In Memoriam

Michael T. Walton

Michael Walton (1945-2013), historian, historian of science, and polymath, was not so old as to be a founder of the RMMRA nor was he, despite our efforts, ever our president, but no member has ever contributed so much, nor, doubtless, will any member ever contribute more to our scholarly reason for being than Michael Walton. Over the twenty-seven years he was with us (and we expected so many more), he gave twenty-four papers, some joint with his companion in life and scholarship, his wife Phyllis, papers only Michael (and Phyllis) could give: learned, arcane, fascinating. He organized two of our conferences (2000 and 2011); he drafted our Constitution; he was instrumental in guiding our transition from a hard-copy to an electronic journal; only he had year after year of our programs to contribute for our archives when we sought to recover our history; and from 1996-2013, he brought continuity to our Board, either as elected representative or as initiator of what he hoped would be our annual monograph series, still unfinished by his untimely death. At our conferences and elsewhere, he reached out to us, especially our younger members, to nurture worthy scholarship; he always entertained (and sometimes shocked!) us with his wit and humor; regardless of content or period, he was an incisive and amazingly learned and helpful commentator on our conference papers; he was an important booster of our electronic journal; and he was a silent benefactor to the Association: No one knows the extent of his financial contributions to the conferences he organized, and only conference organizers could collectively determine how many banquets and receptions were lent a touch of grace and conviviality by the wine he anonymously bestowed on us. Michael, our organization and conferences will not be the same without you and your loyal and generous and scholarly commitment to us.

Michael Walton, with degrees from the University of Utah (BA 1969, MA 1970) and the University of Chicago (PhD 1979), not to mention two years study at the University of Utah College of Law, was a scholar’s scholar whose work grew from his insatiable love of learning, unprompted by an academic or university appointment. He was primary author, often with his wife, Phyllis, of four books with a fifth in draft at his death, six chapters, eighteen articles, more than fifty conference papers, two prefaces, three encyclopedia articles, more than twenty book reviews, and co-editor of two books. In addition to the RMMRA, he was member of the Society for the History of Alchemy and Chemistry, Historians of Early Modern Europe, and The Sixteenth Century Society and Conference.

A brief look at some of his publications will show Walton’s range and depth. His PhD dissertation, “Fifteenth Century London Medical Men in their Social Context” was later revised and co-authored with his wife Phyllis Walton as Medical Practitioners and Law in Fifteenth Century London (Raleigh, NC: Lulu.com, 2007). This work is notable not only for its historical treatment of late medieval
English surgical guilds and their relationships to civic authorities and judicial processes, but also for situating Walton in an intellectual milieu (fostered by the University of Chicago’s Richard McKeon, Charles Gray, Allen Debus et al.) whose traditions he continued to develop and explore for the remainder of his life, especially in the areas of humanism, medicine, chemistry, alchemy, law, and philosophy. He must have taken particular pride, thus, in the publication of *Reading the Book of Nature: The Other Side of the Scientific Revolution* (Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, v. 41 (1998), a book he co-edited with Allen G. Debus, one of the University of Chicago directors of his 1979 dissertation. Walton continued a relationship with Debus until his death in 2009, publishing an essay “John Dee’s Monas Hieroglyphica: Geometrical Cabala” in Allen G. Debus, ed., *Alchemy and Early Modern Chemistry: Papers from Ambix* (Huddington, West Yorkshire: Jeremy Mills, 2004). Indeed, at the time of his death, Walton was co-editing with Karen Hunger Parshall and Bruce T. Moran a Festschrift to Professor Debus entitled *Bridging Traditions: Alchemy, Chemistry, and Paracelsian Practices in the Early Modern Era*, with a tentative publication date of 2014.

In 2011, Walton published a second book, *Genesis and the Chemical Philosophy: True Christian Science in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, AMS Studies in the Renaissance, No. 45 (New York: AMS Press, 2011) focused on “the rise, maturation, and decline of the Genesis-inspired chemical philosophy” of its titular period. This book was remarkable both for the array of medical and philosophical thinkers included—Paracelsus, Gerhard Dorn, Oswald Croll, Thomas Tymme, Heinrich Khunrath, Robert Fludd, Jean Baptiste van Helmont, and others—and also for the clarity of presentation as Walton demonstrated that these thinkers illustrate the rise and decline of a spiritualized approach to science and Nature that led finally to a new, secular-minded epistemology for the early modern period. The following year, Walton published his most recent book, *Anthonius Margaritha and the Jewish Faith: Jewish Life and Conversion in Sixteenth-Century Germany* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2012). This historical work received an extensive review by Dr. Marian Diemling (Canterbury Christ Church University) in H-Net, who concluded that “this beautifully presented and well-written book adds to our understanding of the Jewish conversion process experience in the early sixteenth century and again stresses the importance of convert writings for Jewish historiography” (https://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=37981).

Prolific as an historian, Walton consistently published in a wide diversity of journals from the 1970s until his passing. In the 1970s and 1980s, Walton’s subject matter ran the gamut of medical, scientific, religious, and philosophical interests: “The First Blood Transfusion: English or French?” (*Medical History* 18:360, 1974); “Boyle and Newton on the Transmutation of Water and Air; from the Root of Helmont’s Tree” (*Ambix* XXIII: 11, 1980); “Professor Seixas, the Hebrew Bible, and the Book of Abraham” (*Sunstone* 6: 41, 1981); “The Advisory Jury and

During the 1990s and 2000s, Walton’s research interests continued to expand, and he seems to have taken particular inspiration and satisfaction during this period in the essays that he often co-authored with his wife Phyllis and their friend, the geneticist and pediatrician Dr. Robert M. Fineman. This partnership among them was a highly productive one, resulting in a number of articles for diverse audiences. The Walton, Walton, and Fineman publications began with a 1993 contribution to Volume 47 of The American Journal of Medical Genetics (“Of Monsters and Prodigies: The Interpretation of Birth Defects in the Sixteenth Century”). Works with Fineman continued in Walton, Walton, and Fineman, “Holy Hermaphrodites and Medical Facts” (Cauda Pavonis: Studies in Hermeticism, n.s 18, 1999); Walton and Fineman, “The Prevention of Infirm and Monstrous Births” (Quidditas 22, 2001); “Should Genetic Health Care Providers Attempt to Influence Reproductive Outcome Using Direct Counseling Techniques? A Public Health Perspective” (Women & Health 30.3, 2000, and in Genetic Services: Developing Guidelines for Public Health, 1996); “Why Can’t A Woman Be More Like a man? A Renaissance Perspective on the Biological Basis for Female Inferiority” (Women & Health, 24.4, 1997). For Michael and Phyllis Walton, see “Being Up Front: The Frontispiece and the Prisca Tradition” (Cauda Pavonis 17, 1998); “Witches, Jews, and Spagyrists: Blood Remedies and Blood Transfusions in the Sixteenth Century” (Cauda Pavonis 15, 1996); and “In Defense of the Church Militant: The Censorship of the Rashi Commentary in the Magna Biblia Rabbinica” (Sixteenth Century Journal 21:3, 1990). Amidst these wide-ranging publications, Walton and his wife also found time to publish a collection of earlier essays, Mormon Essays: Science and Mormonism, a Study of Harmony and Conflict; Joseph Smith and Science: The Methodist Connection; The Book of Abraham: Toward a Comprehensive Theory of the Text; The House of Israel in Mormon Theology (2007). In the months before his death, Walton had promised the co-organizers of the 2014 RMMRA conference another paper by him and Fineman that would have to do with, of all things, “ideas about elephants from Pliny through the Renaissance.”


