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In his introduction to the Oxford Edition of Macbeth, Stanley Wells gives the usual praise for Shakespeare's character Lady Macbeth, saying that her "steely determination, her invoking of the powers of evil, and her eventual revelation in sleep of her repressed humanity...have given [her character] its long-proven power to fascinate readers and to challenge performers" (1975). Lady Macbeth is often viewed as the driving force behind the actions of Macbeth, the half of the Macbeth couple who is able to reject "the milk of human kindness" and act solely from her own ambition. Is this so? In fact, Lady Macbeth seems unconcerned with her own desires; instead, she places all her energies into the desire of her husband to be king. It might rather be asserted that Lady Macbeth acts solely from her husband's ambition. Contrary to the traditional view that Lady Macbeth's demise is a result of her ability to "unsex" herself and abandon so-called "womanly" ideals of kindness and compassion, it is Lady Macbeth's adherence to the Renaissance ideal of a wife who exists only to serve her husband's needs that leads her into madness following Macbeth's rejection of her role in his new revenge-centered kingdom. Once Macbeth begins to act without consulting his wife, he has eliminated her ability to act for him and therefore her ability to act at all.

The Ideal Renaissance Wife

Lady Macbeth first speaks the words of her husband, reading his letter. Rather than entering the play as a woman with her own thoughts, ambitions and schemes, she is introduced as Macbeth's mouthpiece. In the soliloquy which follows Macbeth's letter, she speaks only in terms of what her husband wants and the obstacles which stand in the way: Glamis thou art, and Cawdor, and shalt be What thou art promised. Yet I do fear thy nature. It is too full of the milk of human kindness To catch the nearest way. Thou wouldst be great, Art not without ambition... (I. v. 3-7).

Lady Macbeth goes on to plan how she will speed Macbeth to action, the chastisement she will serve to him for not acting on his desires, though she has revealed in the latter part of this speech that she does not endorse the murder. Irene Dash notes, "Tantalizing us with the contradiction, 'Wouldst not play false, / And yet wouldst not wrongly win,' [Lady Macbeth] reveals her own moral judgement with the word 'wrongly.' She then jettisons these values in favor of being the fully supportive wife" (160). Before Lady Macbeth has even begun her mighty charges to her husband, it is revealed that she is willing to deny her own morality to serve his purposes, to help him to the goal that he wishes to attain. Her often-cited "choice" to descend into evil methods seems to spring wholly from her desire to serve Macbeth, rather than desire for the kingdom. She asks that smoke surround her so that her "keen knife see not the wound it makes," that her conscience may remain ignorant to the acts she undertakes to serve a god who is higher than divinity in her world, her husband.

Macbeth's arrival allows Lady Macbeth to assume fully her role as wife. She greets him at the door, reassures him about the coming murders and sets the preparations for Duncan's visit in motion, with only two sentences from her husband's mouth. She has acted in precisely the way a Renaissance wife was expected to act. Among the requirements for proper wifey behavior, Lady Macbeth would find that her "behavior was carefully prescribed. She was to tend to her household duties industriously, so as not to waste her husband's goods" (Dunn 17). As the scene closes, she says, "Leave all the rest to me" (I. v. 71). What thou art promised. Yet I do fear thy nature. It is too full of the milk of human kindness To catch the nearest way. Thou wouldst be great, Art not without ambition... (I. v. 3-7).

Lady Macbeth goes on to plan how she will speed Macbeth to action, the chastisement she will serve to him for not acting on his desires, though she has revealed in the latter part of this speech that she does not endorse the murder. Irene Dash notes, "Tantalizing us with the contradiction, 'Wouldst not play false, / And yet wouldst not wrongly win,' [Lady Macbeth] reveals her own moral judgement with the word 'wrongly.' She then jettisons these values in favor of being the fully supportive wife" (160). Before Lady Macbeth has even begun her mighty charges to her husband, it is revealed that she is willing to deny her own morality to serve his purposes, to help him to the goal that he wishes to attain. Her often-cited "choice" to descend into evil methods seems to spring wholly from her desire to serve Macbeth, rather than desire for the kingdom. She asks that smoke surround her so that her "keen knife see not the wound it makes," that her conscience may remain ignorant to the acts she undertakes to serve a god who is higher than divinity in her world, her husband.

Macbeth's arrival allows Lady Macbeth to assume fully her role as wife. She greets him at the door, reassures him about the coming murders and sets the preparations for Duncan's visit in motion, with only two sentences from her husband's mouth. She has acted in precisely the way a Renaissance wife was expected to act. Among the requirements for proper wifey behavior, Lady Macbeth would find that her "behavior was carefully prescribed. She was to tend to her household duties industriously, so as not to waste her husband's goods" (Dunn 17). As the scene closes, she says, "Leave all the rest to me" (I. v. 71).

Angelica Lemke is a sophomore English (writing) and philosophy double major. She is assistant Arts and Entertainment editor for The Denisonian, Denison's arts and entertainment journal. Of this essay, she says, "I never liked Macbeth until I looked at it from this approach. Now, it's one of my favorite Shakespearean writings."
implying the crucial role she will have in the murder, as well as the crucial, gender-specific role she will assume as hostess to the evening's meal. She will hold, but instead, she leaves Macbeth no charge but not trouble her husband with the affairs of the household as well as the crucial, gender-specific role she and honor, though her sentences are fraught with implying the crucial role she will have in the murder. "What cannot you and I perform...?"

Lady Macbeth stresses that she is, as he called her, his partner of greatness," that they can "perform" anything on Duncan or otherwise, if they work as a couple. Her devotion to her marriage seems unquestionable. As Macbeth stands hopelessly in shock, bloody dagger in hand, Lady Macbeth takes immediate action to preserve her husband. She returns the weapon to Duncan's chamber, smears blood on Duncan's attendant. Macbeth is rambling about the guilt which he feels, guilt which Lady Macbeth seems to share, saying, "These deeds must not be thought / After these ways; so, it will make us mad" (II. ii. 32-33), again using the plural pronoun, considering life from the perspective of a couple, but Lady Macbeth is able to put these things aside for the larger purpose of preserving his safety, risking her own by going to the murder scene after the deed. Washing her hands as well as her husband's hands and instructing him to change his clothes to look appropriate during the discovery of the body, Lady Macbeth performs her final act of wifely duty in the play. 

Woman's Work? Macbeth's murder of Duncan and subsequent rise to the throne upset the natural order of the kingdom. It is not surprising, then, that the institution of marriage should be upset as well. Lady Macbeth is quickly removed from her position. Lady Macbeth has never spoken of personal desire to be queen, given that here she expresses the personal desire to be a mother. Though the fate of the child to which she has welcomed Duncan is Inverness by herself. When Macbeth commands his nobles to leave him alone, Lady Macbeth withdraws silently and announced along with them (III. I. 39-43)...Thus Lady Macbeth is now neither companion nor helpmate (Klein 246-247). Lady Macbeth has not only lost her role in the household, but has also lost her power to sway Macbeth's dead, worthless actions. The same woman who brought Macbeth from the point of abandoning his plan to firm resolution and completion is suddenly unable to move him in the slightest way: MACBETH. Unsafe the while, that we must love Our honor in these flattering streams. And make our faces vizards to our hearts, Disguising what they are. LADY. You must lose this. MACBETH. O, full of scorpions is my mind, dear wife Be innocent of knowledge, dearest chuck, Till thou applaud the deed... Things bad begun make strong themselves by ill. So prithee go with me (III. ii. 32-36, 45-46, 54-56).

Macbeth all but ignores his wife's urging to put off his doubt and fear about the security of his reign, while Lady Macbeth, having been already displaced by her own paranoia, is a less effective of a critique. She, like any other member of the court, is told to remain "innocent of knowledge," and therefore, is exculpated from Macbeth's world, excluded from her position as his wife, to help and obstruct his actions. Lady Macbeth's complete lack of influence on her husband is made finally apparent in Act Three, scene four, as Macbeth is confronted with Banquo's ghost. Though she speaks much to calm him and explain his bizarre actions to the court, Macbeth and his lords all but ignore her presence in the scene. No response is made to any of her excuses for his behavior, nor does he acknowledge the value of her work to cover his deeds. Macbeth ends the scene saying that he will consult the "weird sisters," the only other female characters to appear thus far in the play, about what action he should take next, rejecting Lady Macbeth as his accomplice entirely. 

The Death of Wifeliness Lady Macbeth's absences from Act Four of the play is conspicuous, especially given the introduction of another woman, the third and final significant female element in the play, Lady Macduff. The relationship between these two noble ladies, one of which is wife of the murderous king, the other who is wife of the man who will avenge that king's deeds, is such that their comparison is inevitable: The women characters who most win our sympathy and respect insist on reasoning for themselves. Lady Macduff belongs in this group. In a play where a woman's major concern has been to help her husband reach his goal, Lady Macduff questions her husband's value system, unwilling to accept his power of reasoning over her own...She perceives [Macduff's] flight as characterizing both fear and lack of reason when it endangers family, no matter what the ultimate goal may be. Given that she will not excuse morally insupportable actions...Lady Macduff illustrates those qualities that highlight Lady Macbeth's deficiencies (Dah 192-193).

Lady Macduff, then, stands as a foil to Lady Macbeth in that she is a woman who, though left helpless by her husband's departure, can think and act independently of her husband. She values the safety of her family, her entire family, above her husband's desires or even his personal safety. She represents the perspective of which Lady Macbeth has not yet been, but she is not representative of something which Lady Macbeth could not become. Given that Lady Macbeth has been denied her role of participative partner, an alternative role for her to assume might be that of an autonomous woman, not unlike Lady Macduff. She is, however, not given this chance. While Lady Macbeth is denoted in the play by "Lady," Lady Macduff's dialogue is indicated by the generic term "Wife." Here Shakespeare reveals how even the most independent of women is defined by her husband, and he adds another dimension to her relationship to Lady Macbeth, making the husband not only subject to comparison, but allowing her to stand as a symbol for all wives. Lady Macduff's character is necessary because she both demonstrates the severity of Macbeth's descent into evil, being an innocent victim, and the death of wives, of women who are partners with their husbands, in the play. Lady Macbeth cannot take up this role because of her guilt in the murders; she must have a clear retribution in her death, but her foil is able to die the death of wifeliness in her place.
When Lady Macbeth makes her final appearance in the play, her concern for Lady Macduff reaches even into her thoughts as she sleepwalks, though we have no previous knowledge of any personal relationship between these women:

"The Thane of Fife had a wife. Where is she now? What will these hands ne'er be clean? No more o' that, my lord, no more o' that! You mar all with starting (V. i. 39-42)."

She seems to accept guilt in Lady Macduff's murder, a murder which was committed without Macbeth consulting his wife, perhaps because her behavior as a submissive wife has in some way led to the silencing, or death, of even the most autonomous of wives. This is one way in which one might read Lady Macduff's rejection of the "womanly defense" that she "has done no harm" (IV. ii. 79-80), that she is attacking her counterpart's lack of independent action.

Lady Macbeth's madness, her haunted nightmares, then, seems less a result of her role in the murders (She has, after all, continued to act without apparent mental anguish in all preceding scenes of the play) and more a result of her adherence to a doctrine of complete devotion to a husband, even to the point of personal sacrifice, both material and moral. She acts as the Renaissance would have wanted her to act, as Catherine Dunn states, "The law, too, had dictated that a woman's first commandment was submission and obedience to her husband. Furthermore, women were considered inferior...in power and position" (15). Having completely fulfilled this duty, she has brought about her own death.

It is no wonder that Lady Macbeth's death brings forth "the cry of women" (V. v. 8); she has died as a result of being the ideal woman, and women mourn her death as they would their own; these women are nameless creatures, no other speaking woman remaining alive in the play but Lady Macbeth's gentlewoman, and thus are able to represent all of womankind. Macbeth's mild reaction to her death, saying "She should've died hereafter" (V. v. 17), indicated how marginalized the female is in this society, as well as reveals that her death was inevitable in a world which binds a wife's fate to that of her husband. Lady Macduff offers an alternative to Lady Macbeth's behavior, but she dies as well because of the prevailing view of women. Lady Macduff, an innocent victim, inspires more sympathy than does Lady Macbeth, who had opportunity to sway her husband away from his misguided ambition and chose instead to support his desires rather than act on her own morality.

Lady Macduff's behavior, then, represents that which should be embraced, independent thought and action of a wife, rather than that which should be rejected wholeheartedly. Lady Macbeth's submission to her husband in all things. Had Lady Macbeth rejected this role as well, it seems the women of the play might have found some strength to avoid the tragic end in each other's independence; because she does not, the only independence they gain is through their deaths.

"Dearest partner of greatness"

Lady Macbeth, then, is done a disservice by the traditional reading of her character as, "the ravenous wolf [whose] hungry ambition for her husband to be king over-rides all other desires and responsibilities" (Pitt 65). Her character is not so simple as that. She is not the creature of ambition; Macbeth is the originator of the murder plot. He is the one who commits multiple murders to maintain his usurped position. She is merely acting as his ever-supportive wife.

It is this role which "over-rides all other desires," not personal desire for greatness.

Macbeth refers to his wife as his "dearest partner of greatness" (I. v. 10-11), but she is actually never his partner in the crimes. Rather, she acts only to move her husband to that which she knows he desires. Her only concern is with Macbeth's contentment. When he does not find contentment, she is rejected as part of that which cannot satisfy him. It is then that her lack of place in society becomes clear. She is essentially nothing in the eyes of the court and kingdom.

Her identification with Lady Macduff allows Lady Macbeth to be viewed as a multi-dimensional creature, a character who can both call up the powers of darkness to serve her husband as well as feel remorse for actions in which she had no direct role. Furthermore, the fact that she had no direct role in that murder and is still haunted by it leads one to see the relationship that all women in the society bear each other. The weeping of women at Lady Macbeth's death represents the weeping of all women who have not found a true partnership of greatness in their marriage.
Historiography, the process of analyzing the primary and secondary historical documents of a period, enables modern history students to place the past in a context with the present. With the current discussion and debate concerning modern American morality, the historiography of the Victorian period has been the subject of much question. The term "Victorian" refers to England and the United States from 1837-1901, characterized by the rule of Queen Victoria (OED). Specifically, the morality and beliefs in question are those of the Victorian bourgeoisie (middle class). Though only comprising 12-15 per cent of the population they influenced both the lower and upper classes by their emphasis on propriety and etiquette. The process of historiography lends itself to the Victorian period because of the many myths and stereotypes surrounding it. The most lasting stereotype of the Victorian is as simultaneously a prude and hypocrite. Yet, depending upon the source, the Victorian stereotype of prudery also has several evolving definitions. Webster defined hypocrisy as "feigning to be what one is not or to believe what is not: false assumption of an appearance of virtue or religion" (410). Taylor believed prudence and hypocrisy were interrelated and, at times, interchangeable. He emphasized that this "Victorian insistence upon the appearance of respectability without reality -- gained England a name for hypocrisy" (26). Yet, Peter Gay, a contemporary historian, redefined hypocrisy as "a person who is excessively or priggishly attentive to propriety or decorum: a woman who shows or affects extreme modesty" (688). The word "prude" was not consolidated into the Oxford English Dictionary definition of Victorian until 1954 and 1950, which suggests that definition was consolidated between the WWI and WWII generations (OED). Webster's 1965 edition defined a prude as "one who pretends to ignorance or he or she does not possess" (26).

The Myth of Victorian Prudery

"Victorian" refers to England and the United States from 1837-1901, characterized by the rule of Queen Victoria (OED). Historiography, the process of analyzing the primary and secondary historical documents of a period, enables modern history students to place the past in a context with the present. With the current discussion and debate concerning modern American morality, the historiography of the Victorian period has been the subject of much question. The term "Victorian" refers to England and the United States from 1837-1901, characterized by the rule of Queen Victoria (OED). Specifically, the morality and beliefs in question are those of the Victorian bourgeoisie (middle class). Though only comprising 12-15 per cent of the population they influenced both the lower and upper classes by their emphasis on propriety and etiquette. The process of historiography lends itself to the Victorian period because of the many myths and stereotypes surrounding it. The most lasting stereotype of the Victorian is as simultaneously a prude and hypocrite. Yet, depending upon the source, the Victorian stereotype of prudery also has several evolving definitions. Webster defined hypocrisy as "feigning to be what one is not or to believe what is not: false assumption of an appearance of virtue or religion" (410). Taylor believed prudence and hypocrisy were interrelated and, at times, interchangeable. He emphasized that this "Victorian insistence upon the appearance of respectability without reality -- gained England a name for hypocrisy" (26). Yet, Peter Gay, a contemporary historian, redefined hypocrisy as "a person who is excessively or priggishly attentive to propriety or decorum: a woman who shows or affects extreme modesty" (688). The word "prude" was not consolidated into the Oxford English Dictionary definition of Victorian until 1954 and 1950, which suggests that definition was consolidated between the WWI and WWII generations (OED). Webster's 1965 edition defined a prude as "one who pretends to ignorance or he or she does not possess" (26).

