, what, then, does *Jude* 9 have to offer him? First, as I mentioned above and will discuss in detail below, it provides a glimpse at supernatural conflict, a narrative version of a biblical principle never far from Milton's poetics:

> For wee wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darknes of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places (Ephesians 6:12).

Furthermore, it presents the possibility of play in the affairs of the absolute and suggests, in however brief a form, a partial solution to the narratological problems posed by the doctrine of predestination. *Jude* 9 demonstrates with canon authority that there is room for contention, for appeals to heaven, for a fight over a body. In fact, to later readers who lacked access to the *Assumption of Moses*, the verse is radically open. It does not explain how or if the angelic dispute was resolved, whether Michael's prayer/invocation was effectual, or the fate of Moses' body. Unless God is to be the only responsible agent in the epic, Milton must place him above and outside of the action of the poem. *Jude* 9 shows a dispute that God is presumed to have an important stake in, yet he remains absent until Michael calls upon him, and even then he seems to be located somewhere above the action of the scene. Jude's Michael asks God to rebuke Satan because God has given him agency in the conflict, an agency which he in turn resubmits to God.

III.

In the sixteenth book of the *Iliad*, Patroclus convinces Achilles to allow him to wear his divinely-crafted armor into battle to drive the advancing Trojans back from the Myrmidon ships. Clad in Achilles' armor, he leads a slaughter of the Trojans that culminates in the death of Sarpedon, the leader of the Lycians and a son of Zeus. After Sarpedon's death, his companion Glaucus prays to Apollo over the body of his fallen leader:

> And the best of men has perished, Sarpedon, the son of Zeus; and he does not protect even his own son. But you, lord, at least heal me of this terrible wound,

> and lull my pains, and give me might so that I may call to my comrades, the Lycians, and urge them to fight, and myself do battle about the body of him who has fallen in death (521 –6).[9]

His prayer is briefly answered, and a bloody fight ensues over Sarpedon's body, until Zeus finally intervenes on behalf of Sarpedon's enemies:

> In Hector first of all he roused cowardly rout, and leapt on his chariot and turned to flight, and called on the rest of the Trojans to flee; for he recognized the holy scales of Zeus. (655 –58)[10]

The convention of Zeus weighing human fates in his balance or golden scales has several other instances in the Iliad, but none fits the context of our passage in *Paradise Lost* so well as this. In Milton's scene, when the eternal "hung forth his golden scales " (IV: 997), Gabriel points out the sign to Satan who "knew his mounted scales aloft" (IV: 1013 –4) and so flees. Alastair Fowler notes that the use of the balance in *Paradise Lost* "shows God has decided against there being any fight at all" (253 note l. 996). He then proceeds to gloss the passage with two references to the *Iliad* in which Zeus sets out his scales to decide the fate of a battle. Although elements of these other scenes appear in Milton's presentation of the scales, the context of Book IV more clearly evokes *Iliad* XVI. Only here is the balance perceptible to the warrior (as it is to Satan), and only here does the balance prevent a conflict instead of deciding its outcome, by prompting the ill-fated one to flee.

The first implication of a connection between *Iliad* XVI and *Paradise Lost* IV involves the role of traditional epic conventions and motifs in Milton's poem. The scene in question demarcates the dramatic space of the poem—the realm in which the conflict will be decided—as epic space. The first direct confrontation between good and evil in the poem occurs when Ithuriel and Zephon apprehend Satan in Adam and Eve's bower. In the scheme that I have proposed, this scene and the later hearing before Gabriel make up a dramatic configuration with Satan on one side and the good angels on the other, contending over the sleeping Adam and Eve while God looks down from heaven. This is analogous both to *Jude* 9, as I argue above, and to *Iliad* XVI, where Patroclus and Hector fight over the body of the fallen Sarpedon, and

> Nor did Zeus ever turn his gleaming eyes from the mighty combat, but ever looked down on them, and considered in his heart, debating much about the slaying of Patroclus... (644 –6)

In all three versions of this scene, the opposing forces meet in the middle of the configuration. In *Paradise Lost*, this middle field is somewhere above the earth and beneath the throne of heaven—that is, in the realm of angels. It is here that Milton creates the poem's epic space. At each of the poles there is concord, between Father and Son or Adam and Eve, but in between the angels—unlikely inheritors of various heroic epic conventions—send out armed patrols, engage in games, and fight with each other. The creation of this space begins with the fight over Adam and Eve and its echoes of the battle over Sarpedon's body in Milton's archetypal epic model.

By making the angels the bearers of epic convention in his poem, Milton is reassessing traditional epic values, as he states in a familiar passage:

> Wars, hitherto the only argument
> Heroic deemed, chief mastery to dissect
> With long and tedious havoc fabled knights
> In battles feigned...
> Not that which justly gives heroic name
> To person or to poem (IX: 28 –31, 40 –1).

One of the implicit premises of *Paradise Lost* is the importance of humankind to God. In the first step toward the temptation and fall of man, Beelzebub brings this to Satan's attention in Book II, when he speaks to the infernal council,

> Of some new race called Man, about this time
> To be created like to us, though less
> In power and excellence, but favoured more
> Of him who rules above (348 –51).

Beelzebub's rumor is confirmed both in the poem and the experience of Milton's reader: humans are the future. And so, as the angels are obsolesced by the creation of humankind, so the elements of heroic epic that they personify are also relegated to the past. Furthermore, even though the epic space seems to be where decisive action occurs, Milton makes this claim hollow by showing heaven's complete control of the outcome of the angelic conflicts.