For all of his academic accomplishments, however, Michael Walton took particular pride and joy in his family, community, and the marine business he and Phyllis owned and operated in Salt Lake City, Walton Marine. As Phyllis wrote, “What at first was a disappointment, we came to regard as a blessing. Our business became at times a blue-collar salon. Our customers loved to fish and run rivers, but they would also read some of Mike’s articles; some even bought his books. He encouraged everyone to become a better person, and the recurring theme among the comments from his customers, suppliers, and competitors is his honesty. What better tribute could a man have?” He was past president of the Friends of the University of Utah Library; a member of the Utah Coalition on Tort Reform (1985-86); he was co-founder of Beit Midrash, Center for Jewish Studies in Salt Lake; and he was Past Executive Director of the Utah Guides and Outfitters Association.

On 23 August 2013, a week after suffering an acute stroke, Michael T. Walton died at home. His family and close friend, Robert Fineman, were with him.

Ave atque vale

Charles Smith, Professor of English Emeritus
Colorado State University, Fort Collins

Todd P. Upton, Ph.D., Independent Scholar
Littleton, Colorado

Obituary


From the editor

*Quidditas* is the annual, on-line journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association. Often, the journal publishes the winners of the Alan D. Breck and Delno C. West Awards. These awards recognize, respectively, the most distinguished papers presented at the annual conference by a junior scholar and a senior scholar. The winner of the Breck Award for 2013 is Tiffany Beechy of the University of Colorado, Boulder, for her paper “Spewing Wisdom: The Digestive Alchemy of Medieval Poesis.” The winner of the West Award for 2013 is Ginger L. Smoak of the University of Utah, for her paper “Imagining Pregnancy: The *Fünfbilderserie* and Images of ‘Pregnant Disease Woman’ in Medieval Medical Manuscripts,” which appears in this issue. The journal also publishes Notes, Review Essays, and Texts and Teaching—that is reviews of books that may be useful for teaching in medieval and early modern courses. These features furnish readers and contributors venues not available in other scholarly journals.

The word *quidditas* is a Latin legal term that originally meant “the essential nature of a thing.” In fourteenth-century French the word became “quiddite.” In the early modern period, the English adaptation, “quiddity,” came to mean “logical subtleties” or “a captious nicety in argument” (OED), the term is so used in Hamlet (“Why may not that be the skull of a lawyer? Where be his quiddities now, his quillets, his cases, his tenures, and his tricks?” 5: 1, 95–97). Thus, the original Latin meaning, together with the later implied notions of intense scrutiny, systematic reasoning, and witty wordplay, is suited to the journal.
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Aethelflaed: History and Legend

Kim Klimek
Metropolitan State University of Denver

This paper examines the place of Aethelflaed, Queen of the Mercians, in the written historical record. Looking at works like the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Irish Annals, we find a woman whose rule acted as both a complement to and a corruption against the consolidations of Alfred the Great and Edward’s rule in Anglo-Saxon England. The alternative histories written by the Mercians and the Celtic areas of Ireland and Wales show us an alternative view to the colonization and solidification of West-Saxon rule.

Introduction

Aethelflaed, Queen and Lady of the Mercians, ruled the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Mercia from 911–918. Despite the deaths of both her husband and father and increasing Danish invasions into Anglo-Saxon territory, Aethelflaed not only held her territory but expanded it. She was a warrior queen whose Mercian army followed her west to fight the Welsh and north to attack the Danes. She lost two battles and won at least three. Aethelflaed should be an Anglo-Saxon icon; however, she is barely a footnote in mainstream contemporary Anglo-Saxon sources. Bits and pieces of her story appear in charters, annals, poems, and stories; not enough material has been gathered on her for a modern monograph, or even a full-length article. But her reign was important enough to warrant inclusion in at least four major annals and chronicles. The few Anglo-Saxon mentions of Aethelflaed outlined the basics of her place in history as a small part in the unification of England from Alfred to Aethelstan. Yet, there is more to Aethelflaed’s story. Within the canonical Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Aethelflaed is just another forgotten memory destroyed by the vagaries of time and the chronicler’s pen but in the Mercian Register, the Anglo-Saxon Charters, and the Irish Annals, she is part of an alternative history. In these records of the conquered or almost conquered, her reign and the subsequent absorption of Mercia
into Wessex are part of a wider narrative that undermines the ideology of Wessex conquest. Considering all these sources helps us to understand Aethelflaed both as her father’s daughter and as a ruler in her own right. These sources show us that her rule as Queen of Mercia, while it complemented her father’s and brother’s consolidation of England against the Danes, could also be seen as a corruption against that consolidation.

**The Sources**

One of the most important sources for this period is the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (ASC). The complicated text compiled from seven manuscripts and two fragments is a unique source of information about England from the ninth to twelfth centuries. The Chronicle consists of six extant versions (A, B, C, D, E, and F) and several fragments. The Main, or Canonical, Chronicle is cited as versions A, from Winchester, a West-Saxon area, and E, from Peterborough, which was inscribed long after the Viking invasions. Versions B, C, and D were written in Abingdon and Worcester, two areas once in Mercian control, but by the early tenth century under West-Saxon rule. The Chronicle is an annalistic history, where monks jotted important notes like comets or deaths in the abbey. Occasionally, dates would be written in advance, and a monk would have to fit details into a small space. The format offered little narrative, but the chroniclers were dedicated to God, not history. The Chronicle may read like a mere listing of achievements, but it is far more than that—each entry has significance and meaning. We should read the accounts concerned primarily with women with this in mind—the chronicler chose to craft each entry with forethought and energy. Aethelflaed is mentioned by name eight times in the full Chronicle, with six of the eight mentions in the Mercian chronicles, C and D.

Several additional chronicles mention Aethelflaed: the West-Saxon chronicles of Asser’s Life of Alfred the Great, Aethelweard’s Chronicle, the Welsh Annales Cambriae, and the Irish chronicles, including The Three Fragments. Asser and Aethelweard’s chronicler refer to Aethelflaed in similar fashion to the Canonical versions of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Sources outside of Wessex’s influ-
ence, like versions C and D of the ASC and the Celtic sources, refer to Aethelflaed in less traditional forms. Unlike the West-Saxon chronicles, Aethelflaed is not paired in an obligatory fashion to the men in her life. She is not Aethelflaed, daughter of Alfred, sister of Edward, wife of Aethelred. She is Aethelflaed, Lady of the Mercians. I contend that this characterization of Aethelflaed is an alternative reading of history written by men whose homes and regions had been conquered by Wessex. Aethelflaed’s history corrupts the easy colonization and consolidation of England and the British Isles by Wet-Saxon kings like Alfred and his son Edward.

Noblewomen are often understood in relation to their fathers, brothers, husbands, and sons. Undoubtedly, in the world of familial politics, one’s relations were paramount to understanding one’s place within the world. Even in modern histories, we understand medieval women within their familial relations. Aethelflaed herself is consistently paired with men in the majority of modern secondary sources. For example, F. T. Wainwright, who wrote the first modern article on Aethelflaed, states: “Aethelflaed was the daughter of Alfred the Great, sister of Edward the Elder, the wife of Ealdorman Aethelred of the Mercians and herself ruler of the Mercians for seven years after her husband’s death.” Feminist scholars have attempted to elevate Aethelflaed but even in their work, the men still take center stage. Helen Jewell does not mention Aethelflaed at all in her 2007 monograph on women in early medieval Europe and has only a brief paragraph describing Aethelflaed’s biography in her 1997 book on medieval English women. Yet, Jewell writes twice as much on her husband Aethelred, who appears in half as much source material as his wife.2

Other modern historians briefly discuss Aethelflaed as a military leader, and their work tends to be based on the canonical West-Saxon sources. David Jones writes that Aethelflaed “vowed a life of chastity after nearly dying in childbirth” and applied her energies

1 Damico and Olsen, New Readings on Women in Old English Literature, 44.

to military pursuits, echoing the twelfth-century Anglo-Norman historian William of Malmesbury. Pauline Stafford calls Aethelflaed one of the greatest warrior queens of the age. In one of the longest modern recitations of Aethelflaed’s reign, Christine Fell in *Women in Anglo-Saxon England* devotes four pages to the Mercian queen. *Battle Cries and Lullabies* repeats the idea about Aethelflaed’s chastity but presents a more nuanced view of her military campaigns.