The word "prude" was not consolidated into the Oxford English Dictionary definition of Victorian until 1954 and 1950, which suggests that definition was consolidated between the WWI and WWII generations (OED). Webster's 1965 edition defined a prude as "a person who is excessively or priggishly attentive to propriety or decorum: a woman who shows or affects extreme modesty" (688). Rattray Taylor (a contemporary historian, redefined hypocrisy as "a person who is excessively or priggishly attentive to propriety or decorum: a woman who shows or affects extreme modesty" (688). Rattray Taylor (a contemporary historian, redefined hypocrisy as "a person who is excessively or priggishly attentive to propriety or decorum: a woman who shows or affects extreme modesty" (688). Rattray Taylor (a contemporary historian, redefined hypocrisy as "a person who is excessively or priggishly attentive to propriety or decorum: a woman who shows or affects extreme modesty" (688). Rattray Taylor (a contemporary historian, redefined hypocrisy as "a person who is excessively or priggishly attentive to propriety or decorum: a woman who shows or affects extreme modesty" (688). Rattray Taylor (a contemporary historian, redefined hypocrisy as "a person who is excessively or priggishly attentive to propriety or decorum: a woman who shows or affects extreme modesty" (688). Rattray Taylor (a contemporary historian, redefined hypocrisy as "a person who is excessively or priggishly attentive to propriety or decorum: a woman who shows or affects extreme modesty" (688). Rattray Taylor (a contemporary historian, redefined hypocrisy as "a person who is excessively or priggishly attentive to propriety or decorum: a woman who shows or affects extreme modesty" (688).
of nothing from the moment that they... [dis-... of the Post Victorian. Through her discussion in "Old Bloomsbury" of life at Hyde Park Gate, she illustrated the repression of the Victorian age. She was criticized for talking too much about emotions at dinner and for her lack of emotional control (159).

Another Post-Victorian article addressed the ambivalence expressed on the subject of Victorians. The New Statesman article, "The Victorian" in some respects condemned the Victorian, but posed the question of whether or not the WWI generation was more Victorian than the Victorian itself (182). To pose that question indicated that the post-Victorians were not all as free as extremists like Virginia Woolf had recorded. The article was written in 1917, well beyond the close of the Victorian age, yet there was difficulty in reaching a consensus on the Victorian age, which disputed the idea that all Post-Victorians came to the consensus that Victorians were prudish and repressed.

The author of this article supported the image of the Victorian at his worst, a hypertonic: "the person who in all history had the greatest opportunities of putting into practice the politics of generosity and who, with a virtuous face, almost consistently put into practice..." People resented this hypocrisy, it "[wor] his virtuous face, rather than his sins, that the world [found]... difficult to forgive" (181). But perhaps the world of 1917 found it difficult to forgive the Victorian and idealized him at the same time because Post-Victorians lived in a world of disillusionment, a world of war without hope and were a people looking for someone to blame.

It is easy to perceive Victorians as prudes by reading the above source. However, sympathetic Victorian analysts, like Annie Windsor Allen, disproved Gosse's statement in the universal rejection of all things Victorian. Yet, Annie Windsor Allen's sympathetic view can also be attributed to the fact that she wrote before WWII, and was not affected by disillusionment. Also, Gosse's disapproval of Strachey's condemnation supported the idea that while WWI historians consolidated the stereotype of prudery, it was a subject of debate during their own time period. Although these sources were public, they were extreme and not necessarily representative of the WWI generation; two of the authors, Lytton Strachey and Virginia Woolf were in the same literary circle. For instance, although Old Bloomsbury was a memoir, it was meant for the public realm. Other articles, like Gosse's review of Eminent Victorians and The New Statesman article appeared in public journals. The ideas these sources discussed originated in the Victorian public realm and contained no evidence or support from the private realm. Therefore, creating rather than reflecting a vision of the Victorian period, these historians did not present a comprehensive view of the Victorians, but a reaction against WWI.

Like WWI historians, later twentieth century historians generally confirmed the Victorian stereotypes of prudery/hypocrisy, repression and Victorian duplicity, but attempted to add a psychological dimension to their analyses, distinguishing them from the arbitrary rationalism of their WWI generation counterparts. Although they acknowledged the existence of a private sphere, they condemned it as hypocritical and they utilized sources from the public realm to support the idea that the Victorians were repressed.

One twentieth century historian, Ronald Pearsall, did not question the stereotype of Victorian repression, but reprimanded it with his statement that repressed desire naturally lead to the Victorian fear and the arbitrary reactionism of their WWI generation counterparts. Although they acknowledged the existence of a private sphere, they condemned it as hypocritical and were repressed (422). Pearsall, did not question the stereotype of Victorian repression, but reprimanded it with his statement that repressed desire naturally lead to the Victorian fear and the arbitrary reactionism of their WWI generation counterparts. Although they acknowledged the existence of a private sphere, they condemned it as hypocritical and were repressed (422). Pearsall referred to the exploits of a British voyeur, the notorious Cap...
In his book, *Education of the Sexes*, Peter Gay used Freudian analysis to dispel and explain stereotypes of the Victorian Prude and Hypocrite. Freud defined hypocrisy as an ambivalence in the societal expectations of man (420). According to Freud, any man in civilization was an unconscious hypocrite (418). In his book, Gay represented the Victorian man as a convention-prone individual being pulled between the Freudian concepts of the id (desire and instincts of the individual) and the Superego (the pressures of the family and society), searching for knowledge and meaning and life.

The elements of the Victorian bourgeoisie, through the lens of Freudian theory, were the "pangs of sex, the pressures of technology, the anxieties of physicians, the risks of pregnancy, the passion for privacy... [and] man's fear of woman" (459). Gay believed that men educated themselves through their senses by building upon Freudian concepts of infantile sensory education and awareness and through acceptance of the superego. Gay's use of Freud, combined with his wide variety of public and private sources, a variety that other Victorian historians have lacked, enabled him to determine what actual sexual knowledge the Victorians possessed and how they acquired it. He explained their acquisition of sexual knowledge through his concepts of factitious innocence, learned ignorance and platonic libertinism.

According to Gay, Victorian men and women were not sexually innocent in the sense that they believed themselves to be innocent. It was a factitious, but not fictitious, innocence (279). Although they were not sexually innocent, they were not hypocrites because of their reluctance to acknowledge it. Factitious innocence in middle class women led to a 'learned ignorance'. Victorian women unconsciously remembered their initial sexual knowledge, first gained in infancy, during marriage and were able to overcome their ignorance (280). However, because of societal expectations, men wanted to believe that women were "ignorant[1] of vice" or of anything sexual because of their education through the superego. Society stated that women did not have sexual knowledge (280). Because of these public requirements, women and men were forced to maintain the facade of learned ignorance, but it was not so, as Karen Lystra also supported, in the private sphere of the Victorian, especially women, acquired sexual knowledge through 'platonic libertinism', obtaining sexual knowledge by looking and hearing, but not touching, which explained much of their misinformation (334). Specifically, Victorians obtained knowledge by listening to servants, through the observation of the birthing process, from public statutes of nudity, and by public displays of breast feeding (351, 352, 337). Gay used other sources, such as cookbooks and personal journals to dispel the myth of prudery. Mrs. Beeton's *The Book of Household Management* assumed that the housewife was familiar with procedures for cutting off the heads of turtles for soup and examining the breasts of possible wet nurses. Gay remarked with humor that "there isn't a whiff of smelling salts over these pages" (346). Gay also dispelled the myth that bourgeois men were too restricted by propriety to be useful. When forced to become involved with the pregnancies of their wives, "the consequences of foreordained bourgeois men involved and informed" (354). Although William Gladstone actively participated in the pregnancy of his wife, by rubbing her breasts nightly to increase the circulation of milk, he could not bring himself to write the word 'breast' in his journal (352). This suggested that no writer involved and active husband, but also that euphemisms were deeply imbedded within him. Gay's standards, William Gladstone was not a hypocrite because Gladstone's reluctance to write about sex did not inhibit his actions. This is true with this and other examples, Gay emphasized the extent which the superego was embedded within the Victorian psyche.

According to Charles Reade (cited within Gay's book), the "true prude," or self-moralizer, was the real Victorian hypocrite (378). Gay asserted that the works of these purists, such as Anthony Comstock, were not representative of Victorian culture, but a reflection of what these reformers sought to be (379). The separation of spheres of what Froude called the "utter divorce between practice and profession" was not a strictly Victorian behavior, but has existed and continued to exist in every major civilization (Gay 406). By presenting alternative explanations and viewpoints of the Victorians, through Freud and through Victorian voices, it became more and more difficult to simply condemn the Victorian as a prude and a hypocrite.

Even more so than Peter Gay, Karen Lystra, in her book *Searching the Heart*, examined the private sphere of the Victorian, strictly through love letters. During the Victorian era, without the modern means of contacting one another, letters were the primary means lovers had of communicating with one another, but they were also a way for the Victorians to reveal their true selves. Yet the very existence of a 'true self' disputes the idea of Victorian prudery/hypocrisy. To the Victorians, intimacy and love were extremely important, but were only acceptable within the domain of the private sphere. The public realm was too uncertain for the Victorians to reveal their true selves. Because of the value of privacy, relationships in the private realm became sacred and were valued more.

In the twentieth century, Americans merge the public and private spheres, and the idea of 'separate spheres' contradicts our supposedly superior openness. What Peter Gay refers to as the 'passion for privacy', according to Lystra, made Victorian love sacred (17). Through her research, Lystra noticed that Victorians derived "considerable pleasure" by speaking of sex in private, which did not indicate prudery, or any unwillingness to speak of sex (59). For instance, Lincoln Clark, a member of the Victorian bourgeoisie, challenged Acton's theory that women have no sexual pleasure when he wrote "I have the vanity to believe that the pleasure would not all be on one side" (61). Dorotha Lummi, another member of the Victorian bourgeoisie, wrote her husband after a separation that "I hope your heart and your lips and all of your sweet body will be warm and welcome with desire...", which further disputes Acton's claim...
that women had no sexual feeling (74). Another unusual letter from prominent bourgeois minister, Robert Burdette, fantasized about his next meeting with his "Little Girl"/lover, Clara (95). He described to Clara a fantasy with his "Little Girl" resting in his arms with "one free hand. . . that wants to play hide-and-seek with two soft, snowy play fellows now and again. \And you have a hand\? Well. . . it has its own hiding place" (95). Although WWI and WWII historians would find this letter hypocritical, due to Burdette's position as a minister and well-respected member of his community, it illustrated that Victorians, indeed took great pleasure in discussing sexual acts. Robert and Clara enjoyed sexually fantasizing in their letters in the private sphere, yet they knew that their letters were completely inappropriate in the public realm, perhaps enhancing their pleasure in the private realm. Gay and Lystra dispelled Victorian stereotypes of prudery and hypocrisy by re-defining them through an examination of the public and private sources. Unlike previous historians of the WWI and WWII generations, Gay and Lystra questioned and examined sources such as Marryat and Acton in order to gain a realistic understanding of Victorian ideologies. They also utilized personal journals to gain a perspective directly from the bourgeois, which revealed that Victorians possessed sexual knowledge as well as sincerity. These sources revealed the complexity of Victorian society, and the need for structure and self-revelation in a changing society. When examined in their own private settings, the Victorians were not prudes. They fortified themselves within their separate spheres in order to maintain their identities. It is impossible to generalize nearly a century of people, spanning all classes and two countries, as prudish. Before labeling or generalizing a society, one must examine sources that call them prudish and determine why: the time period and the use of accounts from the public, rather than the private sphere. It was easier for many historians to promote the image of Victorian prudery than to reinterpret and explain it as did Peter Gay and Karen Lystra. Before our society looks at another, one should think about how our own society will be reviewed, using what methods and what sources. The most vocal or prolific members of any society are not necessarily the most representative. While our contemporary society discourages labeling individuals, it seems an impossibility that we should attempt to label a whole society and reduce it to a single word. The Victorians were not simply prudish, but were a part of a complex social structure and rich culture. By labeling them and reducing them to a negative connotation of an outdated word, prude, our society misses all that they represent and offer to the future.
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The Reality Blowing In

BY HILLARY CAMPBELL '00

NOTE: This essay was written as a response to James Faulkner's Sanctuary, Virginia Woolf's The Waves, and Ford Madox Ford's The Good Soldier—it is a conversation between myself and three characters from the novels: Sanctuary's Temple, Waves' Bernard, and Soldier's Dowell. Though I realize this essay is not written in any typical analytical or "academic" form, I nevertheless chose to write it this way in order to illustrate both the main point of the essay (the reality of fiction), as well as to mirror the brilliantly convincing style/technique/realism found in Waves. After reading these three novels, I wanted to express the inherent modern nature of them all, in addition to each author's haunting ability to draw strings between the characters in the novels and the readers reading about them. This essay was meant—typical though it may be—to voice my interpretations of the three novels in a way just as imaginative as that found in the novels, and in a way highly worthy of the texts I have come to adore.

"There's an excitement, a blooming, an electricity—almost like a living, breathing current running through the brown grass and bricks and flesh. Every seat is filled and the day is sunny, as though a breathless workers, abounding with words. You can and-white what is colorful and imaginary and false—Dowell says."

"A throbbing in my right cheek. A tiny heart—"I say."

"What narrative?" Temple asks."

"And you just plan to sit there while we talk?"

"That's the plan."

"What's 'this?'" Temple asks."

"Say what?"

"Whose life?"

"Say what?"

"It was interpretive," I say, opening my eyes to find it, he once said to me. If you want to find it, you will. Wanting is acknowledging self, acknowledging need and desire and you, I, me, because none of us knows a 'right' definition of ourselves. It is all make-believe and taking photos like those up on the wall there. Why? A glossy You is not the real You, and yet you paste and stick because you want to be associated with that happy, smiling You. A faux reality. A proposal of the delighted girl by the beach in California, with hair that is longer now. And yet you claim that that is who you were and are and want to be. But you don't know."

"That's in Florida," I say.
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In the silence, the candle flickers. We can all hear its silent fury, and we can all hear the car roar by outside. The darker it becomes outside, the fuzzier long. No one will want to talk back to her. No one stress and academia, though, I know she won't last Dowell's breath sounds like another candle. Temple ready to fall. Bernard's weight creaks a spring.

"And why? For what purpose? To point what lesson? It is all a darkness" (Ford 151), Dowell says. "Darkness," Temple says. "Darkness," Bernard says. The candle goes out in Dowell's eyes, and the smoke fills the room as though it were fog choking the humanity out of us. I smirk. I begin to feel like we are losing sight of what is important, of what I had originally sat them all down to tell me. "So does life narrate?" I ask, and I think why would anyone want to narrate this moment, with the black pulse of the window trying so hard to get in here.

"What makes us human is to tell stories. Con- stancy. Reterration. You—" Bernard looks at me, "I don't know your story, and I have no reason to believe what you say is true, and yet I choose to listen to it, because that's what makes me pull the blinds to the sunlight. Pull them up. You—" he looks to Dowell, "I don't know if what you've said is true. I don't think you know, and you began to doubt it when they all told you your life. You—" he looks to Temple, "are insane. I don't know that you even have a bed, a kitchen, a liking of fish. Your world was turned upside-down, and all you can say is that you had a cat."

"He was gone when I got home," Temple says to the floor, quietly.

I look to my hands, and back up again. Ber- nard continues.