To return to the fight over the body in *Iliad* XVI and *Paradise Lost* IV, we must consider the epic convention of the fight over the body of a slain warrior. In fact, the battle over Sarpedon's body begins a series of three such encounters that extends into

Book XVII of the *Iliad*. After Sarpedon's body has been stripped of its armor by the Achaeans and carried off by Apollo for burial, Hector's charioteer Cebriones falls to Patroclus. Hector and Patroclus then fight over his body, and the Greeks are able to strip the armor from his corpse. But the Trojans do not have to wait long for revenge. A few lines later Zeus decides that Patroclus' time has come and so sends Apollo to knock the borrowed armor from his back. As a result, Patroclos falls in battle. But no sooner does he finish his death speech than a battle for his own body begins.

In these scenes in the *Iliad*, the body functions as a locus for combat. Both the length of the poem and the length of the war necessitate the introduction of localized, personal conflicts with smaller stakes than the fate of Troy. To this end, the fallen body of a comrade or foe (and often his armor) becomes something, literally, to fight over. Homer, however, notes with some irony that once the conflict begins, the reason for fighting becomes somewhat obscured:

> No longer could a man, even a knowing one, have made out the godlike Sarpedon, since he was piled from head to ends of feet under a mass of weapons, the blood and the dust, while others about him kept forever swarming over his dead body (XVI: 637 –41).

In *Paradise Lost*, the place of the body is occupied by the sleeping Adam and Eve. Ithuriel and Zephon are sent to the bower to protect them, and when they find Satan already there, they prevent him from further molesting Eve. The scene emphasizes human helplessness and vulnerability, especially when we consider that this is when Eve's temptation begins—while she is sleeping. Soon after the good angels begin questioning Satan, however, their focus shifts from Satan's designs on Adam and Eve to the possibility of an impending brawl. Thus the original concern—whether it is Moses' body, Sarpedon's body, or Adam and Eve—is forgotten when the dispute begins.

This lack of concern for Adam and Eve as such is in keeping with Satan's larger purposes in venturing to earth. For a few weak moments he lustfully considers human Eve "divinely fair, fit love for gods" (IX: 489), but then steels himself to his task of leading her to ruin. For him, the human couple offers a means of obstructing the divine will, of attacking the honor of his foe. In the fight over a body, those being fought over become mere symbols, place markers, questions of honor to spur on the conflict. Thus, in the same way that the body of Sarpedon provides the Trojans and Achaians with something to fight over, Adam and Eve are the grounds for the dispute between Satan and Gabriel and the others; they are, at once, objects for the good an-

gels to protect and Satan to corrupt, the locus of verbal combat, and the stakes in Milton's reluctantly heroic epic.

IV.

In a famous autobiographical digression that prefaces Book II of "The Reason of Church Government," the thirty-two year old John Milton reflects on his gifts as a writer and his industry as a reader, and determines to "leave something so written to aftertimes, as they should not willingly let it die" (108). Interestingly, Milton's ambition marries his sense of a religious vocation with a nationalistic desire to give his "mother dialect" (108) a work worthy of its people:

> That what the greatest and choycest wits of Athens, Rome, or modern Italy, and those Hebrews of old did for their country, I in my proportion with this over and above of being a Christian, might doe for mine (108).

Even in the midst of his self-appointed literary apprenticeship, more than seventeen years before he composed the lines that declared his intention of soaring "above the Aonian mount" and thereby transcending the achievement of the Greeks and Romans, Milton's canon makes no distinction between secular and sacred. Like Spenser before him, Milton's mythopoesis is characterized by an insatiable and indiscriminate appetite for literary raw material and new combinations of ideas. And also like Spenser, Milton remains untroubled by the need to reconcile fundamental differences in the philosophical and religious underpinnings of the works of the epic poets he draws upon.

In *The Return of Eden*, Northrop Frye observes that Milton's "ambition as a poet is to join the tradition of inspired prophetic speech that began with the great commission to Isaiah" (8) – a claim in keeping with Milton's own description of his project. But Frye goes on to argue that Milton eventually decided that his prophetic contribution should take the form of "the encyclopedic poem [...] a shape derived ultimately from the shape of the Bible" (9). Frye's ingenious generic argument is that the epic poem as Milton saw it spanned from the beginning to the end of time, with the Bible's journey from the creation in *Genesis* to the Last Judgment in *Revelation* as the great model. If we modulate from Frye's universal argument to the particular instance of intertextuality in the fight over the body examined above, we may observe the precise way in which the scope of Milton's project encompasses not only the 'length' of time involved between the imagined dawn and sunset of human culture, but its 'breadth' across cultures as well. That is, Milton's weaving of New Testament

teaching and Homeric plot and imagery in a work marked by seriousness of religious purpose—his making seamless what later writers could only render as pastiche -- is itself among the boldest of all of his apologetic claims.