These descriptions of Aethelflaed are so common as to be unremarkable. How could Aethelflaed be other than an extension of her father Alfred’s military campaigns? Yet, many of the primary sources outside of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle offer us much more than a woman who was merely a daughter and sister of a mighty military king. She was Lady and ruler of the Mercians, not just her father’s daughter. But, of course, the canonical history of Wessex wrote to prove Wessex’s superiority over the rest of the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Danish kingdoms.

**Canonical History: The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Asser’s Life of Alfred**

Alfred the Great is a figure well-known to historians of England, partially because of the wealth of information the canonical historians left for us. During the tumultuous Danish colonization of England in the ninth century, Alfred, alone of the Anglo-Saxon kings of the heptarchy, remained standing against the Viking incursions. Ruling the central kingdom of Wessex from 871 to 899, Alfred defended his kingdom with military and diplomatic actions. He built military fortifications and convinced the Danish king Guthrum to convert to Christianity. His educational programs rivaled those of the Carolingian Renaissance, and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle owes

---

4 Stafford, *Queens, Concubines, and Dowagers*, 118.
6 De Pauw, *Battle Cries and Lullabies*, 83.
much to Alfred’s belief in vernacular education. He deserved the twelfth-century appellation of “the Great” and he remains the only English monarch to carry that title.

Wessex was not, however, the only Anglo-Saxon kingdom to maintain freedom during this period. In the eighth century, three kingdoms amongst the heptarchy controlled most of the Anglo-Saxon lands: Northumbria, Mercia, and Wessex. Scandinavian raiding armies changed this dynamic in 865. Thetford in East Anglia fell to the Vikings in 865; York in 867; and Danes wintered in London by 871. By 877, Scandinavian lords controlled most of Northumbria, East Anglia, Essex, Kent, Sussex, and Eastern Mercia. Wessex lost territory in the east, but maintained control over its central and western territory. Mercia, despite losing much of its eastern half, controlled a land mass similar in size to that of its southern, and still Anglo-Saxon, neighbor. The last Mercian king, Burhred, died in 874. That same year, a “foolish king’s thegn was grated the kingdom of Mercia to hold, but does not seem to have been crowned king.7 By 878 only one true Anglo-Saxon king remained, Alfred. Nevertheless, Mercia also remained, albeit as a kingdom without a king. Alfred had a built-in diplomatic agent: Aethelflaed was the first child of Alfred of Wessex and his Mercian wife, Ealhswith.

To secure power over the neighboring kingdom of Mercia, Alfred married this daughter to a powerful local ealdorman, Aethelred, at the previous Mercian king’s death. Alfred then acknowledged Aethelred and Aethelflaed as Lord and Lady of Mercia. Her marriage cemented the relationship between Mercia and Wessex. Aethelflaed was the daughter of one king and sister to another, and to Mercia, through her mother and aunt, one a royal lady and the other a queen. Alfred also granted to Aethelred a sword at his death, a gift that Simon Keynes marks as a “sign of his special position as effective ruler of Mercia.”8

7 ASC, Winchester Manuscript A, year 874.
8 Asser, Alfred the Great: Asser’s Life of King Alfred and Other Contemporary Sources, 323, n. 391.
Despite her pivotal import to these bonds, the canonical versions of the ASC (versions A, and E) mention Aethelflaed infrequently. Version A mentions her by name once, at her death. Mercia is written of 7 times from 876 to 918. Version E mentions her by name once, at her death. Mercia is mentioned 5 times from 878 to 918. Her army and her boroughs appear under Edward’s aegis, as his name and army appear by name previous to any mention of the Mercians.

Perspective may have everything to do with Aethelflaed’s absence. Historian Christine Fell notes the West Saxon bias of much of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and considers that suppression of women’s achievements could be more about their place of birth than their sex. A desire that “Mercian achievement should not be seen to outshine West Saxon” could have relegated Aethelflaed’s achievements to the background. Alistair Campbell, in his introduction to the Chronicle of Aethelweard suggests that Aethelflaed and Aethelred’s removal from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle might have been because Edward was intent on looking forward and “may well have found it [Aethelflaed’s deeds] irritating.”

The second essential work about Alfred and his reign is Asser’s Life of Alfred, written in late 893. The author seemed concerned with portraying his patron as a great king, particularly to newly conquered areas. There is little negative information about Alfred in this manuscript. Because the work ends abruptly in 893, before Aethelflaed’s rule in Mercia, Asser’s work provides us with only a few details of her life before becoming a ruler. Asser leads us to believe that, because she and her sister Aethelgifu were born before her father’s educational program was complete, neither of them benefited from his interest in education. Instead Alfred’s two sons, Edward and Aethelweard, and his youngest daughter Aelfthryth were “devoted and intelligent students of the liberal arts.” Perhaps Aethelflaed was too old to profit from Alfred’s new program. Still, as the eldest daughter of Alfred, she was important to her father and in 882/3 he married her off in a politically expedient move.

The story of Aethelflaed appears mainly in the Mercian Register, which was inserted into the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. The oldest manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, cited as A, does not use the Mercian Register. The Register was, however, added wholesale to manuscripts B and C “without any attempt to dovetail its annals into those of the Chronicle.” The register forms then a discreet part of the Chronicle. The Mercian Register fills a gap within those manuscripts B and C, which have no entries for the years 915 to 934. The D and E forms of the Chronicle also use the Mercian Register, but here the register is inserted into the regular annals. The E version is closely tied to the D form and has interpolations of the Mercian Register. The Mercian Register disappears from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as abruptly as it appears. The last entry is in 927 when Athelstan succeeded to the kingdom of Northumbria and accepted the oaths of other kings on the island. The majority of the entries in Version C, the least modified version of the Mercian Register, concern Aethelflaed: She is in eight of the twenty notes. Twelve notes concern Aethelflaed’s immediate family—her father’s death, her brother’s accession, her husband’s death, and her daughter’s removal. The Mercians clearly had more interest in Aethelflaed than the West-Saxons.

When Alfred died around 900, his son Edward faced serious challenges. Edward succeeded to a divided and invaded land, and his cousin Aethelwold and his Danish allies also contested his inheritance. Edward found needed support through his sister Aethelflaed and her husband. In 903, Aethelwold and his army “harried all over Mercia” and the Mercians joined Edward against Aethelwold and the Danes. Battle broke out again in 910 and the Mercians had a great victory at Tettenhall, killing many Danish men. Notwithstanding it being a Mercian victory, the battle is mentioned in the ASC versions C, D, and E and in the Mercian Register, but only in Mercian Register is Aethelflaed mentioned by name. Shortly after the
battle at Tettenhall, Aethelred died, perhaps as a result of wounds he received during the battle. Aethelflaed would act as independent leader for the first time.

She may have led well before her husband’s death. F. T. Wainwright suggests that Aethelred was in poor health for much of his reign, stating that he “could do no more than offer advice from a sickbed.”12 His sources for Aethelred’s continuing illness are the Irish Three Fragments, where Aethelred is “in a disease” from at least 902,13 and a mention from Henry of Huntingdon, who wrote that Aethelred was “long infirm” before his death.14 Following that logic, Aethelflaed ruled Mercia as early as 902.