"But this reterritory is not true—it can't be proven or verified because of the meaningless of every- thing around us. Like a good friend of mine told me, 'I desired always to stretch the night and fill it fuller and fuller with dreams'" (Woolf 205). This cotton? Hell no! It's a dream. This carpet. This swirl on my tongue and between my toes. My outstretched hand to you is but an illusion." He looks to me. "Who writes the story—the writer or the reader?"

"Well, the writer," I say without pause. But as soon as I say it, I know I'm wrong. And I'm scared. And I'm terrified of putting myself out there on the line, and writing reality, and having all blow up in my face when this person draws this from it, and that person draws from that, until it's not mine anymore, and therefore by stripping away my narra- tion of life, they have stripped me away, as well.

"I have done with phrases" (Woolf 295), Ber- nard says. "Life is not susceptible perhaps to the treatment we give it when we try to tell it" (Woolf 267).

I look desperately, clawing for solid ground, head swiveling, to Dowell, who only shakes his head and says softly, "I leave it to you" (Ford 220). Gathering limbs and sentences and movement, they leave my room of light slowly, one by one, slipping out as Lisa did such a seemingly long time ago. I feel completely at a loss—completely helpless and hopeless and without answers. And yet, somehow, with.

They are gone. I am alone. Perhaps I dream of their stay, and of what was said. Perhaps in the morning it will all be like evaporating mist, and my bed will not have his imprint on it anymore. The throbbing in my chest has stopped. My foot is awake. And looking for life to narrate, there is nothing but she, who swims through my eyes, and reminds me of the electricity and the falseness of the students and the need to finish this, this, this. There is nothing but she, the reality blowing in…

"That was when I got to thinking a funny thing. You know how you do when you're scared. I was looking at my legs and I'd try to make like I was a boy. I was thinking about if I just was a boy and then I tried to make myself into one by thinking. You know how you do things like that?" (Faulkner216)."
From Surrealism to Trance Film and Beyond

Trance films in general ... tend to resist specific interpretation. (Sitney 23)

In his book, Visionary Film, P. Adams Sitney describes the trance film as the link between earlier surrealist film and the later mythopoetic and structural films of the avant-garde cinema. Trance films in general seem indeterminant in meaning; it is difficult to say that they literally mean some specific thing, as they seem poetic in form, like metaphors for their subjects. Often, trance films or their precursors in the surrealist tradition employ psychological symbols and themes in order to suggest an overall idea on feeling to the viewer, as opposed to a straightforward narrative plot. In this way, these films can almost be understood as impressionistic in some sense.

In Sitney's definition, he considers the trance film (and other avant-garde films of the same period) to deal with several themes: the unconscious articulation of space, the quest for sexual identity, the evocation of the dream-state (Sitney 18). However, unlike the trance film, "the surrealist cinema ... depends upon the power of film to evoke a mad voyeurism and to imitate the very discontinuity, the horror, and the irrationality of the unconscious (Sitney 11). I would agree with Sitney in this respect; trance films seem much more ordered and rational than surrealist ones.

The link between surrealist film and trance films is related to the dream-like quality which both genres portray on the screen. By transporting the viewer to a place which can exist with elements not from reality, the trance filmmaker is able to create a work which asserts its meaning in a nontraditional way. That is, the meaning of a film from either genre will not be easily deciphered; the images cannot always be taken at face value, or the film might seem to have no meaning at all. Sitney also sees a connection historically between the trance film and what he calls the mythopoetic or mythographic film. He writes,

The fundamental change of the early 1960s within the avant-garde film, as I have shown in several places, was the emergence of the mythopoetic film, a direct descendant of the trance film, which had undergone a gradual but fragmented evolution in the 1950s. (Sitney 345)

The mythopoetic film is similar to the trance film in that it also concentrates on the "privacy of the imagination." But whereas the trance film concentrates on a dream-state, the mythopoetic film focuses on ritual and myth, whether already established or created in the diegesis (Sitney 123). As in its precursors, mythopoetic film has an ambiguity surrounding the meaning or plot of the film, giving it as well a sense of indeterminate meaning.

As I discuss the individual films I have chosen from surrealism: Salvador Dalí and Luis Buñuel's Un Chien Andalou, from trance film Maya Deren's Meshes of the Afternoon and At Land and from mythopoetic film, Kenneth Anger's Invocation of the Pleasure Dome, Puce Moment and Kustom Kar Kommandos. I hope to make clear the evolution of the avant-garde film as Sitney has described it, from the surrealist films of the 1920s to the trance films of the 1940s and then to the mythopoetic films of the 1950-60s. But most of all, I also hope to show that it is possible that the further evolution of the avant-garde may branch off from the current structuralist trend into something which most closely resembles "cinematic impressionism."

Un Chien Andalou and Trance Film Elements

Un Chien Andalou (1928) by Luis Buñuel and Salvador Dalí, has long been heralded as the definitive surrealist work of the cinema. As Buñuel himself wrote after the film had been made:

It should be noted that when an image or idea appeared the collaborators discarded it immediately if it was derived from remembrance, or from their cultural pattern or if, simply, it had a conscious association with another earlier idea. They accepted only those representations as valid which, though they moved them profusely, had no possible explanation...

The motivation of the images was, or meant to be, purely irrational. They are as mysteriously and inexplicable to the two collaborators as to the spectator. NOTHING, in the film, SYMBOLIZES ANYTHING. (Mullen 153)

It would seem from this emphatic note from the filmmaker that in fact, trying to find any coherent meaning in the film would be futile. However, because the same characters are seen throughout the film, it seems impossible for the viewer to not perceive some sort of linearity or continuity (of which Buñuel also writes). "Far from being puzzling, the film achieves the clarity of a dream" (Sitney 4).

However, because of the interdiles which make clear that the film actually spans a period of eight years, confusion sets in. Without these indicators of time, one could attempt to view the film as a somewhat chronological narrative, albeit in the form of a dream. With these interdiles, there is some ambiguity as to the order of the events. The most ambiguous perhaps is the phrase "eight years later" which follows the eye-slaeching scene and precedes the scene in which the main female character rushes to assist the cyclist, her eye now intact. There is no cause and effect type of action occurring here; events may seem to proceed in an order, but they are never as a result of anything else in the film.

Even with all these ambiguities (or perhaps because of them), Un Chien Andalou does convey the mood or aura of a dream state, readily recognizable because of the inconsistencies in plot and causality which are the mainstays of traditional narrative film. Even though Sitney would classify Un Chien Andalou as a surrealist film (and I would not dispute this) it also has many elements of trance film, alluding to the evolution into it. As already mentioned, the film evokes a dream state, one of the staple elements of surrealism which "leaked into" trance film. Both filmmakers also appear in the film, though not as protagonists: Buñuel as the eyeball killer and Dalí as one of the priests being pulled along with the pi-不予

Elements of the search for sexual identity are also present within the film. The androgynous is especially representative of this trance characteristic. Also, the man as a sexual predator towards the woman and the woman as she relates to the various men both seem to be searching.

Un Chien Andalou does not seem to contain many elements pertaining to the unconscious articulation of space, but it is not a trance film anyway. In fact the surrealist elements far exceed the trance elements, so while it may fit into the trance genre, it is on the fringes of such a definition.

The Evolution of the Avant-Garde

... the surrealistic cinema ... depends upon the power of film to evoke a mad voyeurism and to imitate the very discontinuity, the horror, and the irrationality of the unconscious (Sitney 11). I would agree with Sitney in this respect; trance films seem much more ordered and rational than surrealist ones.
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Like Buñuel and Dalí, it seems that Deren did not intend for her films to give any specific meaning. The introduction which she reads on a videotape of one of her films reads:

I am content if on those rare occasions whose truth can be stated only by poetry, you will, perhaps, recall an image — even if only the aura of my films.

However, even though there is no determinate meaning in her works, Deren succeeded in helping to define an entirely new genre in the American avant-garde cinema.

Perhaps Deren's Meshes of the Afternoon (1942) is the film which best exemplifies the emergence of the trance film from surrealism. It fits somewhere in between the two genres because of its heavy reliance on Freudian psychological symbols mixed into a dreamlike diegesis. Another filmmaker praises this use of such symbols:

Perhaps the most startling thing about this film is the naturalness and ease with which it presents certain psychological symbols ... Maya had the capacity to speak more directly about what everyone else was being very pompous about — that is, symbolism, particularly psychological symbolism — than anyone else I ever met. If one underestimates such a talent, then I suggest trying to make a film that uses the obvious psychological symbols like keys and knives as Meshes does and not bring the house down with laughter. (Brakhage 93)
Meshe is more ordered than a surrealist film because it does portray a continuous story, but the objects which are central to the film (telephone receiver, flower, knife, key) are reminiscent of the striped objects which are central to the film (telephone receiver, flower, knife, key) are reminiscent of the striped

The very words which Anger uses to describe his vision of his film are imbued with religious and mythic imagery. The car is seemingly "birthed" from the mythical Hollywood which Anger portrayed in The Inauguration of the Pleasure Dome (1956, revised 1966). Sitney calls this film "the most formal work to herald the emerging mythic form in American avant-garde film. (Sitney 124)

In Inauguration, Anger displays a somewhat bizarre "magical" ritual, not unlike what he himself undertook in his occult practices, only the participants in this ritual are gods from Greek, Roman and Egyptian and Christian mythology. The film is imbued with rich colors and at times up to five layers of superimpositions, giving the ritual a sense of richly layered luminosity.

Inauguration does seem to embody what Sitney means when he writes, "The triumph of the mythopoeic film ... spring from the filmmakers' libration from the repetition of traditional mythology and their flight from which they forged a cinematic form for the creation or revelation of new myths." (124). However, the film also contains remnants of the trance era as well. The heavy layering of superimpositions and the strangely trance-like movements of many of the characters evoke the dream-like mood that the avant-garde has long been known for.

The strange orgy which ensues after Pan's poignantly looks at the subject as it applies to painting, an impressionistic film would be an exhibition of independent artists in 1874. The term [impressionism] was first used to characterize the group in response to the first exhibition of independent artists in 1874. Louis Leroy and other hostile critics seized on the title of an exhibition of independent artists in 1874. Louis Leroy and other hostile critics seized on the title of a painting by Monet Impression, Sunrise, as exemplifying the radically unfinished character of the works. The word 'impression' to describe the immediate effect of a perception was in use at the time by writers on both psychology and art. Jules-Antoine Castagnary's review (1874) demonstrates that it was not always used in a negative way: 'They are impressionist in the sense that they render not the landscape but the sensation produced by the landscape' ... The term is sometimes described to use freely executed effects in works of other periods in which the artist has presented an impression of the visual appearance of a subject rather than a precise notation. (Turner, Vol. 8 151-152)

The above definition dictionary of impressionism could be effectively applied to many of the films I have discussed as a surrealist, trance or mythopoeic genera. Especially because of the inde

The term [impressionism] was first used to characterize the group in response to the first exhibition of independent artists in 1874. Louis Leroy and other hostile critics seized on the title of a painting by Monet Impression, Sunrise, as exemplifying the radically unfinished character of the works. The word 'impression' to describe the immediate effect of a
with "finding a technical means to express individual sensations" (Turner 151). It seems then that impressionism would be autobiographical and the scene that it would pay attention to more private experiences and trying to convey the actual feelings of these to the viewer. Here the analogy of experimental film as "film poem" (Sitney vii) becomes useful as we imagine a sort of synesthesia as the poet/filmmaker endeavors to give visual representations of the tactile elements of an experience.

It is difficult to predict where the avant-garde cinema will next lead us, but I do believe that perhaps this sort of impressionism is possible as long as one intensely studies the subtle differences between the already established genres and builds upon the development which has occurred over the past seventy years. If a project is consciously undertaken to build upon the past historical development of the avant-garde cinematic art form, perhaps impressionism is a possibility.
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INCEST IN THE GOTHIC NOVEL

BY WYATT HOLLIDAY '98

The human mind has a preoccupation with sex and violence but seems to be unable to reconcile itself with the extension of this preoccupation, namely violent sex such as incest. This preoccupation is nothing new; there has been incest as long as there have been people. If you believe the Judeo-Christian Bible, the entire human race is the product of incest; if God only made Adam and Eve, with whom else could their children "go forth and multiply"? This theme is also widespread and prevalent across the centuries in other literature; and it has usually evoked horror and disgust in those who encounter it. Witness Shakespeare's Hamlet (a possible Gothic hero, himself), and his opinion in 1600-ish of incest:

O, that this too solid flesh would melt ...
Or that the Everlasting had not fixed
His canon 'gainst self slaughter!
... within a month (of my father's death) ...
... (my mother) married with my uncle,
My father's brother ... "O, most wicked speed, to post
With such dexterity to incestuous sheets (Hamlet Ll)

Indeed, Anne Williams lists the reasons that Hamlet, both the character and the play, is so important to later Gothic writers such as Walpole: it has "a castle; a ghost; a madwoman; a family secret concerning a murder; plenty of violence; and incest (emphasis mine), both actual and implicit" (31). Horace Walpole's The Castle of Otranto was written in the England of the 1760's and contains seeds of implied and attempted incest and incestuous images. Incest as a Gothic convention is also, however, as contemporary as Anne Rice's Interview with a Vampire, which had a doubly creepy movie version which showed on the big screen the very real implications of the Louis character's kissing the Claudia character. Incest is as much a Gothic convention as a locked door. I will attempt herein to explore how the convention of incest in the Gothic novel has played a role in the genre by examining the ways in which it has been used in the first major Gothic, Walpole's Otranto, and Matthew Gregory Lewis's also early The Monk.

In Walpole's The Castle of Otranto, incest serves several functions, one of which is to further the "dominant power structure," i.e. the patriarchy, in which lies the source of all political and economic power in the novel (Winter 18). The Gothic genre can be seen as a family romance in that it mostly concerns itself with the comings and goings, morals and mores, of one (or several) particular family units. Otranto fits easily into this mold; the novel opens to a description of the inhabitants of the Castle, and reads almost like a cast list at the beginning of a play:

Manfred, Prince of Ortranto, had one son and one daughter: The latter a most beautiful virgin, aged eighteen, was called Matilda. Conrad, the son, was three years younger, a homely youth, sickly, and of no promising disposition; yet he was the darling of his father, who never showed any symptoms of affection to Matilda. Manfred had contracted a marriage for his son with the Marquis of Vincenza's daughter, Elizabeth (Walpole 15).

From this opening, we have a sense of the family politics: the stronger older child, a daughter, is ignored and unloved, while the younger, sickly boy is doted upon and already is engaged to be married. Manfred sees his son as the only acceptable heir to the paternalistic realm of Otranto, even to the point that he seems not even to recognize the Darwinistic superiority of his daughter. Manfred seems nearly mad for viable male heirs, because there is a prophesy which foretells the downfall of "the House of Manfred." When his wife Hippolita attempts to dissuade Manfred from his intention to marry Conrad

Wyatt Holliday is a senior English literature major. When asked about his plans for after graduation, he responded "I don't want to buy, sell, or process anything. I don't want to buy anything that is sold or processed, sell anything that is bought or processed; or process anything that is bought, sold or processed; and I don't want to repair anything that is bought, sold or processed." He's thinking about kick-boxing, "the sport of the future."
off because of "his great infirmities," Manfred "never from the start, on the first page of the novel: "(Isabella) ... to set the scene for Manfred's attempt at his life. The irony, of course, is that, through his mad quest for an heir, he destroys his chance of having one; the action of the story ultimately leads to nothing more than the theme, of which Walpole himself speaks ill in the Translator's Preface, "the sins of fathers are visited on their children" (Walpole 5).

It is important to remember, however, that Manfred's attempt at incest in fact is what destroys his first chance to have an heir, and that his other chance for an heir is consumed in a situation that, at least from a Freudian standpoint, contains imagery which seems to imply incest. The presence of incest in the action foretells certain ruin, because incest stands in direct opposition to the family paradigm which is central to the Gothic as family romance. As Anne Williams sets forth in her excellent Art of Darkness: Foulcault ... argues that "sexuality" was superimposed upon alliance," creating a situation in which the demands of family, property, social order, and tradition conflict with the new ideas of the private self that the private self should constitute the fundamental basis of private behavior. ... It follows ... that such an arrangement would regard incest, the paradoxical theme of degradation into triviality" (32).