【Notes】

1. On the canonical and textual history of *Jude*, see the summaries provided in Leaney 81 – 82 and Cranfield 145 – 48.
2. On the early authority of the *Book of Enoch*, see Charles 163 – 64.
3. Biblical passages are quoted from a facsimile edition of the Authorized Version of 1611, *The Holy Bible, King James Version: A Reprint of the Edition of 1611*. On the evidence that the Authorized Version was the Bible Milton "most frequently used and had most indelibly in his mind" (5), see Sims 4 – 6.
4. For an introduction to the *Assumption of Moses* and a translation of the surviving fragment (that unfortunately does not include the scene cited in *Jude*), see Charles 407 – 24. For a discussion of the relation of the fragment to the *Epistle of Jude*, see Charles 412 – 13, and Kelly 264 – 6.
5. My mentor James Nohrnberg might observe here that Milton's rewriting of *Genesis* and his claim to prophetic preeminence might constitute the poet's own fight over the body of Moses—in the sense of superseding the body of his work in the Pentateuch and usurping his place as the interlocutor between humankind and Yahweh.
6. The similarity between this verse and 2 Peter 2:4 —"For if God spared not the Angels that sinned, but cast them downe to hell, and delivered them into chains of darknesse, to be reserved unto judgement..." — has led many New Testament scholars to conclude that one book was the source for the other. See Leaney 77 – 88.
7. See Sims 263, citing Merritt Hughes.
8. The other is 1 *Thessalonians* 4:16. See Leaney 91.
9. Unless otherwise indicated, the *Iliad* is quoted from the Loeb Classical Library edition, translated by A. T. Murray.
10. Compare Richmond Lattimore's translation and its amplification of the message that the scale sends: "In Hektor first of all he put a temper that was without strength. He climbed to his chariot and turned to flight, and called to the other Trojans to run, *for he saw the way of Zeus' sacred balance* (655 – 8, emphasis added).
11. Even the War in Heaven belongs to the past and must be narrated to Adam by Raphael because it took place before he was created.
12. Insightful commentary on this passage from *The Reason of Church Government* can be found in Fisch 179 – 82.

【Works Cited】

Charles, R. H., ed. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English.* Vol 2. Ox-

ford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Charlesworth, James. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Cranfield, C. E. B. *I & II Peter and Jude: Introduction and Commentary*. London: SCM Press, 1960.

Fisch, Harold. *The Biblical Presence in Shakespeare, Milton, and Blake: A Comparative Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.

Fletcher, Harris. *Milton's Rabbinical Readings*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1930.

Frye, Northrop. *The Return of Eden: Five Essays on Milton's Epics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

The Holy Bible, King James Version: A Reprint of the Edition of 1611. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005.

The Iliad of Homer. Trans. A. T. Murray. Rev. William F. Wyatt. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1924; rept. 1999.

___. Trans. Richmond Lattimore. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Kelly, J. N. D. *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude*. London: Adams & Charles Black, 1969.

Leaney, A. R. C. *The Letters of Peter and Jude: A Commentary on the First Letter of Peter, a Letter of Jude and the Second Letter of Peter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost.* Ed. Alastair Fowler. London: Longman, 1971.

Milton, John. "The Reason of Church-Governement." *The Prose of John Milton*. Ed. J. Max Patrick. New York: New York University Press, 1968. 103 – 14.

Ryken, Leland. "Paradise Lost and Its Biblical Epic Models." *Milton and Scriptural Tradition*. Eds. James Sims and Leland Ryken. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984. 43 – 81.

Sims, James H. *The Bible in Milton's Epics*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1962.

Devotional Method and Efficacious Reading in John Donne's *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*

Mardy Philippian, Jr.

Abstract John Donne's *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions* is an odd devotional text, and it seems especially so when attempts are made to speak of its spiritual efficacy for early modern readers. Donne's text does not conform to the standard devotional conventions of the period, whether employed by Catholic or Protestant devotional writers, and its peculiar emphasis upon recording a prolonged experience of suffering marks it as distinct from similar early modern works of "daily devotion," works that instead focus upon detailing protocols for devotion and not the emotional and psychological effects that result from enacting those protocols. This essay looks at the conventions that were typical of early modern devotional writing, using St. Ignatius of Loyola's Spiritual Exercises and Bishop Joseph Hall's The Art of Divine Meditation as representative examples of devotional writing in the period.
Key words John Donne; devotion; *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*; method; meditation
Author Mardy Philippian, Jr. teaches at Simpson University, where he is Assistant Professor of English and Director of the Writing Center. His current research is on the efficacy of early modern devotional reading. Email:

John Donne's *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions* (1624) is unique as a devotional work because it is not a devotional method in itself for readers to use in the hopes of achieving their own spiritual recovery, but is rather an application of a method that its author never articulates. The convention of early modern devotional texts was to offer readers a detailed set of meditative protocols, or steps, as exemplified by such representative texts as *The Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius of Loyola and Bishop Joseph Hall's *The Art of Divine Meditation*. In contrast to the conventional approach to constructing a devotional that Loyola and Hall employ, Donne in his Devotions only offers readers the effects of a method applied, a narration of sequential events in the recovery of a patient, but not the methodological program that would detail the means by which recovery might also be achieved by its reader. While the *Devotions* records a trajectory from physical and spiritual illness to wellness, the absence of any obvious method limits its potential efficacy as a devotional text. The *Devotions* is profoundly logocentric, idiosyncratic, and particular in a manner that contemporary, popularly used Jesuit and Protestant devotional exercises were not. Yet in his neglecting to provide his readers with just such a method, Donne may be resisting not merely a convention of early modern devotional writing but a theology of language that would locate

spiritual recovery in words—the supposed physical embodiment of prayerful petition and meditative focus—and not in prayer itself.

The most influential Catholic devotional text of the early modern period was St. Ignatius of Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises* (1545, 1st Spanish edition; 1548, 1st Latin edition). In this work Loyola lays out the basic protocols of a devotional method that would be adopted and adapted by generations of later devotional writers, including John Donne. As the opening of St. Ignatius states (*Spiritual Exercises* 5):

By the term "Spiritual Exercises" is meant every method of examination of conscience, of meditation, of contemplation, of vocal and mental prayer, and of other spiritual activities... For just as taking a walk, journeying on foot, and running are bodily exercises, so we call Spiritual Exercises every way of preparing and disposing the soul to rid itself of all inordinate attachments, and, after their removal, of seeking and finding the will of God in the disposition of our life for the salvation of our soul.