Nevertheless, Aethelflaed truly became the leader of Mercia when she began her concentrated building program in 910. Her construction of boroughs (or burhs) continued a process her father had begun during his reign, and we may suppose that Alfred trained his daughter in these practices, whether actively or passively. Alfred’s building campaign was a system of defense meant to protect his territory from Danish incursions. Based on a reading of the tenth-century document “Burghal Hidage,” Alfred’s burhs were designed to be permanent settlements of people and fortresses for his semi-permanent garrisons.15 Historian Richard Abels writes that “the defensive system that Alfred sponsored, and its extension to Mercia under Ealdorman Aethelred and the ‘Lady Aethelflaed’, enabled his kingdom to survive.”16 The burghal system of Wessex “became a tool for conquest and territorial consolidation . . . by Edward the Elder, Ealdorman Aethelred and the Lady Aethelflaed. . . .”17

---

12 Damicco and Olsen, New Readings on Women in Old English Literature, 46.
14 Henry of Huntingdon, Historia Anglorum, 167.
15 Abels, Alfred the Great: War, Kingship, and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England, 199.
16 Abels, Alfred the Great: War, Kingship, and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England, 199.
fact, a Mercian charter talks of the building up of Worcester by both Aethelred and Aethelflaed “for the protection of all the people.”\textsuperscript{18} The building of burhs, particularly for defense, shows us Aethelflaed’s military and social stratagems. She might not have held the formal title of queen for the Wessex monastic chroniclers, but she behaved like one.

The Welsh border posed Aethelflaed’s first military test as queen. Early in her rule, the burhs of Gloucester, Hereford, and Worcester were built. Aethelweard writes that the Danes had built fortifications in Gloucester in 877, so re-building this city as Mercian may have been of importance to Aethelflaed and her husband. Of the eleven towns built during Aethelflaed’s reign, five were on the border with Wales. Although poorer in resources, the Welsh border was still a significant boundary that needed protection. Welsh leaders had taken oaths of loyalty to Aethelred, which probably extended to Aethelflaed upon his death. However, in 916, a Mercian abbot was killed while in Welsh territory. Three days later, Aethelflaed sent an army into Wales where she destroyed Brecon Mere and took thirty-four hostages, including a Welsh king’s wife.\textsuperscript{19} Aethelflaed thus proved that she was not to be discounted in the military arena. With the Welsh quieted, Aethelflaed and her Mercian army focused on repelling the Danes to the north and west of Mercia.

She continued to fortify towns and assist her brother in repelling the Danish forces for the next two years. Her remaining seven burhs were situated along Danish borders. Some, like those of Tamworth and Stafford, were even in Danish-held lands. Aethelflaed fought not only against the Danes, but also against the Irish-Norwegians who invaded Northumbria in 914. She fortified two burhs in 914/915, Eddisbury and Runcorn—both of which were further north than those burhs in central Mercia that were directed against the Danes. According to the Irish Chronicle, The Three Fragments, Aethelflaed directed these fortresses against the Irish-Norwegian

\textsuperscript{18} Hooke, \textit{The Anglo-Saxon Landscape: The Kingdom of the Hwicce}, 104.

\textsuperscript{19} ASC, Abingdon Manuscript (Version C), year 916. \textit{Brecon Mere} has been identified as Langorse Lake, near Brecon.
leader Ragnald, whom she met in battle in 918 where “her fame spread abroad in every direction.”

Aethelflaed and Edward, her brother and king of Wessex, had an easy alliance. One of her more important conquests for Edward was Derby, which continued to hold a Danish garrison. The Mercian Register tells us that Aethelflaed “obtained the borough which is called Derby, with all that belongs to it” while Edward fought due south and east and occupied Towcester and Huntingdon. Their armies were not conjoined, but their building policies leave little doubt that brother and sister prepared and executed their plans in conjunction with the other.

We cannot doubt that the creation of burhs impressed Alfred’s, and Aethelflaed’s royal power upon their subjects, both old and new. New towns were a part of Alfred’s defensive scheme against the Danes and we can assume the same for the towns built by his daughter and son. While Aethelflaed concentrated on building burhs in the northwest portion of Mercia, Edward built fortifications in the east, only moving north after his sister’s death. We can see, then, that Aethelflaed’s building continued her father’s protective stance. Aethelflaed acted as a military commander when she built burhs in her territory. The building processes might also have been her way of solidifying her own power over Mercia and signaling this power to her enemies, her subjects, and perhaps even her brother.

With her death, the cooperation between Mercia and Wessex was at an end, and Edward needed no more pretext to Mercian freedom. In 918, the Mercian Register reports that she “died twelve days before midsummer in Tamworth, in the eighth year in which with lawful authority she was holding dominion over the Mercians.”

20 Fragmentary Annal, FA 429, year 907.
21 ASC, Abingdon Manuscript (Version C), year 917.
22 ASC, Abingdon Manuscript (Version C), year 918.
the stronghold at Tamworth, and all the nation of the land of Mercia which was earlier subject to Aethelflaed turned to him.”

The Mercian Register completes our description of Edward’s capture of Mercia from Aethelflaed’s daughter, Alfwynn, who was “deprived of all authority in Mercia and taken into Wessex.” We can surmise that Aethelflaed meant her daughter to succeed her, as the Mercian Register confers upon her “authority” in Mercia. And, since Edward needed to “occupy” Tamworth in order to subject the Mercians to his authority, Alfwynn must have actually held some authority there. All these events happened directly after Aethelflaed’s death in Tamworth, indicating a sudden regime change.

Aethelflaed’s Mercian Legacy

Given the events that appear in the Mercian register, Aethelflaed was obviously important to the Mercians. Their male chroniclers assigned her a starring role. Yet, later versions of events cast Aethelflaed as bit player. During the same period, in the Canonical ASC, she is mentioned by name only at her death, in version A. The Mercian army, as commanded by Aethelflaed, is mentioned three times in the versions A, C, and D. The Mercian monks could also have written this story without its main actor, but they chose to include her and her most significant events, both before and after her husband’s death. For monks whose allegiances and family ties most probably lay within the district of Mercia, Edward’s abrupt invasion of Tamworth and his removal of Alfwynn must have struck these writers as close to the military advancements he had made on London and Oxford, two former Mercian cities, which he conquered at Aethelflaed’s husband’s death. The canonical tale here is of Edward finishing his father’s consolidation of England under one king. To the Mercians, it may well have felt like a new invasion. Perspective is paramount in history.

23 *ASC*, Winchester Manuscript (Version A), year 922.
24 *ASC*, Abingdon Manuscript (Version C), year 918.
Aethelflaed’s importance is also clear in the Anglo-Saxon charter. In it, she and Aethelred appear as “rulers of Mercia” and they exchange land with a church and grant a gold chalice to an abbess. She appears with Aethelred in one other charter (S 223) and on her own in two charters (S 224 and S 225). Interestingly, the reliability of all five charters in which Aethelred appears alone has been questioned. Only one of Aethelflaed’s charters has received such a charge. In total, Aethelflaed appears in four of nine charters for the period between Ceolwulf II and Edward the Elder (874-924). This total is more frequent than any previous Mercian queen, most of whom only appear once. Prior to Aethelflaed, Mercian queens appear in three of forty-nine charters. Of 604 charters of the West Saxons and Wessex, only one queen, Frithugyth, Aethelweard’s wife, appears as a co-benefactor (S 253). Out of the total 1163 Anglo-Saxon charters, queens appear as co-sponsors only twelve times. This gives Aethelflaed one-third, and Mercian women over half, of all the representations of women in 400 years.