There is a further scene which further the idea that "that strain of industrial trageiny" will lead to "Gothic and Camp remain [ing] on intimate terms" (Duncan 32) (a phenomenon proved by the tremendous success of the movie Scream last year). In trying to understand the "depaysement" which has occurred, one is tempted to suggest that the topic of incest is plumbed by Manfred's suggestion of marriage with his former-soon-to-be-daughter-in-law, Walpole (unintentionally) writes one of the most humorous scenes in all of Gothic literature: Manfred (waving) advancing to seize the Princess. At that instant the portrait of his grandfather, which hung over the bench where they had been sitting, uttered a deep sigh, and heaved its breast. ... The picture ... began to move ... quite its panel, and descended (on the floor with grave and melancholy air) (24).

Recalling Hamlet's Father's ghost, the specter motions for his erant descendant to follow; when Manfred tries to follow, thinking the specter is come to impart knowledge upon Manfred, the ghost shuts a door in his face. This scene is interesting because it deals with the implications of incest on two levels: that it is so horrific that the mere suggestion of it causes Manfred's dead ancestors to get up and leave the room, while at the same time inspiring the rather comic image of Manfred's dead ancestors getting up, leaving the room, and slamming the door in his face.

There is, of course, more to the treatment of incest in Orsento than just camp and irony. There is real and genuine connection to the grossness of the idea of incest. After all, incest does, in the end, cause the downfall of the present principality, leave dead bodies strewn about, and send people into religious vows. The real grossness of the incest is best shown in the scene in which Isabella, Matilda, and Hippolita are crying about the, at that point, seemingly inevitable divorce/incestuous marriage which would come about as a result of Manfred's quest for an heir. A careful examination of the formation of the scene reveals a deep-seated allegory for the suggestion of the divorce/incestuous marriage. Manfred is reviled as a "impious man," "a murderer, an assassin," "odious," and my personal favorite, "execrable" (Walpole 90-1). Near the beginning of the section, Isabella responds to Hippolita's assertion that she cannot hear ill of her father?—no, Madam, no; force should not drag me into the room, while at the same time imparting the rather dant feelings of possession, domination and power, the implication of incestuous rape in this scene, as replacement for his giant-helmet-fallen-from-the-sky-killed son with the cry "Heavens!" and goes on to use too many exclamation points to be taken very seriously: "What do I hear! You! My Lord! You! My father-in-law! the father of Conrad! the husband of the virtuous and tender Hippolita!" (Walpole 23).

As Ian Duncan suggests, "the writing mimics its own theme of degradation into triviality" (32). There is a further scene which further the idea that "that strain of industrial trageiny" will lead to "Gothic and Camp remain[ing] on intimate terms" (Duncan 32) (a phenomenon proved by the tremendous success of the movie Scream last year). In trying to understand the "depaysement" which has occurred, one is tempted to suggest that the topic of incest is plumbed by Manfred's suggestion of marriage with his former-soon-to-be-daughter-in-law, Walpole (unintentionally) writes one of the most humorous scenes in all of Gothic literature: Manfred (waving) advancing to seize the Princess. At that instant the portrait of his grandfather, which hung over the bench where they had been sitting, uttered a deep sigh, and heaved its breast. ... The picture ... began to move ... quite its panel, and descended (on the floor with grave and melancholy air) (24).

Recalling Hamlet's Father's ghost, the specter motions for his erant descendant to follow; when Manfred tries to follow, thinking the specter is come to impart knowledge upon Manfred, the ghost shuts a door in his face. This scene is interesting because it deals with the implications of incest on two levels: that it is so horrific that the mere suggestion of it causes Manfred's dead ancestors to get up and leave the room, while at the same time inspiring the rather comic image of Manfred's dead ancestors getting up, leaving the room, and slamming the door in his face.

There is, of course, more to the treatment of incest in Orsento than just camp and irony. There is real and genuine connection to the grossness of the idea of incest. After all, incest does, in the end, cause the downfall of the present principality, leave dead bodies strewn about, and send people into religious vows. The real grossness of the incest is best shown in the scene in which Isabella, Matilda, and Hippolita are crying about the, at that point, seemingly inevitable divorce/incestuous marriage which would come about as a result of Manfred's quest for an heir. A careful examination of the formation of the scene reveals a deep-seated allegory for the suggestion of the divorce/incestuous marriage. Manfred is reviled as a "impious man," "a murderer, an assassin," "odious," and my personal favorite, "execrable" (Walpole 90-1). Near the beginning of the section, Isabella responds to Hippolita's assertion that she cannot hear ill of her father?—no, Madam, no; force should not drag me into the room, while at the same time imparting the rather dant feelings of possession, domination and power, the implication of incestuous rape in this scene, as replacement for his giant-helmet-fallen-from-the-sky-killed son with the cry "Heavens!" and goes on to use too many exclamation points to be taken very seriously: "What do I hear! You! My Lord! You! My father-in-law! the father of Conrad! the husband of the virtuous and tender Hippolita!" (Walpole 23).

As Ian Duncan suggests, "the writing mimics its own theme of degradation into triviality" (32). There is a further scene which further the idea that "that strain of industrial trageiny" will lead to "Gothic and Camp remain[ing] on intimate terms" (Duncan 32) (a phenomenon proved by the tremendous success of the movie Scream last year). In trying to understand the "depaysement" which has occurred, one is tempted to suggest that the topic of incest is plumbed by Manfred's suggestion of marriage with his former-soon-to-be-daughter-in-law, Walpole (unintentionally) writes one of the most humorous scenes in all of Gothic literature: Manfred (waving) advancing to seize the Princess. At that instant the portrait of his grandfather, which hung over the bench where they had been sitting, uttered a deep sigh, and heaved its breast. ... The picture ... began to move ... quite its panel, and descended (on the floor with grave and melancholy air) (24).

Recalling Hamlet's Father's ghost, the specter motions for his erant descendant to follow; when Manfred tries to follow, thinking the specter is come to impart knowledge upon Manfred, the ghost shuts a door in his face. This scene is interesting because it deals with the implications of incest on two levels: that it is so horrific that the mere suggestion of it causes Manfred's dead ancestors to get up and leave the room, while at the same time inspiring the rather comic image of Manfred's dead ancestors getting up, leaving the room, and slamming the door in his face.

There is, of course, more to the treatment of incest in Orsento than just camp and irony. There is real and genuine connection to the grossness of the idea of incest. After all, incest does, in the end, cause the downfall of the present principality, leave dead bodies strewn about, and send people into religious vows. The real grossness of the incest is best shown in the scene in which Isabella, Matilda, and Hippolita are crying about the, at that point, seemingly inevitable divorce/incestuous marriage which would come about as a result of Manfred's quest for an heir. A careful examination of the formation of the scene reveals a deep-seated allegory for the suggestion of the divorce/incestuous marriage. Manfred is reviled as a "impious man," "a murderer, an assassin," "odious," and my personal favorite, "execrable" (Walpole 90-1). Near the beginning of the section, Isabella responds to Hippolita's assertion that she cannot hear ill of her father?—no, Madam, no; force should not drag me into the room, while at the same time imparting the rather dant feelings of possession, domination and power, the implication of incestuous rape in this scene, as replacement for his giant-helmet-fallen-from-the-sky-killed son with the cry "Heavens!" and goes on to use too many exclamation points to be taken very seriously: "What do I hear! You! My Lord! You! My father-in-law! the father of Conrad! the husband of the virtuous and tender Hippolita!" (Walpole 23).

As Ian Duncan suggests, "the writing mimics its own theme of degradation into triviality" (32). There is a further scene which further the idea that "that strain of industrial trageiny" will lead to "Gothic and Camp remain[ing] on intimate terms" (Duncan 32) (a phenomenon proved by the tremendous success of the movie Scream last year). In trying to understand the "depaysement" which has occurred, one is tempted to suggest that the topic of incest is plumbed by Manfred's suggestion of marriage with his former-soon-to-be-daughter-in-law, Walpole (unintentionally) writes one of the most humorous scenes in all of Gothic literature: Manfred (waving) advancing to seize the Princess. At that instant the portrait of his grandfather, which hung over the bench where they had been sitting, uttered a deep sigh, and heaved its breast. ... The picture ... began to move ... quite its panel, and descended (on the floor with grave and melancholy air) (24).

Recalling Hamlet's Father's ghost, the specter motions for his erant descendant to follow; when Manfred tries to follow, thinking the specter is come to impart knowledge upon Manfred, the ghost shuts a door in his face. This scene is interesting because it deals with the implications of incest on two levels: that it is so horrific that the mere suggestion of it causes Manfred's dead ancestors to get up and leave the room, while at the same time inspiring the rather comic image of Manfred's dead ancestors getting up, leaving the room, and slamming the door in his face.
forced "innocence" of the Catholic priest that the urge and drive to be promiscuous arises. Steven Bruhm proposes that in breaking free from the dictates of the church, Ambrosio swings too far in the opposite direction, gaining an excessious revenge on a symbo-

of the Church, the Madonna-esque Antonia: "so while we may applaud his transgression against au-

thority, we recoil against his transgressions" (130). Much in the way the readers of Otranto were equally horrified and amused by the juxtaposition of the vile and the comic, it could be argued that there is a possi-

ble duality in the reader's response to Ambrosio in the beginning sections of the novel. However, I would assert that as we delve into the novel, we come realize that Ambrosio's "play the power" impulses ultimately manifest themselves in his acts of murder, rape, and the eventual "sale" of his soul to Satan. Lewis's tale lacks the horror which made Otranto a pleasurable read; instead, the plot of The Monk does "not depend on comedy or tragedy but rather on suspense, anxiety, and fear" (Winter 18). The scenes of degradation are wholly degraded; we know, or at least suspect, early in the novel that any sexual congress between Ambrosio and Antonia would be incestuous, as the novel is loaded with hints and dual images involving these two characters, right down to their names. Ambrosio's quest for the con-

summation of his sexual fantasy echoes Manfred's quest for an heir, in that it seems to wholly consume him, to the point that he loses sight of all else; how-

ever, while Manfred is the villain of the novel, he is not (really) really side. Ambrosio, on the other hand, is possibly the most despicable character we have en-

countered in Gothic literature: he trades his soul to the Devil so that he may have the opportunity to kidnap, rape and murder his sister. This sense of utter vulgarity is apparent in the passages which contain the actual rape. Ambrosio not only ruins a virgin (and figuratively, the Virgin), but he does it in a setting which suggests necrophilia, possibly the only sexual act which is seen, by and large, as more foul than incest. The sense of disgust which the rape engenders is furthered by the setting in which it occurs:

By the side of three putrid half-corroded Bodies lay the sleeping beauty... A's wrapped in her shroud She inclined upon the funeral Bier, She seems to smile at the Images of Death around her. While he gazed upon

their rotting bones and disgusting figures, who perhaps were once as sweet and lovely...(the images) served to strengthen his resolution to destroy Antonia's honour" (Lewis 379). It should be noted that, at this point, to Ambrosio, Antonia still serves as a representation of the Madonna, the Divine, the Perfect. He desires that aspect of Antonia as much as or more than her human "woman-necess": "what charms me, when ideal and considered as a superior Being, would disgust me, become Woman and tainted with all the failings of mortality" (Lewis 41). While it is ambiguous, I do not think that Ambrosio is "turned on" by the necrophilic imagery so much as by the dichotomy of those images and the transcendental beauty of Antonia. However, the act of the rape removes from Antonia the veil of divinity which she had to that point worn; she "becomes a woman," as the euphemism goes. I would assert that this sweeping away of perfection causes in Ambrosio a recognition, first of the rather immediate necrotic feeling which he and Antonia are surrounded, and secondly, on some level of the incestuous nature of the rape. Lewis tells us that at the aftermath of the consummation, Nature seems to recall to the touch. He felt himself at once repulsed from and at-

tracted towards her, yet could account for nei-

ther sentiment. There was something in her look which penetrated with horror; and though he understood instinct was still a stranger to it, Conscience pointed out to him the whole extent of his crime (387). The word choice here is very interesting. That Antonia "penetrated" him with horror" obviously recalls his earlier penetration of her sexually. To further this look at word choice, one need only examine the diction of the rape scene to under-

stand the utter disgust and degradation which the idea of the incestuous rape causes. The language which Lewis uses to describe the rape is frightening. Lewis portrays Ambrosio as "an unprincipled Bar-

barian" (383), who is wholly overcome with lust: "in the violence of his lustful delirium, [Ambrosio] wounded and bruised his tender limbs. Heerless of her tears, cries and entreaties. He gradually made himself self Master of her person, and desisted not from his prey, till he had accomplished his crime and the dishonour of Antonia (383-4).
genre, which I think bear stating (or repeating, at least). First, whenever a someone becomes involved in an incestuous relationship, that person is doomed. But secondly, and of paramount importance, I would assert that the presence of incest within the Gothic genre was used for the most part to invoke disgust and abhorrence, and to signal the downfall of any who become involved in it. While only early Gothic novels were examined herein, this sentiment holds true in later Gothic works as well: D'Art ends up in an asylum only after noticing that his sister's "wet dress shapes ... those mammalian lubricities which are the horizons and the valleys of the earth" (Faulkner 150), i.e. that Dewey Dell has a nice rack.

With this final image of horror, it is obvious that the convention of incest within the Gothic genre was used for the most part to invoke disgust and abhorrence, and to signal the downfall of any who become involved in it. While only early Gothic novels were examined herein, this sentiment holds true in later Gothic works as well: D'Art ends up in an asylum only after noticing that his sister's "wet dress shapes ... those mammalian lubricities which are the horizons and the valleys of the earth" (Faulkner 150), i.e. that Dewey Dell has a nice rack.
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Love relationships and marriage during the Renaissance boasted very specific social roles for both males and females. Ideal Renaissance men and women were required to obey distinct codes of conduct; these codes, once translated into marriage treaties, pervaded marriages of the day (Vaughan 76). Females were expected to be silent, chaste, and obedient figures of society. This image carried over into female marriage roles, as wives were trusted to faithfully obey their husbands. Males were chiefly concerned with their honor and reputation in society; that is, a husband was expected to retain control of his wife. If he could not, and she was unfaithful to him, then he was deemed a cuckold. Renaissance men feared cuckoldry, for it labeled women as whores, and as victims, and was viewed as a mockery of male virility (Kahn 122). Shakespeare commented on this pervasive Renaissance male fear and its impact on marriage in several plays. The relationship between Othello and Desdemona in Othello and that between Claudio and Hero in Much Ado About Nothing each illustrate male vulnerability to such a fear through Renaissance notions of female sexuality, as well as the ironic partnership of cuckoldry and the dependence of women's lives on the faith of their husbands.

According to Coppelia Kahn, cuckoldry was thought to be derived from three central attitudes toward Renaissance love relationships (121). Misogyny, the first of the beliefs, presumed that all women were licentious and wayward. The second belief was termed "double standard:" that is, infidelity was acceptable for men, but inexusable for women. The final belief was called "patriarchal marriage." This basically involved male domination of marriage and female status as property. When a woman was unfaithful to her husband, the value of his property rapidly deteriorated. In such a situation, a role reversal took place, converting the man to victim and the woman to the center of the action. This woman would be the first to be blamed, not her lover. She would suffer condemnation, while her lover would simply endure mere disapproval from the community. Strangely enough, cuckoldry, the true victims of the events, were brought more humiliation than were either of the adulterers. This is due in part to Renaissance masculine ideals, which implied that a woman's fidelity is a symbol of her husband's virility (Kahn 121).

Cuckoldry was represented in literature through symbolic horns. These horns were both a phallic symbol and a representation of male virility. A woman leading her husband by the horns was symbolic of the man allowing his virility to be manipulated by his wife. Of course, according to Renaissance masculinity, this idea was completely unacceptable, for it shifted the dominance from husband to wife. Men had three defenses against cuckoldry. The Renaissance man would either deny the existence of cuckoldry by objectifying women, expect female infidelity due to misogyny, or change the commonly outcast cuckold into a phallic symbol through horn imagery (Neely 141). These defenses allowed men to experience cuckoldry as a male bond, and to view marriage as a community of potential cuckolds.