Ignatius would make clear that in using the term "spiritual exercises" he is referring to a variety of methods ("every method of examination") and not to any single one. And while he describes in the subsequent sections of the treatise what the devotee is to do at any particular juncture in the full course of the exercise, he does not provide readers with a description of his own personal responses to the exercise as a "method of examination," he does not offer readers a picture of a personal, idiosyncratic, and particular application of the method he describes and recommends for use. This is an important point to make here, since Protestant devotional texts in contrast both describe a method and model its use for readers. Following his opening discussion and definition of the term "spiritual exercises," Ignatius uses the imperative form and not the first person perfect tense. He does not narrate his specific experiences as a practitioner of this or any other method but instead describes in language intended to direct practitioners in how to apply the method. In the opening instructions for the first week of the program Ignatius carefully details the beginning protocols of the method in the imperative voice:

> First, in the morning, immediately on rising, one should resolve to guard carefully against the particular sin or defect with regard to which he seeks to correct or improve himself... Secondly, after dinner, he should ask God our Lord for the grace he desires, that is, to recall how often he has fallen into the particular sin or defect, and to avoid it for the future. (p. 15)

As this excerpt shows, Ignatius does not provide his readers with the results from following the protocols. He does not, in other words, construct for readers a narrative of his personal, idiosyncratic, and particular spiritual experiences during his use of the text and the devotional method it proscribes. Loyola offers instead a broadly accessible program that avoids universalizing his own devotional experiences as model or ideal experiences that all readers should seek to replicate. Unlike the devotional treatises in this Jesuit tradition, a tradition that began to take shape in the early to mid-sixteenth century, The *Devotions* record the applications of a devotional method, the experiences had as a result of following a set of protocols. But the specific protocols

Donne would appear to follow are not ever clearly and explicitly articulated in the same manner that Ignatius, for example, in his devotional treatise makes overt for the benefit of readers.

In *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*, Joseph de Guibert shows that Ignatius's Spiritual Exercises exemplifies "very little of the character of spiritual treatises," which he argues tend to "expound principles of the interior life or develop ascetical or mystical doctrines." (De Guibert 109). De Guibert adds that the text "has nothing of the character of a spiritual treatise," since it is not "a series of exhortations or meditations such as the Middle Ages have left us in large numbers." Yet, he adds,

The special character of the book is clear. It is a series of practical directives, that is, of methods for examining the conscience, for engaging in prayer both vocal and mental, for deliberating or making a choice, and the like; and all these directives are intermingled with plans or outlines of meditations and contemplations. Hence the work is not an exposition to be studied, but a collection of diversified instructions intended to direct the performance of a certain number of interior exercises which are systematically organized. Therefore the *Spiritual Exercises* is a book not be read, but to be practiced. (De Guibert 110 – 111)

St. Igatius's devotional text evidences a shift in the history of devotional writing from strict treatise, which again according to de Guibert "expound[s] principles of the interior life," to the construction of a text whose guidelines and directions are intended "to be practiced," or enacted, the intentions of which are to be physically and psychologically embodied in the practitioner. Ignatius does not record his own experiences of working through the method he describes, but rather limits his involvement as a devotional writer in the lives of practitioners to formal, principled instruction. And while the *Spiritual Exercises* does not adhere, according to de Guibert to the typical generic conventions of spiritual treatises as exhibited by medieval treatises of this kind, it nonetheless is typical of devotional texts produced within and by catholic writers in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

Donne's *Devotions* is organized into twenty-three "stations" with each station divided into three distinct subsections: a Meditation, an Expostulation, and a Prayer. This tripartite design on the surface appears to be modeled upon the structure of the well-known devotional work of the early seventeenth century, Ignatius's *Spiritual Exercises*, as Louis Martz first suggests and Thomas F. Van Laan later argues. Van Laan goes to great lengths to show the parallels between Donne's use of a tripartite devotional pattern and St. Ignatius's development of a three-part method or program of meditation. Ignatius's Spiritual Exercises first asks devotees to compose a place in their minds on which to meditate, to analyze that place for its spiritual significance, and finally to enter into a colloquy with God. But Donne's text does not follow Ignatius's devotional method all that closely, and the different sections "do not," as Ramie Targoff recently reminds us, "always follow logically upon one another," and even more to the point, "although Donne moves through the days of illness chronologically, the narrative lacks an obvious forward thrust" (Targoff 131). Donne instead constructs an unfolding and much more overtly philosophical querying of his own convictions and

the posing of deeply existential questions, what Donne calls on the title page of the *Devotions* "*debatements with God.*" *This querying begins in the Meditation section and extends into the Expostulation section in which the specific questions he introduces are determined to have palpable and potentially dire spiritual implications.* The questions posed in this middle section are typically fraught with anxiety over a sense of his own sinfulness, self-doubt, and the growing belief that his health will not return and that recovery is not possible, either in the physical or spiritual sense. In the closing section of each station, Donne then offers a Prayer intended to provide some closure to the arduous questions posed and to introduce as a result a sense of emotional calm.