The charters represent Aethelflaed’s actions: she works with her husband before his death, and she acts alone in her widowhood. Aethelred’s and Aethelflaed’s lack of royal titles and coinage has suggested submission to Alfred and Edward. While there is a lack of royal title, both the kings of Wessex treated Aethelred and Aethelflaed as allies. In three Wessex charters, S 367, S 367a, and S 371, Edward acts “with Aethelred and Aethelflaed of Mercia.” Edward’s charters all concern requests made by a duke Aethelfrith—the land in question existed in border areas between Mercia and Wessex. Edward may have been acting in concert with the Mercian rulers to stave off any accusations of impropriety in oft-disputed territory. Mercia was the weaker territory, but it nonetheless avoided external invasion, at least during Aethelflaed’s lifetime.

25 Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*. Hereafter, charters from this work will be referred to by their Sawyer number only.
Alternative History: Celtic Sources

The Annals of Ulster, the most prominent of Irish Chronicles, lists Aethelflaed only at her death: “918. Ethelfled, a very famous queen of the Saxons, dies.” These annals often list the deaths of queens and prominent women; from 439 to 1047, twenty-three women’s deaths are mentioned. Of those twenty-three women, only three are mentioned without their concomitant men: the Saint Brigid, the Abbess of Cell Dara, and Aethelflaed.

Aethelflaed’s military actions may have earned her note by the Irish. The Fragmentary Annals provides the most tantalizing view of Aethelflaed. These annals were probably written prior to 1040 and the relative brevity of years (covering the years 573 to 914) is matched only by their verbosity and storytelling. Fragmentary Annal 429 begins in 907 and abruptly ends in 914. The annal concerns the Norwegians in Britain and their encounters with Aethelflaed, Queen of the Saxons. Like other alternative, non-canonical, sources, Aethelflaed’s agency is direct and active: at signs that the Danes were amassing in Chester, “The Queen then gathered a large army about her from the adjoining regions, and filled the city of Chester with her troops.” According to the Three Fragments, she directed fortresses against the Irish-Norwegian leader Ragnald, whom she met in battle in 918 where “her fame spread abroad in every direction.” The Queen “holds authority over all the Saxons” and she specifically requests Irish help in defeating the Danes at Chester. She actively commands the battle and ends the seizure of the city: “The pagans were slaughtered by the Queen like that, so that her fame spread in all directions. Aethelflaed, through her own cleverness, made peace with the men of Alba and with the Britons, so that

26 Annals of Ulster to 1131, 369.

27 Aethelflaed does not appear in the Annals of Tigernach or the Annals of Inisfallen, despite those two chronicles relying on the Annals of Ulster. These last two works only mention women without their male relatives in two instances: Brigid and Abbesses.

28 Fragmentary Annal, FA 429, year 907.
whenever the same race should come to attack her, they would rise to help her. If it were against them that they came, she would take arms with them. While this continued, the men of Alba and Britain overcame the settlements of the Norwegians and destroyed and sacked them." Thus ends the Fragmentary Annal, with Aethelflaed making peace with the Irish and Welsh and commanding the island of Britain against the Scandinavian invaders.

Surprisingly, Aethelflaed’s male relatives receive little attention in the Fragments. Aethelred’s illness and death are noted; Alfred and Edward are not mentioned. The strong warrior who consolidates England is a woman. And while she is a Saxon, she rules the entire south without a distinction made between Wessex and Mercia, controlling an expanded territory, even by eighth-century Mercian standards. It is not unusual that the Irish sources would not write about Anglo-Saxon history—with Viking invasions and settlements of their own, and various kings battling for supremacy, Irish history was itself enough for the chronicles.

If the Anglo-Saxons make so few entrances into Irish history, can these two mentions of Aethelflaed be true alternative histories? The battle scenes in the Fragmentary Annals are detailed and complex (boiling cauldrons, beehives, and tunneling) and the peace treaty is outlined with a complete speech from the Queen’s messenger. The Viking invasions had brought the British Isles into closer proximity than they had been in years. For two annals to detail Aethelflaed as an important queen seems significant. In the histories, Brigid is the only other woman to whom the chroniclers attend. In the Irish ballads and legends, the poets often portray strong, often dangerous, and always beautiful women—and their men fare no differently. In the Fragmentary Annals, I believe we see a composite view of Aethelflaed. She met the requirement of Irish hero: she was a strong, dangerous, warrior able to throw off a foreign yoke—a yoke familiar to all the Irish writers.
Alternative History: Folklore

Two years ago, a student and native of Ireland relayed a story he had heard from his grandmother concerning Aethelflaed. An Irishwoman, his grandmother told him stories that dwelt on English perfidy against rightful rulers. I asked him to write the story down for me, as best he could recall. His tale outlined Aethelflaed and her daughter as the rightful rulers of Mercia, rulers who had close connections and warm relations with Irish kings. This remained true until Aethelflaed’s death, when Edward claimed Mercia as his own and killed his niece, Alfwynn. The story ended with Aethelflaed and Alfwynn being invited to live with the Tuatha de Danaan in their barrows under the earth, as rightful queens and beautiful women, where they then became responsible for deceitful tricks against any English on Irish soil, or against any English sympathizers.

Stories about the Tuatha de Danaan abound in Irish folklore and histories. The Tuatha de Danaan, or children of the goddess Dana, were pre-Christian deities of Ireland who supplanted the original inhabitants of Ireland. Once later cultures supplanted the Tuatha, they became Fairy Folk, ageless gods and goddesses who could appear and disappear almost at will into the human realm of Ireland, or Tara. They dwelt in underground barrows and often exited their realm to claim spouses, interfere in human political affairs, or invite popular human rulers to dwell forever in their realms, in an apparent apotheosis of popular rulers. The tale of Aethelflaed and Alfwynn’s acceptance into the Tuatha de Danaan mirrors these Fairy Folk Tales.

This encounter supports two useful ideas: 1) there are oral histories about the Middle Ages, and 2) Aethelflaed had been more than “Lady of the Mercians” and her story had outlived her small part in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Despite this oral morsel, I have found no reference to Aethelflaed in written Irish Folktales or stories. Further work with oral history may bring to light additional tales, which may also lead to connections between the conquered Aethelflaed and the conquered Tara.
Conclusions

Perhaps Mercian nobles accepted Aethelflaed as ruler as a way to keep Mercia independent from Wessex. The nobles did not seek Edward’s protection, and Edward did not advance into Mercia at Aethelred’s death. Instead, Mercian nobles chose to maintain Mercia and its traditions by supporting their Lady and her daughter, the latter of whom could later be married to an ealdorman, who in turn would rule them as king. Aethelflaed remained a widow in the seven years between her husband’s death and her own, thereby smoothing the way for her daughter’s accession and maintaining her own power. Whether this was her choice, the Mercian noblemen’s, or her brother’s, we do not know. We do know, however, that Edward did not challenge her supremacy in Mercia, although he did gain control over the traditional Mercian cities of London and Oxford.

The Wessex writers had more than a passing interest in removing Mercian players from the scene. Yet Annals from outside of Wessex control show Aethelflaed as a strong queen and leader of the Mercian forces. Aethelflaed is remembered, even in the tersest of contemporary sources, as the Mercian leader and a builder of military garrisons. But when we look at Aethelflaed in a larger context, outside of the canonical history written in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, we find a woman as strong as her father and brother, a woman whose territory ceased to be a kingdom after her death.