In Othello, the plot revolves around the marriage of Othello and Desdemona. However, this marriage is one lacking in trust, as well as even personal intimacy, for Othello and Desdemona really know very little about each other. The relationship between the two is based solely on the tales Othello has shared with Desdemona: "She loved me for the dangers I had passed / And I loved her that she did pity them" (1.iii.167-8). The foundation of their marriage is composed totally of Othello's own life, which exhibits the self-centered qualities of Othello's love for Desdemona (Elliott 63). This lack of personal knowledge later manifests itself within the marriage as a lack of trust. According to Gerald Bentley, "romantic ignorance often paves the way for deception" (1019).

As Renaissance ideals, Othello and Desdemona both accept and reject established codes of conduct.
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Othello has been described as "ideally calm, reasonable, and rooted in a sense of legitimacy" (French 204). However, he rejects masculine ideals by wed- ding a much younger bride of a different social class (Vaughan 75). Renaissance men were supposed to be at most four to five years older than their wives. Othello is an alien in Venice, both racially and so- cially, and is not acquainted with Desdemona's world, and is highly vulnerable to Iago's deceit for that very reason. Othello can easily see the prejudice of Venice, but is blind to Desdemona's re- jection of this prejudice. However unlike today, Renaissance society would not have sympathized with Othello's position in a racist society. Michael D. Bristol concludes that Othello and Desdemona's marriage would have been seen as "an absurdly mutual attraction between a beautiful woman and a funny monster" (46). Even Iago is successful and respected, however his knowledge outside of military situations is limited ("Othello" 1990). This lack of societal familiarity pervades his consciousness, allowing Iago to manipulate Othello's jealousy.

Desdemona rejects ideal feminine identity in her outspokenness. Betraying her father, Desdemona demonstrates her reluctance to submit to male au- thority (Vaughan 75). However once married, Desdemona surrenders to the typical submissive char- acteristics of the Renaissance wife. She is obedient and respected, however his knowledge outside of military situations is limited ("Othello" 1990). This lack of societal familiarity pervades his consciousness, allowing Iago to manipulate Othello's jealousy. Desdemona shifts from one image to the other, then back to "superhuman" after her murder. Desdemona's growing jealousy results from this shift from "superhuman" to "subhuman" instigated by Iago. As an outsider in Renaissance society, Othello is par- ticularly vulnerable to Iago's influence. When pre- sented with Iago's vulgar images of Desdemona's sexu- ality, Othello immediately mistrusts his wife. In con- trast, Othello's trust in his Ancient never wavers. This image of Desdemona in favor of Iago is due both to Iago's status as a venerable friend, and the fact that Othello does not even really know Desdemona. She is as unfamiliar to him as anyone else.

Strangely, however, Othello seems naive in his mistrust of his wife. Just as Othello knows Iago as an old friend, he should also know that Iago has a vul- gar mind, and that he should not necessarily believe the lusty charges he brings against Desdemona. Fur- thermore, Othello had previously staked his own life on his wife's fidelity, when he was presented with Iago's idea of her faith. However once married, Desdemona is rather impulsive and insecure. From here, Othello begins to doubt that Desdemona is really a "right" to revenge is a form of charity, benefiting both yourself and your spouse (Adamson 239). A sharp contrast is visible between Othello's extreme rage and jealousy, and Desdemona's meek naivete. She asks Emilia for confirmation "that there be no women do abuse their husbands / In such gross kind?" (IV.iii.60-1). While Desdemona can hardly believe that such women exist, her husband is convinced of her guilt and is plotting his violent revenge.

The murder of Desdemona is a direct result of the nature of Othello and Desdemona's marriage, and Renaissance male fear of cuckoldry. The displaced trust from the relationship is missing due to the lack of intimate knowledge between Othello and Desdemona. Othello threatened feelings stem from his fear of misogyny, as well as from his own lacking self-esteem in doubting Desdemona's love for him. The extremity of Othello's fear allows him to become an active murderer that kills Desdemona.

Similar to Othello and Desdemona's marriage is the relationship between Claudio and Hero in Much Ado About Nothing. These two really lack any knowl- edge of each other. Claudio falls in love with Hero at first sight, remote object (Needy 43). He refers to Hero as "the sweetest lady that ever I looked on" (I.iii.166-7). However unlike Othello, Claudio is a brave soldier who is completely lacking in knowledge of women. He has to have Don Pedro woo Hero for him instead of winning her for himself. Claudio's basic image of women stems from medieval notions of female excellency; namely that a chaste woman is a virtuous woman ("Much Ado About Nothing: Comment" 1966a). Furthermore, this attitude is extremely vulnerable to warnings of cuckoldry from Benedick and Don John (Friedman 237). These warnings later increase Claudio's capability for believe- ing Hero's infidelity.

Claudio is the conventional Renaissance man, and has been described along with Don Pedro as "standing... on ceremony, rule, and right" (French 127). Claudio exhibits his masculine identity by in- quiring about Hero's dowry. He asks whether or not Hero has a brother here. It is proper Renaissance procedure to investigate such subjects (Bennett 275). Claudio is not a wealthy man, and marriage could often be a financial stepping-stone for Renaissance men (McEachern 275). In addition to this, Claudio shows his ideal masculine identity in his rejection of Hero in the church scene. He refuses her because of his image of her infidelity, and to marry her would stain his honor: There, Leonato, take her back again. Give not this rotten orange to your friend. She's but the sign and semblance of her honor. (IV.29-31) Hero has lost her sexual purity here, and in Claudio's eyes, it follows that she has lost all of her other virtues, including her intellectual purity. She has become a "votary of Rhode". Anthony J. Lewis ex- plains that "Claudio...sees only with his eyes, not with his reason" (58). The same could be said about Othello, as both men are convinced by visual proof. In order to preserve his social honor, Claudio can no longer marry the unchaste Hero. Therefore, he re- jects her at the altar.

Claudio is also a very impulsive character, which leads to his refusal of Hero during the wedding scene. Earlier in the play during Don Pedro's wooing of Hero, Claudio was quick to believe that Don Pedro and Hero were both betraying him and that Don Pedro was wooing Hero for himself. This impulsive attitude carries into the church scene, during which Claudio denounces Hero publicly for her alleged in- fidelity. This episode correlates to Othello's instantan- eous distrust of Desdemona. Both men have spontaneous and explosive natures. Finally, Claudio's...
quick agreement to blindly marry Hero's cousin even though she was an Ethiope" bolsters this impulsiveness ("Much Ado About Nothing: Comment 1966a). Just as Claudio is the ideal Renaissance man, Hero is the conventional Renaissance woman, yielding and submissive. "[Hero] is mostly a docile participant in an arranged marriage" ("Much Ado About Nothing" 1990). Hero is described by Carol Cook as "meek, self-effacing, vulnerable, obedient, seen and not heard, she is a face without a voice" (91). These qualities are apparent in Hero's silence. She never fully expresses her love for Claudio, and the one time she speaks of him endearingly is in a complement to Benedick: "He is the only man of Italy / Always excepted my dear Claudio" (III.i.92-3). Her silence, obedience, and modesty make Hero the ideal Renaissance wife (Neely 144). However, Hero's silence restricts her as a "non-character." Carol Hansen comments that: "Indeed, the character of Hero is seen as puppet-like, popping up at the end like a doll who had been temporarily dismissed" (55).

Claudio possesses two images of Hero. The first is a nonsexual, not threatening, fraternal love. The second is a lustful beauty that deceives men. These two images may be associated with Othello's images of the "superhuman" and "subhuman" Desdemona. Like those of Othello, Claudio's perceptions of Hero change from nonsexual to lustful at the altar, and then back to nonsexual after her alleged death. Claudio's anxiety, influenced by Benedick and Don John's warnings, is released at the altar scene. As Renaissance male code required male dominance, cuckoldry reversed this to make men the victims and women the active participants. Thus, cuckoldry was a direct violation of Renaissance male honor. Additionally, Hero was to be Claudio's property after the marriage, so he felt as though Hero had committed the ultimate betrayal (Hays 87). Therefore, his great show of emotion at the church scene is due to his male fear of cuckoldry.

Further, Claudio's belief of Don John's and Borachio's lies is much like Othello's acceptance of Iago's accusations. Both men were harboring notions of misogyny in their minds prior to the allegations brought against the women, and therefore both men reject the women. This rejection is never questioned by Claudio, even after Hero's death. He insists that he "sinned not but in mistaking" (VI.2.161-2). Thus, male influence persists despite Hero's death. Claudio's words at the tomb symbolize this male dominance and female silence (Cook 197).

With his final marriage at the play's conclusion, Claudio finally "enters the brotherhood of cuckoldos" (Friedman 243). Old order is restored in new terms as Hero is unveiled to Claudio, finally purged of her unchaste accusations. These new terms consist of Claudio's recognition of Hero as a truly chaste, silent, and obedient woman. The fear of cuckoldry was pervasive in Renaissance marriage, and was represented by Shakespeare in various manners. Othello illustrates this fear tragically through the death of the honest Desdemona, while Much Ado About Nothing portrays this fear in a comic manner. The fact that Hero does not actually die allows the cuckoldry theme to be communicated in a lighter way than that of Othello. These plays depicted cuckoldry in two different lights, but the consequences of even the threat of cuckoldry were equally severe in both cases. Perhaps the extremity of the male response in these situations could be attributed to the common notions of feminine ideologi, misogyny, double standard, and patriarchal marriage. Males, aware that many women were lustful and deceitful, were apprehensive in their marriages. As wives were seen as property, these men would grow concerned about keeping their property under control. Consequently, male sensitivity was greatly heightened. Increased fear of threat followed closely thereafter. The fear felt by these men is clearly illustrated in Othello's and Claudio's impulsive reactions to even slight implications of feminine infidel-ity. This common Renaissance male fear was also easily derived from the nature of marriage at the time. Many marriages were based on money or were arranged, which allowed for a lack of trust and personal intimacy within relationships. When husband and wife hardly knew each other, there could be no solid foundation of trust in the relationship. This lack of trust between Othello and Desdemona ended tragically, while that between Claudio and Hero ended happily. However, putting Hero's alleged death into consideration, the lives of both these women were contingent on the faith of their husbands. An irony persists between cuckoldry and men's faith, for as cuckoldry hinged on a wife's sexual faithfulness to her husband, wives depended on their husbands re-
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Love Relationships and Cuckoldry taining faith in them to be honest. Unfortunately, was often impossible to achieve, and males contin-ued to fear cuckoldry and accept misogyny. The conse-quential lack of trust in many relationships, this faith
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The politics of academic tenure is an issue which, in the 1990s, is working its way into the conscious of the academic mind. Its significance stems from the fact that the tenure process, and the resulting decisions, affects not only educators, but also students, university communities, and society at large. According to one junior professor, "tenure, at its inception, was meant to protect the academic freedom of university teachers" (Epstein 43). We must ask today, however, in the midst of many tenure-related disputes and discussions in the popular and scholarly media, just how valid tenure is in today's educational system and, more importantly, what positions institutions of higher learning should take on related issues in the future.

Those in favor of the practice claim that Academic tenure has been justified historically by the ostensible necessity of protecting "academic freedom." In particular, it was argued to be necessary, purportedly in the interest of the unfettered search for knowledge and truth, to protect the faculty member and, perhaps more importantly, the employing institution from attack by partisan or parochial political, social and religious interests. (Dresch 68)

This goal, in and of itself, is an understandably noble pursuit. Tenure is important because it "serves academic freedom and freedom of speech at the PC university of the '90s," says Richard Berthold, an associate professor at the University of New Mexico, "I say things in class that would get me fired without tenure" (Blair 2). Clearly, there is a need for such protection in academia, a world based on ideas and knowledge. If the tenure process dealt solely with these issues, it would unquestioningly remain a beneficial practice. The tenure process is an intricate and complicated one, however, and one which does much more than merely protect the rights of educators as a whole.

Critics argue that "fundamentally ... [tenure practices] served to concentrate power within institutions in the hands of the [already] tenured faculty, which collectively and virtually independently controlled the award of tenure, not infrequently to ends contradictory to the ostensibly claimed protection of academic freedom in the search for truth" (Dresch 68). This concentration of power allows those select few with tenure to control who has, and does not have, a voice within academic institutions. Such a state would not even present a major problem if the group of tenured individuals were representative of the teaching faculty as a whole—with proportional numbers of women and minority groups—or of the student population. This, however, is not the case, as the majority of those holding tenure are older white males—a group which many refer to as the "old boy network." As Journalism Scholar Larissa Grunig states, "With more women faculty members now than ever before, this situation of women encountering special difficulties in shattering the glass ceiling of academia has major implications" (93). Also of concern is the "lack of women who are tenured or who have attained the rank of full professor" and the "imbalance between female faculty and female students" (Grunig 94).

Thus, a main problem with the current tenure system is its effect on the careers of female educators. According to the New York Times Magazine, "In the male-run world of American colleges and universities ... 88 percent of presidents, provosts and chancellors ... 87 percent of full professors, [and] 77 percent of trustees [are men]" (Matthews 47). While such statistics may not cause alarm in some, they are simply not consistent with to the number of women in the work force or in academic institutions. According to Psychology Today, "unemployment rates for women with Ph.D.s are two to five times high for men ... [and] Even if women do get an academic
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job, they are likely to be assigned a lower rank and salary than their male counterparts" (McLeod 14). This assertion is supported by an experiment in which "heads of departments were sent identical resumes with either a male or female name. The 'male name' applicants were judged as meriting the rank of associate professor, while the same resumes from 'female' applicants caused them to be rated as suitable for the lower rank of assistant professor" (McLeod 14). Though such an isolated experiment could be considered unrepresentative of academia as a whole, published evidence suggests otherwise.

According to an article in *Journalism Quarterly*:

The older men who make [tenure and promotion] choices still don't feel comfortable with women. This is not considered overt discrimination; it is usually subtle and often unconscious: those doing the choosing would never consider themselves to be discriminating against women. They are simply following their customary way of choosing people. (Grunig 9)

Whatever their intention, however, the result is a severe shortage of women faculty members in tenured positions across the country. "The more prestigious the institution, the fewer women there are," says Anthony DePalma of the *New York Times*. "And the higher the rank, the lower the likelihood that a woman will hold it. Thus, women make up only 11.6% of full professors nationwide and have made their greatest inroads at community colleges, where the pay is lowest" (DePalma). These trends are especially prevalent in the hard sciences, according to *Science* magazine:

The number of women getting Ph.D.s has grown in almost every field of science and engineering: the total is up from 21% in 1979 to 36% in 1990, but not enough of those new Ph.D.s are making it all the way to tenure positions in universities and colleges. In 1979, according to National Science Foundation figures, women held 5% of all tenured positions. By 1989, the figure had risen—but only to 28% in 1989. But not enough of those new Ph.D.s have been given tenure offers except the few at men's institutions characterized her tenure review." (Reich 32) Not one of the male candidates had aroused the degree of anger and bitterness that characterized her tenure candidacy. Most had not written as much, nor received lifetime employment offers except the female ones. (Matthews 47), left Columbia early out of disgust for the tenure process by which a college educator earns tenure. (Articulate 1998)

Accordingly, the tenure criteria of most universities most commonly fall into three broad categories: teaching, research, and service or citizenship. Teaching, the most cut-and-dried of the three, is commonly based on student course evaluations and the reputation of the medium in which the work is published. The third criteria, however, is more subjective than the others and "is one that always has to be considered but is only in exceptional cases emphasized. It is a judgment, at least in part, of character; it is also a judgment about willingness to conform to the rules, explicit and implicit, that govern institutions of higher learning" (Epstein 43). Such judgments are one of the main reasons tenure decisions often have been accused of unfairness. In the case of female educators, problems arise when their research is trivialized by men who use gender-based standards of assessment and when their character is evaluated on a personal, rather than professional, basis.

Because the men on tenure committees have "standards [that] assume that [women have] had the same formative intellectual experience as they, and [have] come to view the modes and purposes of scholarship as they do" (Reich 32).

One example comes from the University of Wisconsin. "Ceil M. Pillasbury was disappointed when, in 1989, she was denied tenure at the [University's] business school. The associate professor had won an award for outstanding teaching, and her research had been published in one of the top journals in her field" (Borjorno 40). This problem is common in business schools around the country, where, "Only 9% of business faculty at Business Week's Top 20 business schools are women, and at several prominent B-schools, including those at Dartmouth College and Washington University, not one woman is tenured" (40). According to a professor at the University of Virginia's School of Business, "The system is controlled by people who have been in the club for many years, mostly white men" (40).