Despite the anxiety that pervades any reading of the *Devotions*, in their assessment of its overall ability to achieve such spiritual and emotional calm critics have tended to affirm its success as an efficacious devotional text. The *Devotions* resulted from John Donne's illness in late 1623, was published in early 1624, and has been read and interpreted by most early modern scholars as accomplishing just what its author appears to have intended for it to do: to allay the anxieties and fears that would prevent the devout from entering into deeper devotion to God. In the earliest assessment of the devotional efficacy of Donne's *Devotions*, Izaak Walton in his *The Life of Dr. John Donne* (1640) characterized the text as providing a picture of man's soul in conflict with itself and God, conflicts that are said to be beautifully and memorably resolved by the end of the work in what Walton calls "a Sacred Picture of Spiritual Ecstasies" (Walton 199). But Walton's seventeenth-century treatment of the text is not the only one to represent it as ultimately calming for readers. More recently, N. J. C. Andreasen claims to have shown it leads readers to a "fuller religious assent" and Janel Mueller describes it as a work that enacts a "spiritual resurrection." (Andreasen 207) Like Walton, the Devotions' first critic, these later critics have determined the work to be a devotional success.

These critical assessments by Walton, Mueller, and Andreasen are predicated upon an interest in generically classifying the text and to identifying its sources by carefully attending to its narrative structure and design. Yet these appraisals fail to consider the historical fact that early modern devotional writers and readers expected to find and use a detailed set of protocols that would guide them into a state of deeper devotion to God. Anthony Raspa, the most recent editor of a scholarly edition of Donne's odd spiritual aid, poses the following essential questions that would identify the parameters of inquiry that have been typical of critics' readings of the text: "Is Donne's Devotions a formal meditation... or is it not? If Devotions is not such an exercise, what is it? Does it have to be anything at all other than what is suggested by its obvious structure of twenty-three sections each split up into three parts, describing a medical case in 1623, and the thoughts about life and death it prompted in Donne's mind?" (Raspa xxiv – xxv). Ramie Targoff, too, in her more recent discussion of the text writes, "The assumption seems to be that if we can figure out what the Devotions is, we might discern how to read it most profitably." (Targoff 131). I would argue that Targoff's comment here, though intended to disparage such a question, is important, since it apprehends exactly the dilemma readers of this text have long faced.

Determining what the text is makes understanding its purpose possible.

In our efforts to answer Raspa's essential questions and Targoff's implied question, we might think to consult Donne's own description of the text and the purpose he had for it. Donne himself described his Devotions as a text that he intended readers would use for spiritual benefit, as he makes clear in a letter to his friend and frequent correspondent, Sir Robert Ker:

> Sir, Though I have left my bed, I have not left my bed-side, I sit there still, and as a Prisoner discharged, sits at the Prison doore, to be Gees, so sit I here, to gather crummes. I have used this leisure, to put the meditations had in my sicknesse, into some such order, as may minister some holy delight. (*Letters* 249)

Donne writes of the text "minister[ing] holy delight," of its conveying to readers some spiritual benefit sanctioned by God. The image he constructs in this letter to Ker, one of busily occupying himself with arranging "meditations had in my sicknesse," is of a man pausing in his recovery to compile in an intentional order those vivid and descriptive verbal remembrances that chronicled not only the course of his physical illness but also his corresponding spiritual recovery. Donne tells his friend that these meditations, then, as is consistent with their generic purpose, are intended to benefit readers through their power to evoke in readers a sense of the spiritual illness from which they too may be suffering, and in so doing draw a parallel between the speaker in the *Devotions* and readers. And then, following this, minister to them a recovery. Donne records here his hope that the *Devotions* would efficaciously minister to its readers, but not a confident belief that it would.

Early Modern Protestant meditative forms also had an influence upon the character of Donne's *Devotions*. Yet the influence of Protestant meditative practice only extends to the use of a pattern of some kind, an aspect of devotional writing in the early modern period that was neither uniquely Catholic or Protestant. One of the more popular Protestant devotional works of the first half of the seventeenth century was Bishop Joseph Hall's *The Art of Divine Meditation* (1606). Hall divides his text into two parts. In the first part—Chapters I-XXVII—Hall defines the two types of meditation in which a devotee might engage, "extemporal," which is "occasioned by outward occurrences offered to the mind," and "deliberate," which is "wrought out of our own heart... for the finding out of some hidden truth... or... enkindling of our love of God" (Martz 22 – 23). This opening set of definitions in Chapter II is followed by several chapters in which he details "the qualities of the person... that he be pure from his sins" (Chapter V); "the Circumstances of Meditation" (Chapters IX-XI), which includes a discussion of "place," "time," and "the site and gesture of the body"; "the matter" and "order" of meditation (Chapters XII-XIII); how the devotee is to enter the work (Chapters XIV-XV); a description of method (Chapters XVI-XVII); and finally the practice of meditation (Chapters XVIII-XXVII). Throughout Chapters I-XVII, Hall does not provide examples of what kinds of responses on the part of the devotee might be produced as a result of applying his method. He instructs

only in the language of the theoretical, like Ignatius does in the *Spiritual Exercises*.

Beginning with Chapter XVIII, the text shifts away from the discussion of the formal devotional procedures and the proper ways to comport oneself while employing those procedures—what in my discussion of Ignatius's text above I referred to as the "imperative"—to include sample responses. This shift in content, from a detailing of formal concerns to providing readers with a representation of the experiences that might result from applying a formal method, also means Hall's text occupies the methodological and theological space between two competing soteriologies as we will see. This is significant since over the course of the early seventeenth century in England devotional texts increasingly reflected either an intentional working out of Catholic or Protestant soteriology or a difficultly managed mixture of both.