Further work with Irish and Welsh oral histories may bring more new light to Aethelflaed and other lesser-known figures. We might find people who became sites of resistance and subversion against the stronger story of English hegemony. Perhaps Mercia needed to fall for the larger story of Anglo-Saxon England to be complete. But in the Mercian Register and the Irish Annals, the hegemony of Wessex is challenged by the rule of a strong, and nearly forgotten, queen.
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Holy Places & Imagined Hellscapes: Qualifying Comments on Loca Sancta Sermon Studies—Christian Conversion in Northern Europe & Scandinavia, c. 500-1300

Todd P. Upton
Denver, Colorado

The paper uses methods from medieval sermon studies to argue that an insularity in “monastic consciousness” can be traced to earlier centuries than the more generally discussed (and better documented) scholastic environments of 13th century monastic and cathedral schools. It assesses how a monastic discourse reliant on Biblical typologies informed the Christian conversion of northern Germanic and Scandinavian peoples (c. 500-1300, including the British Isles and Iceland). Moments of encounter between Christian missionaries and pagan cultures helped delineate this discourse, most apparent in extant records that reveal Christian and Norse perceptions of geography, holy places, deity worship, and eschatological expectations. Sources include remnants of material culture (archaeological remains, runestones, and etymology), evidence of missionary activities (letters, chronicles), sermon evidence, eddic and skaldic poetry, and saga literature. It argues that shifts in a ‘monastic consciousness’ can be gleaned by contextualizing the sermon tradition for antecedent usages of selected topics—in this case, the conflicting cosmologies of Norse mythology and conversionary methods of early medieval Christianity—and also by demonstrating how monastic writers’ characterizations were understood and qualified within their own (and later) times. Methodologically, assessments occur by cleaving to the historical milieus that informed each discrete stage of homiletic development.

Christian monastic culture and missionary preaching informed a discourse that shaped late antique and early medieval educated elites’ beliefs about northern Europe and Scandinavia. The goal

1 This article is dedicated to Michael T. Walton (מיכאל ט. וולטון), a guiding light and inspiration for my work in medieval studies, whose friendship, laughter, conversations, and support will be much missed. A preliminary version of this article was presented at the 45th Annual Conference of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association (Denver, CO, April 11-13, 2013); many thanks to those audience members who at the session (and afterwards) asked helpful questions and made thoughtful critiques. Also, I am very grateful to the anonymous readers at Quidditas for critiques of an earlier draft; any errors, of course, remain my own.

2 For qualifications as to how “discourse” should be understood here in the early medieval context, especially in the way that I’ll use terms such as “accommodation” and “appropriation” when assessing Christian missionaries, see Cameron, Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire, 120-154. Also, in qualifications that will be further outlined in a forthcoming monograph I’ll be framing my approach to identifying a medieval “discursive formation” with qualified aspects of Edward Said’s Orientalism and Foucault’s The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Order of Things); for preliminary discussions of this methodology, see Akbari, Idols in the East, 6-19: esp. p. 7: “…by a discourse we mean a system of classification that establishes hierarchies, delimits one category from another, and exercises power through that system of classification...."
of this study is to identify some of the processes by which this discourse developed in encounters between Christians and pagans (c. 500-1300) in the regions and cultures of northern Europe, Britain, Ireland, Iceland, and the Scandinavian countries. By proving or disproving this insularity, I also hope to demonstrate that a “monastic consciousness” reliant upon biblical typologies is discernable in sermons produced in the scholastic environments of monastic and cathedral schools, particularly as they developed into their fully realized forms by the thirteenth century.

Specifically, I will look at what kinds of religious and mythological factors informed the perceptions of monastic sermon writers during the sixth to thirteenth centuries’ conversion of the Celtic, Germanic, and Scandinavian peoples, with attention to geographical knowledge, pagan sacred spaces (and their appropriations by Christian missionaries), aspects of eddic and saga literature, and sermon texts. Sources will include archaeological remains (carvings, coins, runestones, mounds), evidence of missionary activities (letters, chronicles, and sermons), eddic and skaldic poetry, and saga and visionary literature. Throughout I will demonstrate how missionaries and writers consistently appropriated both pre-Christian Scandinavian beliefs and pagan holy sites, while developing a monastic discourse that engaged the conflicting cosmologies of Norse mythology and early medieval Christianity.3

Patristic Views of Loca Sancta

When the Scandinavian and Norse-influenced regions of modern Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, and Iceland were Christianized between the eighth and twelfth centuries, the medieval Church had developed a means of “re-sacralizing” pagan sacred spaces that adapted Patristic and Augustinian priorities of spiritual salvation.

over veneration of an earthly site. For the *loca sancta* in the Holy Land, that meant a redirection of a Christian pilgrim’s attention from holy sites within an eastern Roman imperial world to the spiritual space of Augustine’s “heavenly city.” That is, in laying out a spiritual framework for Christians (and especially monks), Augustine explicitly tied his *civitas peregrina* to the Christian pilgrimage tradition, a *loca sancta* of the soul that could be reached by an interior spiritual journey, without the physical exertion of a pilgrimage to an earthly holy site. Augustine’s contrast of the soul’s inner workings (*interioria*) against a preoccupation with things of the world (*exterioria*) became a clerical mainstay by the twelfth century. It also explains in part why many sermon authors who wrote about Jerusalem and the Holy Sites did not describe these places with reference to contemporary realities: the experience of those external realities (such as the Crusades) had nothing to do with what was occurring in the Augustinian mental landscape of a monastic sermon writer.

For missionaries and monks who assessed the Scandinavian lands of the Viking Age, however, the Christian encounter with sacred spaces took a completely different course. Unlike the Judeo-Christian settings of Jerusalem and the Levantine coast, the northern European and Scandinavian lands through which missionaries traveled had no Biblical context that could serve as referents for the creation of a new monastic discourse. Instead, the variety of writers who left written evidence about the Christian conversion (court scribes, skalds, missionaries, archbishops, and monks) developed

4 Augustine’s (354-430) perceptions of the city took those of Origen and transformed them into a coherent theological construct that divorced a Christian’s belief in the importance of Jerusalem as a holy site from what Augustine saw as the basic otherworldliness of Christianity. In that construct, Jerusalem had been destroyed as a city on earth, leaving behind only shadows in the minds of men that Christians might recognize when they beheld the true City of God. [Augustine, *De civitate dei*, CCSL 47, 17.13.] Rome, of course, also “fell” in Augustine’s mind as an earthly city (and representation of empire), but its subsequent seat in the medieval period as the primary bishopric in the west would create an alternative presentation of the city for later writers and theologians.


7 For how this process might have occurred in the medieval monastic environment, see Carey, *Augustine’s Invention of the Inner Self…*, 142-144.
their own discourse about northern geography and pagan sacred spaces. In short, the northern letters, chronicles, sermons, eddic and skaldic literature, and sagas often reflected direct experience, physical encounters with the ‘periphery’ of the cloistered life that cumulatively formed an identifiable monastic discursive formation.  

Now, briefly, to some elements that I see as influential in how monastic writers perceived northern lands.

**Geographical Knowledge**

First, by the High Middle Ages, monastic conceptions of early medieval Scandinavian, Icelandic, and northern European lands were drawn from a variety of sources and interpretations. The works of Isidore of Seville (d. 636, *Etymologies*) and Hrabanus Maurus (d. 856, *On the Nature of Things*) give us a sense of how Europeans in the Iberian Peninsula and Germanic regions perceived the world from the 7th through 9th centuries, in that the descriptions are expressed via classical and Biblical references. The Venerable Bede (d. 735) gave careful attention to geography in his *Ecclesiastical History* and *On the Holy Places*, but always did he cleave to classical tradition and a narrative that showed the inevitable march of Christianity through early British history.