Discouragingly, these problems are not unique to American Universities. In 1993, faculty at Oxford University in the United Kingdom voted to "block the creation of about 15 new posts with the rank of professor—a title that, in Britain, is reserved for only the very top tier of academic staff. The reason: few, if any, women were expected to be among the faculty members to win promotion" (Alverson, an article in *Science* 1231). Neither is Oxford alone in the UK, where "Only 4.9% of... university professors are female and they are paid, on average, $2,300 a year less than their male colleagues" (1231).

Perhaps the most disturbing part of the tenure controversy is the notion that the cause of such problems is too deeply-rooted in society that it is not even noticed is. In an article in *Ms.* magazine, the husband of a woman denied tenure describes an incident: "I was never asked to present a paper at the convention of the medium in which the work is published. The third criteria, however, is more subjective than the others and "is one that always has to be considered but is only in exceptional cases emphasized. It is a judgment, at least in part, of character; it is also a judgment about willingness to conform to the rules, explicit and implicit, that govern institutions of higher learning" (Epstein 43). Such judgments are one of the main reasons tenure decisions often have been accused of unfairness. In the case of female educators, problems arise when their research is trivialized by men who use gender-based standards of assessment and when their character is evaluated on a personal, rather than professional, basis. (Articulate 1998)
...[participating in] curricular development ... University governance ... advising student organizations ... co-curricular activities ... [or] professional organizations. (4)

If the tenure criteria seem complicated, the tenure procedure are even more so. The process—which is presided over by the Provost—first involves the gathering of information regarding the individual being considered. This material, collectively called the dossier, consists of: the individual faculty member's statement, a statement by the individual's department, student evaluations, judgments of colleagues, and examples of the individuals scholarly achievement. (6). The members of the "Advisory board," the composition of which is not explicitly defined, are usually members of the individual's department. All members have a vote, but the President is allowed to make the final decision. Last, the Board of Trustees makes the formal approval of all tenure approvals.

While there are appeal procedures in effect, the entire process is full of opportunities for personal and gender-based discrimination. The department, for example, could consist only of male tenured professors who would evaluate a female candidate negatively. Similarly, the advisor could hold a belief that the candidate is unimpressive. All members have a vote, but the President is allowed to make the final decision. Last, the Board of Trustees makes the formal approval of all tenure approvals.

"Scholarly Activity" is judged for evidence of a lively and creative intellectual life which is engaged in a continuing, viable, and substantive commitment to advancing knowledge, developing understanding and/or performing in a discipline, field of inquiry, or art form, (3) as evidenced by the faculty member creates for students "opportunities to observe the faculty engaged in scholarship, and when appropriate to participate with them" (3). Additionally, "All members of the Denison faculty should periodically give public evidence of scholarly interests and accomplishments sharing work and subjecting it to the constructive criticism of associates" (3). The candidate will be judged in these areas by "peers at Denison, members of the President's Advisory Board, and by scholars outside of Denison" (4).

Finally, "Community Service," though a factor, is considered secondary to teaching and scholarship. This category consists of: a commitment to the basic objectives of liberal education—expressed by sharing one's field with students ... exploring areas of learning beyond one's own specialty or discipline ...
get high annual raises (in both real dollars and percentage points), and they're more likely to be promoted" (Sternhell 98). At Harvard, for instance, “male professors earn $93,600 on average while women of equal rank earn $79,900 on average” (DePalma). Pay discrepancies remain in academia, presumably because the individuals and committees responsible for making tenure decisions frequently are the same individuals and committees responsible for determining salaries and pay increases. Consequently, many sexist trends are found, and will continue to be found, until fundamental changes are made.

Such evidence alone provides a substantial case for the reevaluation of the tenure system. Sexism, however, is not the only of tenure's faults. The current system also provides no means of reprimand for inappropriate behavior. "If a young teacher shows himself irresponsible in his committee assignments, if he misses classes owing to drunkenness, if he seduces his young students, if he shows no regard for the fundamental beliefs of the institution, he could, theoretically, be faulted... and hence denied tenure. With tenure, it occurs to me to add, the same teacher could today do any of the things mentioned in the previous sentence and probably keep his job" (Epstein 43). This double standard for tenured and non-tenured professors is simply unacceptable. Demonstrations of competence and quality at one point in a professor's career does not guarantee that these behaviors will continue through retirement. In addition, tenure inhibits young educators from securing stable jobs. Even professors who are not productive can retain their distinguished positions and handsome salaries, while talented younger faculty remain out in the cold. The redefinition of tenure is needed because, as one Berkeley administrator put it, “People can mentally retire at a very early age because tenure protects them” (Barinaga 1236).

Such examples only add to the case against tenure as an academic institution. Changes need to be made which will hold educators accountable for their actions. Academia needs to create a system in which a professor who does not perform according to expectation is fired, and in which a candidate qualified for a position is hired, regardless of his or her personal characteristics or political viewpoints. Education is serious business and those involved need to treat it as such. Unfortunately, changes such as periodic contract reviews and performance-based salary determination will simply not occur as long as tenure continues to protect the actions, or lack thereof, of the power-wielders in academia. As one tenured Denison professor put it, “I could fornicate with barnyard animals in the middle of the academic quad and there would be nothing the University could do about it.” Such arrogance, and the biased politics which tenure breeds, does not protect "academic freedom." Instead, it protects the ability of power-hungry individuals to destroy the principles on which higher education is based.

Works Cited
Akira Kurosawa is Japan's foremost filmmaker. With his kinetic mastery of the camera, his flawless, Japanese cinema and join the ranks of the world's finest film artisans. He is "one of the few artists to achieve international communication while at the same time retaining his connection with the cultural changes represented by the conflicts between two diametrically opposed forms of martial arts (Desser 63). The revolutionary new technique, judo, is based upon defense, and contrasts drastically with the currently prevalent and more strategically offensive jujitsu.

Immediately in the film, Kurosawa introduces his heroic convention of an individualist protagonist set in a time of transition. However, Kurosawa made Sanshiro Sugata under the auspices of the Japanese militarist government of that time, and was required to meet a certain propaganda requirement, which most likely deterred him from the unsettling social commentary that would characterize his later works (Desser 62). Politically and socially tinged narratives were not allowed due to the wartime environment. Many of Kurosawa's scripts had already been rejected for production, and he was only allowed to direct Sanshiro Sugata because of the safe period quality of the novel on which it was based (Richie 14). Alas, Sanshiro Sugata would have to serve less as a work of social critique and more as an introduction for Kurosawa's exceptional new cinematic style. As a result, Sanshiro stands as the incipient Kurosawa hero, a character embodying many of the traits that would define the spiritual quest of his later protagonists by the incorporation of more potent social backdrops.

Sanshiro Sugata is set in 1882, "during the Meiji period, when Western influences were altering the sense of what it meant to be Japanese" (Prince 39). In the film, the competition between the established form of jujitsu and the newly revealed form of judo "stands for the struggle between the old ways of traditional and feudalism and the new ways of competitive individualism" (Desser 63). Sanshiro is certainly a competitive individual; he begins the film by demanding to be taught jujitsu. Then, upon seeing his entire clan of mentors embarrassingly thwarted by a single master of judo, he immediately sets out to be trained in this new technique. The judo master, named Yano, takes Sanshiro on as a student, and trains him until his skills are at a peak. Unfortunately, once his skills are honed, Sanshiro proceeds to flaunt them. He becomes a showpiece, as demonstrated in a deftly edited scene in which Sanshiro chases intimidated citizens up and down the square, tossing wary villagers to the ground with malevolent glee. While this sequence, Kurosawa is "describing his central character and making clear the vanity and self-interest that Sanshiro will have to discard in his growth and pursuit of enlightenment" (Prince 45). Yano is infuriated with the actions of his pupil. He chastises Sanshiro for abusing the art of judo. "To act as you do," Yano says, "without meaning or purpose, to hate and attack — is that the way of life?" No — the way is loyalty and love — only through it can a man face death. Sanshiro, unresponsive to his teacher's lessons, nobly replies, "I can face death! I am not afraid to die right now!" He immediately rises, throws open the sliding door of Yano's home, and, in an impulsive, impudent display of rebellion, leaps into a pond below.

The following scene, set under the glimmering moonlight of a brisk evening, is key to the thematic pay-out of the film. A young boy, becoming increasingly aware of his immaturity, is subject to a profound spiritual revelation, which Kurosawa illustrates semiotically. Sanshiro experiences a "moment of satori," which is essentially "a discovery of self … predicated upon attaining the sense of self which is the truth of life" (Prince 20). This type of scene, wherein the key character is removed from the guidance of others and describes the truth of his situation through his own vision, would continue to appear in future Kurosawa films, illustrating...
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the dynamism of his still unformed protagonist hero.

The remainder of the film chronicles Sanshiro’s rise to the status of judo champion. Ensuing matches demonstrate that he has learned to fight with the skill, restraint, and calmness “of one who has attained enlightened” (Prince 45). These competitions also educate Sanshiro toward “the empty and illusory nature of glory” (Prince 50). In Sanshiro’s final bout, an informal challenge from a mysterious opponent educates Sanshiro toward “the empty and illusory nature of one who has attained enlightenment” (Prince 78). Here, the dilemma of the Kurosawa hero is upgraded to a Kurosawa hero, “refuses to give up even after every trial” (Richie 18). To quote author Murakami, because it is all he has. Murakami, being a Kurosawa hero, “refuses to give up even after everybody else is convinced he has already lost. This is the reason he is always alone” (Richie 61). Indeed, Murakami is the first true foil figure in the Kurosawa oeuvre. He has a mentor (just as Sanshiro did in Yano), but unlike them, Sanshiro does not place these values in the service of socially productive actions that his stylistic predecessor, Sanshiro Sugata, either introduced and lightly asserted or was denied the chance to explore.

In Stray Dog, the character of the social milieu is an active dialectical tool by which Kurosawa enhances the integrity of his protagonist. This theme will be discussed more specifically, in the next section. But here, it is worth noting that in Stray Dog, Sanshiro occupies “a brightly untroubled world where the ethic of subservience does not—entail a posture appropriate for being economically or politically exploited,” Murakami, and all Kurosawa heroic figures who succeed him, must “confront a corrupt and predatory social order” (Prince 53). When bullets from some recent murders are matched with those from Murakami’s gun, the search for retrieval becomes one of dire importance. Through the gun, the hero’s vicarious inheritance of the pain of the victims and the guilt of the murders.

Murakami begins his relentless quest to apprehend the homicidal criminal, and in doing so assumes the mold of the Kurosawa hero. The breakneck haste and ruthless dedication with which he pursues the case becomes an essential quality of the director’s heroes, who is “distinguished by his perseverance, by his refusal to be defeated” (Richie 18). To quote author and critic Donald Richie, “the Kurosawa hero is a man who continues in the very face of certain defeat” (61). This boundless tenacity is not only a Kurosawa stamp but also, “a basic cultural trait of Japan” (Burch 296). This was already evident in Sanshiro, who refused to be denied the chance to learn the martial arts. However, it becomes more stated in Murakami, because it is all he has. Murakami, being a Kurosawa hero, “refuses to give up even after everybody else is convinced he has already lost. This is the reason he is always alone” (Richie 61). Indeed, Murakami is the first true foil figure in the Kurosawa oeuvre. He has a mentor (just as Sanshiro did in Yano), but unlike them, Sanshiro does not place these values in the service of socially productive actions that his stylistic predecessor, Sanshiro Sugata, either introduced and lightly asserted or was denied the chance to explore.
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the bond Murakami feels with the thief” (Prince 93). Their immediate post-war situations were very akin. If Murakami had been unfortunate enough to have had his possessions stolen upon returning home, what might have he have survived? Would he have turned to thievery? Murakami suggests that he himself might have, and it was the possibility of this in-turn to thievery? Murakami suggests that he himself might have, and it was the possibility of this in-theft behavior,” and Yusa becomes the misled and Murakami tackles the fleeing Yusa in a grimy marsh. The two struggle in the mud, which covers forcing the thief to accept responsibility for his crimes. arresting Yusa despite his identification with him and motivations behind his building a children's playground is answered: Murakami maintains the status quo, tending his wake shamelessly attempt to skewer the pseudo-world.

It is also the film of which he is most fond (Mellen 38). The story follows a listless, mechanical bureaucrat named Watanabe (Takashi Shimizu again) who learns of a fatal tumor in his stomach that leaves him only a year to live. “A year to live!” becomes an ironic statement because, as the film shows, the last year of his life is the only time he will ever truly live. A narrator informs the audience early on, over the languid image of Watanabe stamping papers, that, “he is like a corpse, and actually he has been dead for the past twenty-five years.” The film is an account of his struggle to justify his existence and to reach an assured state of eudomonia infused with the knowledge that he has lived well. Kurosawa had depicted physical and spiritual bouts with disease previously in both Drunken Angel (1945) and The Silent Duel (1947), though Watanabe remains the ultimate life affirmation and in turn, the most “supreme statement of Kurosawa’s heroic cinema” (Prince 113).

Watanabe is the most dynamic of the Kurosawa heroes. His transformation in the film from an idle, paper-shuffling automaton to a resurrected human being capable of compassion and achievement is so strikingly documented that the audience does not doubt Watanabe’s humanitarian intentions even when he is not alive for the last half of the movie. The film’s ability to project the image of the character when co-workers, family members and detractors attending his wake shamelessly attempt to skewer the motivations behind his building a children’s playground in a poor area of the city.

The rugged historical transition and social di-lemma in Ikiru is centered around the post-war Japa-nese bureaucracy, of which Watanabe, at least at the beginning of the film, is the primary representative. In Ikiru, “the illness of an individual functions as a metaphor for a more general social and spiritual sick-ness” (Prince 81). Reforms instigated during the post-war occupation by the West have installed a circumlocutive, convoluted, and complexly inactive bureaucracy at the center of Japanese social milieu. This “joyless” form of the bureaucraticÍs pathological, the teeth of adversity” quality that “describes nearly every one of Kurosawa’s main characters” (Burch 296). Their “masochistic perseverance in the fulfillment of complex social obligations” finds a startling fruition in Watanabe (Burch 296). There are many stories of Watanabe’s attempts to justify his existence, to build the playground is the only thing keeping him from exhaustion. It becomes clear that his campaign to win the support of families and loved ones or the defining identities offered by the corporation of the state” (Prince 52). An early montage sequence follows the Watanabe’s disappearance, consisting of a series of flash-backs featuring Watanabe and his son, Mitsuo. One shows Watanabe and the infant Mitsuo driving to the funeral of Watanabe’s first wife. Another shows Watanabe calming his son before an appendectomy, then leaving his side to go to work. The last is at a train station, as Mitsuo is taken away to fight in the war. The flashbacks all exhibit moments of departure and abandonment, of “separations and emotional failure” (Prince 105). They reflect back to and maintain Watanabe’s current estrangement from his son, a tragic consequence of his fruitless dedication to his aimless work.

The father and son are so alienated from each other’s lives that Watanabe cannot bring himself to tell Mitsuo of his disease. Upon learning of his impending death, Watanabe approaches his son for support, only to overhear Mitsuo and his greedy wife discussing the inheritance. It dawns on Watanabe that he cannot embrace his final days without a vialsification for his existence. There is nothing between them. By the end of the film, Watanabe states, “I have no son.” His endeavor to legitimize his life must metaphorically become another predatory one, where the accomplishment of his family, outside the designations of his work place, and most importantly, inside himself. Watanabe develops as a hero “by separating from [his son, his son’s wife, and his co-workers], rebellious against, and re-jecting another predatory one, where the institutional frameworks of Japa-nese society, that is, the family and the company” (Prince 107). Watanabe discovers this truth at an upscale restaurant, where several young waitresses are preparing a birthday celebration. In an austere use of vertical montage, Kurosawa juxtaposes the crowd’s singing of “Happy Birthday” with Watanabe’s epitaphy. It is his final rebirth. He becomes an en-tirely autonomous figure, a bastion of the individu-ality for which Kurosawa shows such a profound ap-
precipitation. For, in arguing for the autonomous self as positive value in postwar Japan, Kurosawa overturned, and in a sense reverses, centuries of tradition in which an individual's range of choice was consumed and... determined by the ties of family, class, and clan" (Prince 97). Watanabe is a pioneer, a moral trailblazer, and a model for the change in attitudes and outlooks of the audience as they traverse the radically different post-war world.