"First, therefore, it shall be expedient," Hall writes in the opening of Chapter XVIII, "to consider seriously what the thing is whereof we meditate, [thus]"; which is then followed by an example of what the devotee's response to the devotional program might sound like:

> What, then, O my soul, is the life of the saints whereof thou studiest? Who are the saints but hose which, having been weakly holy upon the earth, are perfectly holy above; which even on earth were perfectly holy in their Saviour, now are so in themselves; which, overcoming on earth, are truly canonized in heaven? What is their life but that blessed estate above wherein their glorified soul hath a full fruition of God? (Hall 89)

In this model hypothetical response, Hall's idealized practitioner engages in highly introspective and stirring self-questioning as prompted by the instruction to "consider seriously what the thing is whereof we meditate." As a prompt, this is what we might refer to as an open-form question; the question is not designed to elicit an evaluation or judgment regarding a specific theological matter or dilemma. Instead the question is intended to elicit an introspective response, which is, at first, no doubt largely non-verbal. The practitioner is pondering, not speaking in response to the question. Then after some indeterminate time has passed, the practitioner would presumably offer a description of "what the thing is whereof we meditate," thus establishing the matter that will be considered during the course of the full devotional program Hall has designed. But this open-form questioning is, in a very real way, unbound by emotional safeguards and cognitive parameters, thus making this questioning always potentially unsettling and deeply anxious.

Hall's text is not reassuring in the way the Ignatian might be perceived to be, with its naming of subjects in advance for scrutinizing and consideration. "First, in the morning, immediately on rising," St. Ignatius writes in the opening sentences of the section entitled "First Week" of instruction, "one should resolve to guard carefully against the particular sin or defect with regard to which he seeks to correct or improve himself." In contrast to Hall and the more mainstream Protestant devotional tradition *The Art* represents, Ignatius's text directs practitioners to "guard... against the particular sin or defect... he seeks to correct." Here too, the devotee would pause

for an indeterminate period of time to identify the "sin or defect" within him that he sought to locate and eliminate over the larger devotional course Ignatius details. He goes on: "Secondly, after dinner, he should ask God our Lord for the grace he desires, that is, to recall how often he has fallen into the particular sin or defect, and to avoid it for the future." Directing the devotee to ask "God our Lord for the grace" is nothing less than a scripted prayer—liturgical in nature and so devoid of the opportunity to improvise a prayer that is both relevant to the specific devotional task Ignatius names and succinct enough to serve as a focusing device, a function of language that had characterized Christian worship and devotion during much of the church's long history up until the printing and circulation of Luther's writings led to changes in the use and character of liturgy in the church. The Jesuit exercises offer practitioners more explicit direction and instruction regarding how to engage in the kind of self-scrutiny that leads one to eliminate sin and wrongdoing from one's life, while Hall's Protestant devotional only appears to provide such explicit instruction and direction.

Unlike Ignatian meditation, which derived from St. Thomas Aquinas' belief that sense data is the source of all knowledge, Protestant meditation, deriving largely from the psychology of St. Augustine, emphasized intense psychological scrutiny as the defining action of devotional reading. Louis Martz makes this significant distinction between the two competing traditions. For Protestant devotional readers, Martz writes,

The hint of the presence of something like innate ideas in the deep caves of the soul leads directly to a long account of what might be called the dramatic action of Augustinian meditation. It is an action significantly different from the method of meditation later set forth by Ignatius Loyola and his followers; for that later method showed the effects of medieval scholasticism, with its powerful emphasis upon the analytic understanding, and upon the Thomist principle that human knowledge is derived from sensory experience. Ignatian meditation is thus a precise, tightly articulated method, moving from the images that comprise the composition of place into the threefold sequence of the powers of the soul, memory, understanding, and will, and from there into the affections and resolutions of the aroused will. But in Augustinian meditation there is no such precise method; there is, rather, an intuitive groping back into the regions of the soul that lie beyond sensory memories. The three powers of the soul are all used, but with an effect of simultaneous action, for with Augustine the aroused will is using the understanding to explore the memory, with the aim of apprehending more clearly and loving more fervently the ultimate source of the will's arousal.[13]

The *Devotions* exhibits some of the traits Martz describes of the character of Protestant meditation, especially as it differs from Ignatian, but as a devotional work it cannot be said to exemplify the Augustinian method in every sense. Further, the Devotions cannot be said to reject entirely the three-part Ignatian formulaic structure of (1) composition of a place or a scene in the mind, typically a station of the cross; (2) the posing of questions with respect to the spiritual significance and meaning of the scene composed; and (3) the entering into a colloquy with God, a kind of divine conversation in which the mind and spirit are put at rest. In the various stations of Donne's devotional text there are instances of each of these elements, though the elements are not so tightly grouped together in any sort of successive patterning. Fur-

ther, as Frost rightly points out, "The Devotions... offers no act of the presence of God, no attempt to present visualized scenes as matter for meditation, and no attempt to apply the senses to the matter as an aid to understanding." (Frost 9). Donne employs a three-part structure of Meditation, Expostulation, and Prayer in each station, but these individual subsections cannot be said to correspond too closely to the Ignatian devotional formula. We might be contented to agree with Helen Gardner's insightful point that Donne's conception of meditation or devotion was more inclusive or expansive than that of his contemporaries. As Gardner claims, "Donne meant something much more discursive, a less rigorous exercise than the Ignatian meditation." (Gardner 194)

The discrepancy between Ignatius's devotional method and Hall's is curious considering the expectation to receive clear and detailed instruction with which most readers approach a devotional text of any kind, particularly those devotional readers in the early modern period. Hall neglects to elaborate the protocols of his devotional method. What is characteristic of Hall's *Art* is characteristic of Protestant interpretive instruction in general: a profound and anxiety inducing lack of attention to how a reader of scripture or practitioner of a devotional method might use a text to achieve emotional, psychological, or spiritual calm. The efficaciousness of a devotional text was defined as a linguistically constructed process that, as Bishop Hall describes in Chapter XVI, "begins in the braine, descends to the heart, begins on earth, ascends to heaven." (Hall 87) Hall's description of the devotional experience characterizes it as both deeply intellectual ("begins in the braine") and at the same time emotional ("descends into the heart").