As we get closer to the tenth century, we can see that proto-national identities begin to intrude in the early medieval ideation of the Scandinavian and northern European physical landscape. For

---

8 When analyzing sermon evidence, my methodology in this paper generally follows that of David D’Avray: (1) identify specific *topoi* within an array of documents (e.g., terms such as *locas sancta*, pagani), (2) assess sermons comparatively within both same period and over a given time span (c. 600-1300), with qualifying attention to (2.a) environmental factors, (2.b) intellectual milieus, and (2.c) aspects of material culture; and, finally, (3) provide a comparative counterpoint (geographical knowledge, saga and eddic literature, conversionary tactics) that keeps the investigation tightly focused on the demonstrable perspectives of monastic sermon writers. [See D’Avray “Method in the Study of Medieval Sermons,” in Beriou and D’Avray, *Modern Questions about Medieval Sermons* …, 1-27.]


example, by the time of the Viking conquests, Carolingian scribes were careful that any Roman geographical knowledge they learned be presented to Charlemagne and his successors in ways that served what Lozovsky has called “imperial ideology and identity-creating processes of the period,” a process that allowed both for maintaining a perspective of the Mediterranean world of antiquity, but could also be appropriated by Frankish scholars and kings when promoting themselves as continuators of a Roman imperial tradition.\textsuperscript{13}

Secondly, the historiographical and cartographical record would have also been an influence upon monastic imagination about the north, especially in the many instances where well-known histories included sections that delved into geography. For example, Orosius’s \textit{History against the Pagans}, produced at the court of Alfred the Great (849-899), includes a well-traveled scribe’s details about northern European and Scandinavian lands that focused not only on Orosius’s division of the Mediterranean world, but also upon explicitly Viking Age northern tribes and peoples.\textsuperscript{14} Likewise, while one \textit{mappa mundi} found inside Macrobius’s early 5th century commentary on Cicero’s “Dream of Scipio” (\textit{Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis}) illustrated four great landmasses bounded by Ocean and its “tidal flux” (\textit{Alveus Oceani}), in spite of the distorted depiction of the ocean and equator, we see that at least some attention was given to the northern regions.\textsuperscript{15} Somewhat more realistic assessments of the northern lands are evident in mappae mundi from the 11th-13th centuries, (Anglo-Saxon Cotton world map, c. 1040; the \textit{Beatus Mappa Mundi}, c. 1050; and the \textit{Ebstorf Mappa Mundi}, 1235), suggesting that British cartographers and monks perceived of “internal transformations” of Roman curiale and military classes, at 90-92; also, \textit{in re} “ethnogenesis” of tribes and especially roles that tribal leaders (kings) play in evolving self-definition, see Geary, \textit{Myth}, 99-103, 114-119, 135-156.


\textsuperscript{14} There used to be some dispute about the authorship of the folio version of the Old English Orosius’s (d. 418) \textit{History against the Pagans}; for clarification and current understanding of the issue, see Sealy Gilles, “Territorial Interpolations in the Old English Orosius,” in Tomasz and Gilles, \textit{Text and Territory}, 79-96.

the physical contours of British and Scandinavian lands along the North and Baltic Seas in some detail, and certainly in a more thoughtful and realistic way than their counterparts on the Continent and in Mediterranean lands, for whom the north still remained a place of mystery and danger.

Third, and finally, recent work on T-O maps—where the East (Jerusalem and Biblical lands) are situated on top, with the bottom half depicting Europe (left) and Africa (right), both separated by the Mediterranean Sea—has suggested an important qualification to how we should understand a “realistic reckoning” of physical geography by those in the northern climes. For pre-Christian Scandinavian cultures, cosmologies based on the Norse myths imputed a northwestern orientation to the Vikings, where Heaven or Valhalla were somewhere in the direction of Iceland (rather than the traditional late antique and early medieval eastward-looking locus of Jerusalem), a reorientation that had to be “unlearned” by the Scandinavian peoples when they began converting to Christianity. Imagining different “spaces” and landscapes involved a process facilitated by references to biblical typologies and elements of monastic culture.

Sacred Spaces, Material Culture, and Appropriations by Christian Missionaries

Missionary activity and an appropriation (and repurposing) of pagan sacred spaces were the primary means by which this reorientation of spatial reckoning occurred. Such work wasn’t an enviable task. Lund notes that Charlemagne once asked whether “Paul the Deacon would rather carry heavy chains, be in a harsh prison, or go to Denmark to convert King Sigfrid.” As the Church began

16 Leonid S. Chekin, “Mappae Mundi and Scandinavia,” in *Scandinavian Studies* 65.4 (Fall, 1993), 487-520.


19 Kevin J. Wanner, “Off-Center: Considering Directional Valences in Norse Cosmography,” in *Speculum* 84.1 (Jan., 2009), 36-72.

to expand into the former Roman Gallic provinces and northward in the Early Middle Ages, missionary activities such as sermons, shrine destruction, and church-building created a parallel tradition of perceiving and appropriating sacred spaces that eventually allowed sites to retain a pagan mystique even while being overlaid with new Christian symbols.21

This process of Christian conversion was not uniform in the late antique period, but by the start of the Viking Age conversion throughout Scandinavia and Iceland proceeded in two ways: (1) a gradual adoption of a Christian system of beliefs and practices, and (2) an institutional conversion that occurred in three phases.22 Scandinavians who colonized Christian countries often lived in coexistence until conversion, and in their eyes the new Christian religion was judged by an interpretatio norræna (“a Nordic interpretation”) that often saw the Norsemen selecting what was useful in the Christian religion and discarding the rest (for example, adopting the Latin alphabet and Carolingian writing styles to replace the use of runes).23 Some of these adoptions of Christianity lasted well into the high and late medieval period, as studies of family names and kinship connections indicate how the longevity of some aspects of the conversionary process worked. For example, Ewart Oakeshott has shown how certain French noble houses had pre-Christian elements in their original formation (e.g., the House of de Dreux, related to Celtic “drys/druid,” which was related to ancient Greek word for “oak tree,” δρύς).24

21 For most recent assessments (and bibliography) of northern Europe, Scandinavian, and Germanic conversions in late antiquity (St. Patrick, St. Gregory of Tours, et al), see relevant sections in Brown, Rise of Western Christendom, 123-165, 232-266, 321-380, 408-489.

22 Winroth, The Conversion of Scandinavia, 103-104. In this construction, the Viking Age began on 8 June 793 with the destruction of Lindisfarne Abbey, and Christian missionary attempts were best represented by St. Boniface and Ansgar of Corvey (d. 865), the latter a Frankish monk who traveled to Birka in 829; second stage was 960-1020, marked by the conversion of the Scandinavian kings; and, finally, the third stage was during the 11th-13th centuries, when the Church developed a self-sustaining infrastructure throughout all converted regions.


When missionaries in the late antique period traveled ‘in paganorum frontaria,’ they expected that their efforts would be difficult, as the official position of the Church followed St. Augustine’s admonition that “pagan gods are demons.”25 Countering such diabolical adversaries was part of the job description for the early northern European evangelists, and missionaries such as St. Boniface (d. 754) often framed the battle in terms that hoped for conciliation with all enemies of the Church. In a letter to the Anglo-Saxons that has all the hallmarks of an exhortatory sermon, Boniface asked for spiritual support in his attempts to convert the German Saxons by characterizing the effort as a battle between God and Satan:

... We earnestly beseech your brotherly goodness to be mindful of us... in your prayers that we may be delivered from the snare of Satan the Huntsman and from wicked and cruel men, that the Word of God may be glorified...[through your holy prayers, may Jesus Christ] turn the hearts of the Saxons to the catholic faith, that they may free themselves from the snares of the devil in which they are bound and may be gathered among the children of Mother Church. ...26

Christian missionaries operated in a Church tradition that both accepted St. Augustine’s assertion about the demonic nature of pagan belief, but which also allowed for more sympathetic late antique perceptions (St. Anthony of Egypt, John Cassian), opinions such as the idea that both demons and human beings were fallen creatures from Heaven.27 For early medieval monastic culture, the essential, existential threat of any demon was not physical violence, but, rather, the separation and division a demon’s presence might cause in the spirit of the Christian believer.28

For the growing medieval monastic culture on the Continent and in Britain, however, the Weltbild (“world-view”) of the Viking Age peoples incorporated a host of diverse beliefs and customs that


27 Augustine Casidy, “All are from one: on St. Anthony the Great’s Protology,” in Studia Monastica 44.2 (2002), 207-227; also, Conrad Leyser, “Angels, Monks, and Demons in the Early Medieval West,” in Gameson and Leyser, Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages, 9-22.