Yojimbo begins during a time of similar cap-sized traditions. An opening title informs the audience that the story is set in the late Tokugawa era, a time "when a rising business class threatened the logic of existing social relations as the economy shifted to money not rice, and to the ties mediated by the exchange of commodities and the rationalizations of profit, not personal allegiance and obligations" (Prince 222). In Yojimbo, "Kurosawa discovers Japan through critical moments of transition in Japanese history when decaying values have lost their universal acceptance and new modes have neither clearly emerged nor fully displaced the old" (Mellen 39). Into the frame, in an over-the-shoulder, telephoto close-up, marches a samurai, Sanjuro (Toshiro Mifune). He is out of a job, because the ushering in of the new business era has been accompanied by a disintegration of the feudal structures under which the samurai thrived. He walks into a town split by two warring factions, each with their own respective gang of murderous thugs. For seemingly arbitrary reasons and motives, too, are extreme comic caricatures. One is a giant, malformed ogre; another resembles a fat chipmunk. They scuffle around "with crustacean-like movements" (Prince 228). Even the film's climax, a veritable buffet of bloodletting and destruction that litters the town's streets with bodies, is a tickler. After vanquishing the last of the outlaws, Sanjuro shuffles a sword looks around contentedly and says, "Now there will be quiet in this town."

The combined effect of all this cartoon-quality mayhem is a scathing, satirical indictment of the commodity that had arisen in Japan around the time of Yojimbo's creation. Kurosawa views capitalism and organized crime, institutions fueled by the acquisition of money and the elimination of rivals, as trivial, ridiculous, and utterly negligible to society. They must be eliminated. Unfortunately, the Kurosawa hero, the moral role model responsible for directing society past these defects, suffers in the process. He must become a fantastic apparition; a soiled vagabond who kills for sport and money, with no real code or humanistic ideal. The social atmosphere portrayed by Kurosawa is "so bleak and unapologetically corrupt that the hero cannot escape tarnishing and becomes transformed into a literal outcast, bearing the marks of his stigmata" (Prince 230). Indeed, the Kurosawa hero has come a long way.

The individual heroic figure stands as one of the most successful and availing elements in the films of Akira Kurosawa. Like any fictional protagonists, they are the bridge between the creator and his audience. However, this link is especially important to Kurosawa as an artist. Oftentimes he has expressed a serious distaste for the majority of his native country's cinematic offerings, primarily because "they don't care anything about people" (qtd. in Richie 242). Kurosawa does not exempt himself from this dedication to the human lot, consistently utilizing thesembing and entertaining stories as foundations for insightful social commentaries. Kurosawa's works have celebrated and expanded the film medium's capabilities for expression. He raises probing, complicated questions and proposes possible solutions, all to the benefit and education of the audience. Because of this, Kurosawa is "perhaps the only Japanese director who can be called a creator in the pioneer sense of the word" (Anderson and Richie 376). Kurosawa, "stepping alongside his heroes, looks out into the historical and social maelstrom and struggles forward, informed with "awareness of the fact that the world and the self do not, cannot, match," knowing that the only important thing, the only thing worth cultivating, is the self" (Richie 243). His heroic figures are celebratons of the independent, corrige individual. Kurosawa is, in spirit, the ultimate auteur.

Endnote

1 Kurosawa would do this again to similar effect in Record of a Living Being (1955).
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I AM WOMAN, HEAR ME GASP FOR AIR: AN ANALYSIS OF WENDY WASSERSTEIN'S ISN'T IT ROMANTIC.

BY HEATHER BAGGOTT '99

Each suburban wife struggled with it alone. As she made the beds, shopped for groceries, matched slipcover material, ate peanut butter sandwiches with her children, chauffeured Cub Scouts and Brownies, lay beside her husband at night she was afraid to ask even of herself the silent question "Is this all?"

BETTY FRIEDAN
The Feminine Mystique

Over the past thirty years, feminism has become such an explosive word filled with different meanings and connotations that many scholars and laymen are afraid to casually apply it to their work and everyday life. The meaning of feminism has changed and been distorted to such an extent that we are often confused as to what it actually means. This obscuring of definition has given rise to questions which the modern, enlightened, and conscientious person is forced to ask of himself or herself. Can a man be a feminist? If I do not believe in glass ceilings and gender discrimination in the military am I a feminist? Am I a feminist if I believe that women have reproductive control over their body and it is their right to an abortion? Can you still be a feminist if you choose to have a husband and children over a career?
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explored in the play, but Wasserstein is purposeful in centering the drama specifically around Janie's search for her own happiness and fulfillment. In the course of the play, we see Janie transformed. She begins as a woman afraid to make choices (not willing to accept the judgments and transformations her choices will command) and changes to a woman finally confident in her desires regardless of the pressures and opinions of her friends, family, and the feminist movement. Thus, Janie is a good example (possibly Wasserstein's best example) of a woman slowly liberated from the feminist paradox.

Although Janie is a well-educated Harvard graduate she surprisingly has considerable difficulty in accepting the notion that it is her right as a modern woman to make the decisions that gives her the greatest degree of satisfaction. As a consequence of her confusion, Janie's voice is often indecisive and easily manipulated by both her parents and peers. Wasserstein commented on Janie's silence in a recent interview: "Janie is a character who has a problem expressing her feelings and she desperately wants to be liked" (Betsko 419).

In her relationship with her parents Janie's failure to assert her will is clearly seen. Unannounced, her parents (Tasha and Simon) intrude upon Janie's apartment in the early morning to celebrate her move to New York. Once together, however, instead of congratulating Janie, Tasha undermines her by criticizing Janie for not being involved in a serious relationship. Janie is in fact an inferior woman, she is in constant demands of her parents. In interviews, Wasserstein has been asked about whether Janie is continually seeking advice and justification for her actions. On an interview, Wasserstein subconsciously illustrates Janie's inferiority to Harriet's perceived perfection through small details in the play. For example, Janie encourages Harriet to take her advice and walk with determination in front of the mirror. (Betsko 420)

Wasserstein subtly illustrates Janie's inferiority to Harriet's perceived perfection through small details in the play. For example, Janie encourages Harriet to take her advice and walk with determination in front of the mirror. (Act 1, scene 2)

Janie's parents continually harass her about her love life, her occupation, her choice of friends, yet Janie remains relatively passive to their complaints and disapproval. She reacts only by changing the subject or lightening the mood with humor when the conversation becomes too heated. Janie often turns to humor as a defense mechanism against the constant demands of her parents. Janie, Wasserstein herself has noted Janie's strong sense of humor: "Humor is a protection, but it's a vulnerability as well. I think that may be very female. Janie in Isn't It Romantic tells joke, joke, joke and then finally explodes. Finally, she discovers her own strength (Betsko 419). Through the avoidance of her parent's questions it is clear that Janie is not willing to verbally justify her lifestyle as an educated and single freelance writer. Janie's failure to do so indicates her internal struggle in that she is not yet comfortable in her chosen existence to defend to it herself or her family. Janie's failure to defend her lifestyle is also seen in her relationships with Harriet and Marty. Although Harriet does not consciously make an effort to question Janie's own decisions she is in constant competition with Harriet. Janie does not view herself as equal to Harriet, but rather she sees herself as an inferior woman. Janie sees Harriet as a woman who "has it all" in terms of education, wealth, beauty, confidence. In several interviews, Wasserstein has been asked about whether she believes that women can really "have it all". She explains that Harriet is the closest representation of such a woman: Harriet has all the externals; Harriet could be a cover on Savvy magazine. The girl who has "it all". You know, the person who gets up at eight o'clock in the morning, spends twenty minutes with her daughter and then minutes with her husband, then they go together to drives to work, comes home to a wonderful life, studies French in the bathtub, and still has time to cry three minutes a day in front of the mirror. (Betsko 420)

Wasserstein subtly illustrates Janie's inferiority to Harriet's perceived perfection through small details in the play. For example, Janie encourages Harriet to take her advice and walk with determination in front of the mirror. (Act 1, scene 2)

Also, because Janie admires Harriet's strength and courage as a woman, she commends her ability to compete in the male dominated business world. Janie is continually seeking advice and justification from Harriet. Until the conclusion of the play, Wasserstein redefines Harriet as the epitome of the truly modern woman, "a real feminist" and consequently, she looks to Harriet to give her the answers on how to become a stronger woman. Janie consults Harriet on whether she should marry Marty.

Janie: Hattie, do you think I should marry Marty?

Harriet: I never respected women who didn't learn to live alone and pay their own rent. Imagine spending your life pretending you aren't a person. To compromise on this would be antifeminist... well, antihumanist... well, just not impressive. I'm not being too harsh? (Act 1, scene 6)

We also see throughout the play that Harriet's advice is the only wisdom that Janie respects. Whereas she more easily disregards her parent's feelings, Janie actively seeks to live with regards to Harriet's opinions. However, because Janie is weak and indecisive we ignore her attempts to stand that it is ultimately Janie and not Harriet who chooses to follow this advice and remain a single woman.

Whereas Harriet unintentionally undermines Janie's courage, Marty deliberately attempts to make Janie feel weak and submissive. In many ways, Marty is the most damaging character to Janie's self-esteem. At the same time, however, he acts as the final catalyst in making Janie take an active stance on the direction of her life. Marty serves as the impetus that forces Janie to engage in dialogic thought which ultimately allows her to make a self-transformation. Throughout their relationship, it is clear that Marty does not perceive Janie, or any woman, as his equal. As a consequence of this perception, Marty is constantly belittling Janie. Again, in her relationship with her parents, Janie allows Marty to take control of her life.

We see Marty's degradation of Janie in several forms. He insists on calling her by the pet name "Monkey" which denotes a sense of ownership and control over Janie. The term takes away from Janie's status as an adult and makes her appear as a child. Marty further treats Janie as his inferior by making a deposit, without first consulting Janie, on a house in Brooklyn. He justifies his decision by playing on Janie's indecisiveness: "I figured if I wanted for you to make up your mind to move, we'd never take anything" (Act 1, scene 7). Marty also does not treat Janie as his equal in her career. He can only accept Janie's decision to work as long as it does not interfere with his time with her. Yet, at the same time, Marty does not expect Janie to complain when he is on call as a doctor. The moment Janie's job interferes with Marty's plans to socialize with his family, he asks her to cancel her appointments: "Don't let it (work) take over your life. And don't let it take over our life" (Act 2, scene 2). Yet, again for most of the play, Janie acquiesces to Marty's demands and double standards. She allows him to call her "Mon- key" and she agrees, with little debate, to move to Brooklyn. She even pretends to know how to cook in order to please Marty. Ironically, Janie understands her weakness to conform to those around her saying, "I am reflective and eager to please" (Act 1, scene 7). Nevertheless, Janie is still willing to continue in the relationship and entertain the idea of marriage.

Beyond her relationships with her family and peers, once we see Janie's voice is silenced in the very beginning of the play before any of the characters are even seen on stage. In the prologue, Janie's voice is heard on her answering machine message, but just as quickly as it is played to the audience, it is interrupted by a barrage of messages. Her parents, Harriet, and Cynthia leave messages asking Janie for her time and help, yet Janie's voice is never heard in response. Wasserstein uses these telephone machine scenes throughout the play to consistently show that Janie does not choose to exert her own responses to the demands placed upon her. Symbolically this represents Janie's apathy as a woman. So many people ask for her time and question her lifestyle (Tasha and Simon pestering her about marriage, Marty wanting to move to Brooklyn and start a family, Cynthia asking for love advice) that Janie shuts down as a curious and passionate individual.

This apathy pervades to a deeper level in Janie's conscience. She says to Marty on their first date, "I want very badly to be someone else without going through the effort of actually changing myself into someone else. I have very little courage, but I'm highly critical of others who don't" (Act 1, scene 4). On the one hand, Janie seeks to gain the courage to become a stronger woman so as to exert her will in control of the demands and judgments levied against her. But, on the other hand, she does not want to actively take the time to change her mental attitudes. On an internal level, Janie knows that she has the opportunity to define her existence, but she is afraid to make such choices because active self-transformation involves intense and dialogical questioning between
her sense of reason and emotion. This theme of simultaneity wanting to both change and not change your life is seen throughout Wasserstein's work. In a recent article by Mervyn Rothstein of the New York Times, Wasserstein remarks, "There is a difference between making a choice and really taking something to heart be a true believer and live your life by something." Janie's dilemma is one of choice. If she chooses to marry Marty, Janie is afraid that women like Harriet and the feminists she represents will not respect her choice. She fears that she will be viewed as something. This is when she finally gains the strength to express her dissatisfaction with Harriet. As Janie makes the decision to leave Marty, Harriet simultaneously decides to marry Joe (the man that she has only been seeing for a couple of weeks). In this twist of events, Harriet's engagement exemplifies the confusion and angst that the feminist movement has created. Modern feminism has lost its connection with the principles of its existence. The wisdom of women like Friedan, who articulated a notion of feminism as simply the rights of women to have equal choices as those of their male counterparts, has become obscured. Instead, modern feminism acts as a censorship and critic to female existence. No longer does the feminist establishment contend that all choices are equal. Instead, a hierarchy of lifestyles has been created in which personal satisfaction has become increasingly important while living a politically correct life has become the focus.
Wasserstein shows that value judgments levied against the way women choose to live their lives has become self-defeating and, ultimately, destructive. Janie, like the modern woman, is silenced by the fear of judgment and, consequently, struggles throughout much of her life to simply make a choice. She fears that men like Marty will expect her to "have it all." She fears that women like Harriet and Lillian expect her to sacrifice a family for a career. And she fears that her parents only expect her to marry and bear children. Janie fears being trapped into just one of these situations. To avoid Janie's struggle, Wasserstein implores her audience to return to the roots and fundamentals of feminism where the choice is all that matters. Choosing to be a mother, a businesswoman, an academic, a professional dancer take equal courage and strength of character and should therefore be equally respected. Feminism began as a humanistic movement and Wasserstein is arguing that it should once again be understood in terms of individual happiness and personal empowerment.
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Edward Dorn’s major poetic work, *Slinger*, is a mock epic of immense proportions. Two aspects of the poem make it such: the language used is a combination of language from soap operas, western movies, news epistles, science journals, AM radio, and lyric poetry, and the narrative of the poem underscores the traditional epic format because there is no great physical pilgrimage or journey that takes place, as usually occurs in epics. What Dorn is attempting to do with his four-part mock epic is to create a radical satire of the traditional philosophical beliefs that the Western world has held since Plato’s concept of the World of the Forms. By using the American West as a microcosm for Western society, Dorn criticizes most of the fundamental American beliefs and assumptions with his use of language, character, and narrative; and, in its place, he asserts a new view of the universe that values experience over logic and denies a teleological motive to this experience. Dorn offers to the notion of the radically separate self and object and endorses a way of thinking in keeping with a more radically empirical or phenomenological viewpoint. Before Dorn can implement his way of thought, however, he must have a space that is sufficient for an inquiry into the existence he cites: the American West of rugged individuals with personal strength and conviction.

Dorn uses the West as a place where the traditional network and travel is possible (Davidson 118). Dorn says: “The American West is the place men of our local civilization travel into in wide arcs to reconstruct the present version of the Greek experience... The West is where you will find the Stranger so dear to our whole experience... This is, in fact, what Dorn is doing in *Slinger*; he is attempting to reconstruct traditional Western thought by meeting the gaze of the Stranger (the Slinger) and following the Stranger through experience. The West is able to meet Dorn’s requirements because it is a space that he claims that people can migrate in; it is smooth space. This space, seemingly without borders as the Slinger travels through it, is in opposition to the space, called striated space, that State power (the forces of capitalism in the poem, represented by Howard Hughes) divides and restricts to further its own power (Deleuze and Guattari 480). As the Slinger moves through the West, he deterritorializes the striated space by undermining the fundamental notions that the economic and philosophical landscape, controlled by Hughes, is built upon. Striated space is space that power has worked upon and encompassed, and it is clearly shown that Hughes has the power to modify the environment, as Lil states: but I heard this Hughes Howard? I asked Right, hey they say he moved to Vegas or bought Vegas and moved it. (Dorn, Slinger, 9)

The Slinger has the ability to deconstruct the space controlled by Hughes, but he cannot keep it open forever. The space must become closed by some sort of thought. One space does not exist apart from the other: “[T]he two spaces in fact exist only in mixture: smooth space is constantly being translated, transversed into a striated space: striated space is constantly being reversed, returned to a smooth space” (Deleuze and Guattari 474). The Slinger is tearing down the State of Hughes in order to replace it with another striated space; but it is a space where corrections to our world-view have been made and where many people are responsible for the creation of the space rather than a select few.