Unlike either St. Ignatius's Spiritual Exercises or Bishop Hall's *The Art of Divine Meditation*, Donne's *Devotions* is entirely an instance of a method applied, an example of an individual following a devotional program, which the careful structuring of spiritual despair and recovery into twenty-three stations is intended to demonstrate, though Donne never clearly articulates how. It is not a work that advocates or advances or promotes a specific or unique devotional method or that purports to be a method on its own. It is instead a narrative, a self-account of a method applied, and one to which readers are invited to bear witness or experience. This accounts at once for its oddly personal nature and, even more importantly as we shall see, for its epistemological status, a status that testifies to the importance of understanding the significant place "applied" devotional literature of the early seventeenth century occupies in the history of English literature.

【Notes】

1. Helen Gardner, in her "Introduction" to *John Donne: The Divine Poems* (Oxford UP, 1952), notes the 1548 Latin edition of the work received Papal approval, 1. Her comment is also cited in Thomas F. Van Laan, "John Donne's Devotions and the Jesuit Spiritual Exercises," *Studies in Philology*, 60 (April 1963): 191–202, 193. Louis L. Martz in *The Poetry of Meditation* (Yale UP, 1954), 3–10; Van Laan, "John Donne's Devotions and the Jesuit Spiritual Exercises." Targoff, 131.

2. Frost, 9.

【Works Cited】

Andersen, Jennifer and Elizabeth Sauer, Eds. *Books and Readers in Early Modern England.* Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2002.

Andreasen, N. J. C. "Donne's 'Devotions' and the Psychology of Assent," *Modern Philology* 62 (1965): 207 – 216.

Bald, R. C. *John Donne: A Life*. New York: Oxford U P, 1970.

De Guibert, Joseph. *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice*. Chicago: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1964.

Raspa, Anthony, ed. *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 1987.

-- -. *Letters to Several Persons of Honour: A Facsimile Reproduction.* M. Thomas Hester, Ed. and Introduction. Delmar: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1977.

Frost, Kate Gartner. *Holy Delight: Typology, Numerology, and Autobiography in Donne's* Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions. Princeton U P, 1990.

Gardner, Helen. "Introduction." John Donne: *The Divine Poems*. Oxford U P, 1952.

-- -. Review of *The Poetry of Meditation* by Louis L. Martz. *Review of English Studies* 8 (1957): 194 – 200.

Hall, Joseph. *The Art of Divine Meditation. Bishop Joseph Hall and Protestant Meditation in Seventeenth-Century England: A Study with the texts* of The Arte of Divine Meditation (1606) and Occasional Meditations (1633). Frank L. Huntley, Ed. Binghamton, New York: Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1981.

Martz, Louis L. *The Paradise Within: Studies in Vaughan, Traherne, and Milton.* New Haven: Yale U P, 1964.

-- --. *The Poetry of Meditation: A Study in English Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century.* New Haven: Yale U P, 1962.

Mueller, Janel. "The Exegesis of Experience: Dean Donne's Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 67 (1968): 1 – 19.

St. Ignatius. The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius. Louis J. Puhl, S. J., Trans. and Ed. New York: Vintage, 2000.

Targoff, Ramie. *Common Prayer: The Language of Public Devotion in Early Modern England.* Chicago: Chicago U P, 2001.

- --. *John Donne, Body and Soul.* U of Chicago P, 2008.

Van Laan, Thomas F. "John Donne's Devotions and the Jesuit Spiritual Exercises." *Studies in Philology* 60 (April 1963): 191 – 202.

Walton, Izaak. "The Life of Dr. John Donne." *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions and Death's Duel.* New York: Vintage, 1999.

Wang Xiao-ping Won the 2nd Nara International Myriad Leaves Prize of Japan

Chao Gao

In April 2010, the result of the 2nd Nara International Myriad Leaves Prize of Japan was announced publicly. Prof. Wang Xiao-ping, member of *FWLS* Editorial Baord, from Tianjin Normal University in China was awarded the prize. The Asahi Shimbun and other big newspapers of Japan reported the news.

The Nara International Myriad Leaves Prize whose award – presentation agency was set-up in Nara Prefecture in Japan is the international prize for commending the scholars around the world who have made significant achievements in the world heritage *Myriad Leaves* related academic and cultural fields. Thus, it aims at promoting the Myriad Leaves Research in the world and contributing to rediscovery of the Japanese culture and the creation of a new culture. The prize is awarded once every two years to one winner irrespective of nationality and ethnicity. The Review Committee consists of the authorities at home and abroad , including the Cultural Medal winner, Cultural contributor, Columbia University honorary professor, well-known historian of Japanese literature Donald Keene, the director-general of the Operating Consortium of the New National Theatre and former Minister of Ministry of Science Atsuko Toyama, the Cultural contributor, Winner of the Order of the Sacred Treasure, President of the Association of National Language and Literature of the Universities around the country, Curator of Nara Prefecture *Myriad Leaves Culture Centre* Nakanisisusumu, and the deceased Japanese famous painters, Winner of Order of Culture ,Cultural contributor, Hirayama.