Having established place, Dorn’s poem then conceived itself with language and language use for his explication of the new epistemology, beginning with the names of the characters themselves. “Slinger” is a British term for a person who plays the stock market (Davidson 119). A name like this immediately tells the reader that the Slinger is closely related to Hughes, the symbol for capitalism in the poem, as America in a way that united the nation’s economic and sociocultural determinants” (Wedding 1-2). Like his real-life counterpart, Robart abhors publicity and travels only in disguise, traveling across the country by rail from Boston to Vegas as the cheese in a cheese-burger (McPheron 40). After all, what can be more American than a cheeseburger, that symbol of fast-food mass capitalistic expansion where there is no center of power, but only an invisible network of franchise stores? Robart also maintains his power by staying out of the observable universe and by refusing to be named: Howard? I asked The very same. And what do you mean by inescapable, oh Gunslinger? I mean to say that he has not been seen since 1833. (Dorn, Slinger, 6)

This is yet another similarity to the Slinger, who remains immortal because he cannot be named. The Slinger is referred to as “Gunslinger” in the first book, “Slinger” in the second and third books, and as “Zlinger” in the fourth book. Indeed, being named is the most serious danger that one in Dorn’s West can face. Dorn is here addressing the traditional political and social instincts of a lot of Americans...

The very same.

The scream of the Accomplished Present A conglomerate of Ends, The scream of Parallels All its down with spikes These are the spines Of the cold citizens made to run wheels upon Parallels are just two things going to the same place that’s a bore (Dorn, Slinger, 97)

Again, this is the motion of acquiring space by power that results in the striation of space. In fact, the building of the railroads themselves are an effort to unify and “establish a network of communication no longer corresponding to the traditional network of roads” (Pescuclav 243). Robart’s railroad is a new division of space, one that corresponds to Robart’s wishes for acquisition. In real life, Dorn has used the railroad map as something “that began to reveal
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Or a bullet might be Inscribed — (Dorn, Slinger, 33)

Apart from his linguistic play on the cliché of 'having a bullet with your name on it', here Dorn seems to be identifying with what Foucault terms the 'panopticon,' a means where persons are controlled as Robart makes them visible. Power (Robart) will remain invisible and work on those who are visible, those who are named: "[P]erhaps...is exercised through its invisibility; at the same time it imposes on those whom it subjects a principle of compulsory visibility. In discipline, it is the subjects who have to be seen. Their visibility assures the hold of the power that is exercised over them" (Foucault 199). Hughes avoids the danger of being a subject to power by adopting many different names and identities and thus maintains his authority over characters like "I".

The linguistic play with the name of a character like "I" begins to focus Dorn's concern with creating a new view of the world. "I" is at one moment 'initial' and a 'single', a pronoun and a name (Dorn, Slinger, 32). He is the highest evolution of the Cartesian separation of subject and object, the ontological division in the Western world of mind from body. In the Cartesian system, the mind is elevated above the body and the rest of the physical world, as it is where all thinking and perception occurs. By this model, the rationalizing mind exists in the perceived world. "I" is preserved in LSD for purposes of fair-mindedness in order to push explanation beyond certain inhibiting barriers and the Slinger's trusty steed (Von Hallberg 50).

The horse that Slinger rides with is a suitable companion to one who is tearing down the traditional structures of society and of the self. Slinger's home is an anti-beast of burden who rides inside the coach with him, smokes marijuana, and goes by the names of Heidegger and Claude Lévi-Strauss. Although Dorn has said that his views on these two thinkers are not important, their presence in the text is meant to send off certain connotations with their work. Martin Heidegger's landmark book, Being and Time, provides a radical departure from the traditional Cartesian rationalist account of being by placing humans, which Heidegger dubs Dasein, in a temporal location. The position that Dorn will advocate is close to this, as the Slinger says: "I don't like to see I die."

Time is more fundamental than space. It is, indeed, the most pervasive of all the categories in other words there's plenty of it. (Dorn, Slinger, 5)

Traditional Cartesian duality has held space as all that is important, at the expense of temporality. Heidegger's critique sounds remarkably close to Slinger's: "Time must be brought to light — and genuinely conceived — as the horizon for all understanding of Being and for any way of interpreting it. In order to make this discern, the work has to be cleared of the horizons for the understanding of being, and in terms of temporality at the Being of Dasein, which understands Being. (39)"

The work of the anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss has focused on "kinship systems in terms of their differential and categorial status" and how this "violates the idea of a social contract with its attendant belief in the realm of inherent human values" (Davidson 119-20). Also, through his study of Amazon Indians, Lévi-Strauss claims that all cultural practices and relations are linguistic, at least at the symbolic level (305). As the Horse claims in Slinger: "I study the savage mind."

you are purely animal
of multiple meanings of words. Metaphysics has sought to permanently fix the meanings of all things, including words. Rather than tell us what words have meant, Dorn has said that in Slinger he is concerned with finding "what the words can mean." Interviews 47). Just as the Slinger is a migrating self, words and meanings can wander around with usage of puns and other word play. Notice the description of the Horse in Lil's bar:

"I tell you Slinger you would of split your levis and dropped you heads to see it. (Dorn, Slinger, 13)

The pun on levis equates the Slinger and his mount: Claude Lévi-Strauss — clawed levis' trousers. The Horse's name and the garments of the Slinger are the same. "I" inquires about the Horse's name, more wordplay ensues: "Claude Lévi-Strauss is that — / Yes, you guessed it / a homonym" (Dorn, Slinger, 36). Claude Lévi-Strauss is not only "clawed jeans" but "clawed genes" (Von Hallberg 67). This explains the way that the Horse is referred to when "I" calls him a "mare" in the beginning of the Book (Dorn, Slinger, 5). As the Horse's hat is a XX, he bears the female chromosome pairing, opposed to the XY that he should have. The use of "cockwise" only makes it stranger that a horse with the XX pair should wear the stetson. That the Horse's hat is a Slinger, "cockwise" only makes it stranger that a horse with words take on actions in the real world: Are you trying to describe me, boy? No, no I hastened to add. And by the way boy if there's any addin to do around here I'll do it, that's my stick comprende? (Dorn, Slinger, 25)

"I" seems to be both narrating and performing addition with the use of one word. Throughout Slinger, the narration of the plot takes a back seat to the language employed. Sometimes the words come alive and turn on their speakers, becoming literal from the figurative. See this example from Jean Flamboyant:

"Would you like a light / I see you macho has gone out continued the Doctor Catching his breath Slinger, did you flash how the PHD caught his breath, never saw anybody do it with their hand"

Yes agreed the Slinger, Brilliantly fast (Dorn, Slinger, 81) "Catching" breath takes on a literal level, and this conversation shows that speed is one of the Slinger's most prized characteristics. It is this speed that he draws from his way of seeing through traditional metaphysics and epistemology that sets him apart from others. However, actions can also take grammatical form:

"Uh, I'm not sure I get your question Lil the Horse exhaled, but are you speaking of the need for horsepower?"

Yes, I suppose I am, In Horses!

How would you like poco coins, Lil? Claude asked suddenly

My virtue is not presently on the market, fella Lil glared, which is bad timing of course because I might be amused to make it with a horse. Make It, Claude frownd

It ain't nothing but a neunter monn. (Dorn, Slinger, 170) Flesh turns to grammar here because of the Horse's embarrassment in being turned down. Dorn's use of all of this evasive language undermines the power of language and undermines what is real. Dorn has done this on many different levels — use of language, allegories for Western thought, and allusion to historical characters. Dorn's motive, though, is to create a new form of seeing the world.

When "I" reappears in Book III, he is a radically different character. He has learned from Parmenides (and probably changed from the LSD that was used to preserve him) and now lives more like the Slinger, in an affirmation of life rather than questioning of life. "I" reappears as the secretary to Parmenides as the pilot in a biplane in yet another allusion to the real Howard Hughes. That Parmenides taught "I" is appropriate because "it was [Parmenides'] view that self and other are one and the same in order for one to conceive of sensible objects at all he must be part of those objects as well" (Davidson 131). "I" has now achieved the transformation of viewpoint that Dorn desired; he has become an active observer rather than a passive viewer. He now feels like "trying to read a newspaper / from nothing but the ink poured into your ear" (Dorn, Slinger, 161). "I" can also now realize the true motive of Hughes' quest across America and the way out: Entrapment is this society's sole activity, I whispered and Only laughter can blow it to rags (Dorn, Slinger, 155)

With the linguistic devices he has used, Dorn has done just that; and he has also shown how experience must be lived in time rather than mediated by some outside source. The lack of resolution only confirms this. Slinger and Hughes never duel, Hughes merely decoaches and leaves for South America to continue his appropriation of land and space now that this land is out of his grasp. The idea of closure itself is a Western ideal that is not achieved in experience. By placing the characters of Slinger in the directly perceived world and by satirizing Cartesian systems, Edward Dorn has shown a new way of seeing the world and a new epistemology for explaining it.
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IAM I. HOWEER I WAS BEGOT (King John I, i, 175)

The fool of tradition was originally a creature of the European royal court—the jester, whose job it was to entertain his masters and mistresses and provide them with a sense of self-importance, be it deserved or not (Goldsmith 48). With his head tonsured and hooded, his hood adorned with "ears" and bells (Goldsmith 2), his clothes were of a motley sort—"Modey's the only wear" (AYLIII. vii. 34). The fool was "conspicuously classless," or at least hard to place in any semblance of social hierarchy (Black 83), most likely because the common fool was mentally deformed to a certain degree (McDonnell 14 April 1997). Despite this, he was somehow an accepted member of the royal court.

In Elizabethan drama, the fool made his start as a representative of Vice from the old Morality plays (i.e., Falstaff). In time, however, the fool developed unparalleled wisdom, an evolution credited to William Shakespeare upon his creation of Touchstone (Goldsmith 17). Though more similar to the fool of European tradition than to the Vice fool, the "Wise Fool" is an entity all its own. He was a character used by Shakespeare to be the voice of reason amidst a world of chaos; a character worthy of more than the slapstick wordplay/misinterpretation reserved for common fools (such as Dogberry) (19). The wise fool is not always his mistress and master's flatterer; through the guise of inferiority (to keep himself from being whipped) the wise fool is very often critical of his lords and ladies (48).

The wise fool, however, is nothing more than a literary creation (Somerset 73), the cunning brainchild of William Shakespeare's mind. For what cause did the Bard give birth to him? The pedestrian reason is that Robert Armin had joined the Lord Chamberlain's Men (Somerset 68), bringing with him a very "foolish" acting style, which included an impeccable wit and the physical capability for slapstick comedy. Some scholars and historians say that Shakespeare saw what a boon he had in Armin and created his great fools specifically for Armin to play. Although this may be true, that Shakespeare wrote characters just for Armin, it does not explain why his wise fools came to be; they are certainly not the only kind of comical character whom Armin could have portrayed. Why, then, should some of Shakespeare's foremost bearers of wisdom be those whose intellect was traditionally considered to be minuscule? What purpose is there of uniting folly and wisdom in a single character? The rest of this essay will be an attempt to discover the answers to these questions by examining the character and usage of three of Shakespeare's wisest fools—Touchstone, Feste, and Lear's Fool.

AY. NOW AM I IN ARDEN (As You Like It, II. iv. 14)

Touchstone is our first to be scrutinized. Touchstone is Arden's critic—he criticizes the Duke Senior's reciting of his pretty sermons, Orlando's pinning of poems to trees, Jaques' lamentations over a deer, Corin's simple life, William's simplicity of mind, et cetera (Goldsmith 48). His very name—Touchstone—suggests that his "facets of wisdom was a criterion by which the actions of the other characters...were judged (ix)." Touchstone is thus the voice of reason in Arden, placing the actions of others in check with his dialogue that "consists principally of assertions that things are what they are" (Magarey 61).

Though wise fools are by nature critical, Touchstone is perhaps the most critical of all, often chiding...
his words (Goldsmith x). It is his appearance, then, cure “since the little wit that fools have was silenced” others to the point of being downright nasty. His elements of his character that he hopes to keep se-
men. In court, his own ambiguous rank is not that the fool was not a stable one (McDonnell, 14 April 1997).

Social rank seems to be the more prominent of his two concerns, however. At court Touchstone is merely a fool; in Arden, “a region defined by an attitude of liberty from ordinary limitations” (Barber 225). Touchstone transforms himself into a gentle-
men. In court, his own ambiguous rank is not that much better than that of the rustic bumpkins in the countryside, yet he treats them as his natural inferiors. In his initial meeting with Corin, Touch-
stone introduces himself and his pariahs as Corin’s “bet-
” (II. iv. 61-64). He later argues with humble Corin the glories of the court versus the monstrosi-
you will. He brings an ironic spirit to the satirical and cliché theme of “doting lovers and their foolies” (Goldsmith 86). In lines 96-107 of Act Three Scene two, for example, he mimics Orlando’s romantic na-
ture, saying that love poems such as love’s character is to write easy and do not depict any great thought as one so in love should illustrate. In Act Two, scene four, line 57, Touchstone finds Silvius’ love, which Rosalind compares to her, to be tedious and “stale.”

And yet, as critical as he is of love, he is willing to use its guise for his own licentious intents with Audrey. He tells her that he would prefer her to be beautiful and experienced, claiming that “honesty coupled to beauty is to be looked upon” (III. iii. 26-7), in other words, too much of a good thing. He wishes to be poorly married to her so that after the consummation of their union he may more easily leave the marriage (III. iii. 81). His most shock-
ing speech comes at Act Five scene five, line 55, where he glorifies the cuckold. It is Touchstone’s contention that since the mighty stag has great horns and is admired for them, so should the cuckolded man be for it strengthens his defenses. He asks is it better to be inexperienced and have no horns, or to be a cuckold?—at least then a man has some experience to look back on and enjoy.

On the subject of love, this existential fool tran-
sends emotion and makes much sense—too much sense; for indeed, any lover will tell you that sensi-
tivity and love are rarely compatible. Why, then, should the fool make the most sense? Touchstone exists for a definite reason; it is known that he was not a char-
acter in Shakespeare’s source play, nor were Audrey and Cesario (Sargent 264), so he is considered a bona fide Shakespeare original. In the chaotic court of Arden where dukes live like peasants and women like men,
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this, it has been said that the Fool "has a personality; yet he is not—or cannot be perceived as being—a person" (Seiden 197). He has been compared with Ariel and Caliban (198) rather than with his comic counterparts because the other fools are charac-
ters like any other—Macheth, Desdemona, Angelo—
in short, they have parts. Feste and Touchstone are obviously real people with real feelings: "The Fool, whatever else he is, is not a man" (199). Others, of course, disagree, saying that the Fool is very much human and is not at all supernatural or even a "natur-
al" (Goldsmith 60): "It is the world and not the Fool that is irrational; the Fool's wisdom is the wisdom of a cruel world." (Goldsmith 96). Once again we have a completely original creation of Shakespeare's; once again we must wonder why.

Why is the Fool Lear's truest companion? There are a few valid readings of this question, and they all may work together. The first and simplest is that the two of them together are a mixture of comedy and tragedy—a dramatic marriage of sorts (Goldsmith 95). Another reading is that the Fool is Lear's alter ego (67), "the voice of nothing" (Seiden 209) that breathes most freely in the person of a somewhat detached observer (Goldsmith 31), the wise fool is obviously real people with real feelings: "The Fool, whatever else he is, is not a man" (199). Others, of course, disagree, saying that the Fool is very much human and is not at all supernatural or even a "natural" (Goldsmith 60): "It is the world and not the Fool that is irrational; the Fool's wisdom is the wisdom of a cruel world." (Goldsmith 96). Once again we have a completely original creation of Shakespeare's; once again we must wonder why.
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