The Review Committee thinks that Wang Xiaoping has been recognized in the academic circles as a forerunner of the *Myriad Leaves* Research since he published the academic paper *Commenting on Myriad Leaves using The Book of Songs for reference* in 1981. Basing on having a good command of the Chinese classical literature study, he promoted the comparative study of classical poetics between China and Japan taking *Myriad Leaves* as a centre. Particularly, he presented insightful views to interpret Chinese poems and articles in *Myriad Leaves* which have been always incomprehensible by referring to the pop literature in *The Book of Songs* and some other Chinese literature and also Dunhuang documents. Furthermore, he inaugurated a new phase in the approach to the comparative study of Chinese and Japanese literature by reviewing *Myriad Leaves* in the perspective of the history of World Literature. The interpretation of *Myriad Leaves* in Wang Xiaoping's published academic papers has achieved a higher level in comparison with existing translation and research in the academic circle. His related research fruits of recent years are *On the Emotions of Relatives and the Fil-*

ial Piety in Myriad Leaves 》*Journal of Tianjin Normal University*[J], 2003(3)》, *Dunhuang Literature and Myriad Leaves* 》*Meaning's Culture and Love's Culture—Japanese Studies in China*[C], CHUOKORON-SHINSHA in Japan ,2004 》, *The Comparative Study of the letters of Dunhuang and Myriad Leaves* 》*Dunhuang Research*[J],2004(6)》, *Dunhuang Songs* 》*Myriad Leaves Classical Literature Study Annuals*(3), *Joint Research*, "Eurasia Continent and Myriad Leaves" 2005 》, *Chinese Discourse in the Study of Myriad Leaves* 》*Foreign Literature Studies*[J],2005(6)》 and so on.

The Review Committee points out that Wang Xiaoping will not only energetically continue to study the exchanging history of Chinese and Japanese literary and the comparative study of Sino-Japanese poetry but also extend his latest study to taking a Chinese literature of Asian countries centered exchanging history of literature. In addition, Wang Xiaoping not only carried out the above-mentioned unique comparative study of Sino-Japanese literature, but also introduced Waka's (literally "Japanese poem") charm and the essence of Japanese Classical Literature to Chinese people through his considerable works. Besides, Wang Xiaoping made great contributions to cultivating the subsequent researchers. For these reasons, the 2nd Nara International Myriad Leaves Prize was awarded to Wang Xiaoping.

On 26 June, 2010, the award ceremony was held ceremoniously in Nara Prefecture. Myriad Leaves cultural centers installed special counters to display the Chinese versions of *Myriad Leaves* and Wang Xiaoping's works about *Myriad Leaves* research. More than 200 visiting guests from around Japan attended the award ceremony. The Review Committee of Nara International *Myriad Leaves* Prize introduced the present winner Wang Xiaoping's research fruition in detail. It pointed out emphatically that Wang Xiaoping had published the academic papers of Myriad Leaves Research in two languages in China and Japan since 1981 and it had exerted a tremendous influence. For example, his textual research on *The Kiloword* quoted by Murajiyoeoshi Yoshida is a great innovation which can be said the final conclusion; his exposition about the influence of the Letters of the Six Dynasties in Myriad Leaves is very persuasive ; his research of the relation between the Buddhist prayers in Dunhuang Manuscripts and the works of Yamanoueno Okura is the newest research fruition which is generally acknowledged by the academic circle; his training the talents of *Myriad Leaves* Research is remarkable.

The governor of Nara Prefecture Shogo Arai awarded Wang Xiaoping the prize medal and certificate in person. At the meeting, Wang Xiaoping gave an academic lecture on *Myriad Leaves and The Books of Poems*. Donald Keehan, as Professor of Columbia University and member of the Review Committee of Nara International Myriad Leaves Prize, made a speech on *The Translation of Myriad Leaves*. Nakanisisusumu, Donald Keehan, Wang Xiaoping and Prof. Geny Wakisaka who is the previous winners and from the University of Sao Paulo in Brazil made a speech respectively in the forum on *Myriad Leaves in the World*. After the meeting, a concert called "*the Silk Road*" was held in which some Japanese artists played "*Jasmine*", "*Oriental Cherry*" and some other world famous music. In the evening, there was a celebration banquet.

The next day, The Asahi Shimbun, the Mainichi Shimbun and other newspapers of Japan and also NHK(Japan Broadcasting Corporation) reported the news. Some have also provided the pictures.

On June 30, Wang Xiaoping was invited to give a talk on *The Silk Road and Myriad Leaves* in Nara Women's University and was given a warmly welcome by the participants. After the meeting, Wang Xiaoping replied the related questions presented by the participants.

The Board Chairperson and Principal Mr. Takeshi Kano and his colleagues of Tezukayamagakuin University where Wang Xiaoping had worked specially came to attend the awarding ceremony. All the members of the League of Understanding China of Osakasayama city where Wang Xiao-ping had worked as a teacher also took part in the award-presentation ceremony and congratulated Prof. Wang Xiaoping on winning the prize.

世界文学研究论坛

黄铁池/上海师范大学（中国）
聂珍钊/华中师范大学（中国）
查尔斯·罗斯/普渡大学（美国）

Editors in Chief
Huang Tiechi,Shanghai Normal University,China
Nie Zhenzhao,Central China Normal University,China
Charles Ross,Purdue University,U.S.A

ISSN 1949-8519