28 Brakke, Demons and the Making of the Monk, 14-22.
had to be countered with Christian tenets, or appropriated outright as part of a reconfiguration that supplanted local beliefs with a Bible-based outlook. Early Scandinavians divided the natural world around them into elemental deities and spirits that were often drawn from everyday experience, but whose observance could also reflect deeper existential understandings. As Thomas A. DuBois argues in his Nordic Religions in the Viking Age, “…the assumption that gods are meant to be imitated is itself a Christian view, based on a Hellenistic notion of discipleship, and one that can cloud our views of pre-Christian religious systems.”

This distinction should also be kept in mind when trying to delineate a discourse among monastic writers about loca sancta, because even a cursory glance at the eddic and saga literature reveals a completely different dynamic in the northern pagan cosmologies than were to be found in the Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian traditions of the late antique or early medieval Mediterranean worlds. That is, in contrast to twelfth-century Continental and Mediterranean monastic desires for the living a life based in the vita apostolica or imitatio Christi, the pantheon of Scandinavian gods and goddesses were to be avoided or appeased, mocked or sacrificed to, but never to serve as exemplars for model behavior or morality. Thus, in the Norse-influenced regions, we see a respect and veneration for “helping spirits” who (at least in the Balto-Finnish shamanistic tradition) could assume the forms of reindeer, fish, birds, and small woodland animals; one need only think of Ratatosk the Squirrel (who runs up and down the World Tree in Norse mythology


to irritate everyone, but particularly plaguing Nidhogg the Dragon), or even the ravens Hugin and Munin, who fly throughout the Nine Worlds and report back to Odin All-Father.  

As intercessors between societies and nature, however, these spirit guides weren’t always benevolent; here comes to mind the Viking battle-crazed berserkers, men who wore wolf or bear pelts to channel the most violent of the predatory spirits; or consider Finnish Norsemen who sacrificed black horses to the Sámi god, Ruto, so that the Dark One wouldn’t bring plague or barrenness to livestock.  

Even the earth, the rocks, the waters of fjords and rivers, and the sky had a collective resonance with the Vikings that had to be accounted for in the cosmology of the Scandinavian cultures. The Aesir, or sky-gods (Odin, Thor, Frigg, Baldur, and even the Finnish blacksmith, Ilmarinen), were revered for the impact that they could have on mitigating thunderstorms or blizzards; conversely, the Vanir, or land-gods (Freyr, Freyja, and including attributes of the sea-god, Njörd), were respected and prayed to for the benevolent effects they could have on soil fertility, crop yields, or calm seas.  

For the Nordic peoples, these deities and supernatural phenomena also often could be associated with physical sites on earth, places whose material reality Christian missionaries had to perpetually negotiate with a “range of ancestral and landscape spirits, as well as with more well-known gods.” To cite just a few examples, first, there was the veneration of stakes, trees, or pillars within Norse and Welsh mythologies. According to the


ninth-century chronicler, Einhard, and the Anonymous Saxon Poet, the Saxon oak tree at Eresburg that Charlemagne cut down in 772 was a hallowed shrine (Irminsul) near the Weser River in central Saxony. Research has shown that the Eresburg oak was not a singularity; there were more of these irminsuls in the north, made of either wood or stone. These vertical structures might have had astronomical significance, positioned to accord their shadows with the sun’s passage across the sky, or perhaps venerated because of the deities or “dāimons” thought to reside within them. Davidson identified the columns with the sky-god Tiwaz/Tyr (the Norse god of war), but for my interests here, the monastic chronicler, Adam of Bremen (d. 865), called the Irminsul a columna quasi sustinens omnia (“universal pillar that supports the whole”), a belief that ties the presence of these Saxon symbols with Norse belief in Yggdrassil.


the World Tree, whose cosmic trunk and boughs bind the worlds of gods and human beings.\textsuperscript{41} Whatever the pillar’s purpose, Christian missionaries who came upon such \textit{irminsuls} sometimes did not find just a singular oak or ash being venerated, but an entire sacred grove, as we learn from Adam of Bremen’s description of human bodies and animal carcasses hanging from trees in Uppsala (east-central Sweden) before conversion.\textsuperscript{42} 

In Norway, runestones were another kind of material culture that missionaries had to either absorb into Christianity or discard.\textsuperscript{43} Archaeological research on this front has done much to help us understand the process of Christianization in the region, particularly in regard to the Cistercian presence.\textsuperscript{44} Runestones served as markers that indicated both religious and political affiliations; in the first instance, by inscriptions we can infer systems of inheritance that indicate the propensity of women to convert to Christianity (especially land-holding women), while, in the second, no support from royalty for Christian missionaries meant “proliferation” of runestones (Uppland, in east-central Sweden).\textsuperscript{45} That is, when crown-supported missionaries in Denmark undertook mass conversion, the runestones are fewer and farther between.\textsuperscript{46} 

A last example of the material culture that informed sermon authors and missionaries would be the mounds and standing stones that Scandinavians venerated across northern European, Hibernian, British, and Icelandic regions.\textsuperscript{47} Reassessments of the Viking Age

\textsuperscript{41} Davidson, \textit{Myths and Symbols in Pagan Europe}, 170.


\textsuperscript{44} James France, “The Cistercians in Scandinavia,” in Felten and Rösener, \textit{Norm und Realität}, 475-487.

\textsuperscript{45} Anne-Sofie Gräslund, “Late Viking-Age Runestones in Uppland: Some Gender Aspects,” in Sheehan and O Corráin, \textit{The Viking Age: Ireland and the West}, 113-123.

\textsuperscript{46} Sawyer, \textit{The Viking-Age Rune-Stones}, 124-145.

burial mounds at Sutton Hoo (Suffolk, East Anglia)—or those that contained the Oseburg Ship (Norway)—suggest that pre-Christian Norse burial practices involved a degree of “theatricality” from members of the pagan communities who interred their dead, some of which might have reflected an dramatic reenactment of creation myths or celebrations (ten-day funeral parties, the rape and slaying of slaves, slaughter of animals). Such care for the dead and preparation for a journey into the underworld remained even in the face of conversion (burials with weapons, bones in cauldrons, bark-covered corpses, etc.). In Sweden, Old Uppsala was the site that Adam of Bremen called the main pagan center for the peninsula, and it oriented around three major mounds, with idols dedicated to the Æsir (Norse gods of Asgard). How did the Christian missionaries (and later bishops) deal with this site? After Christian conversion in the early 12th century, Uppsala was chosen as the archdiocese for Sweden. Likewise, acceptance of Christianity in another pagan center (Nidaros/Trondheim, Norway) soon brought papal legates and formalization of an archdiocese in the same period.


The Welsh and Gaelic Otherworld of *Annen Verden* (Annwfn, Annwn) needs to be mentioned here, both because of its resonance with Norse approaches to the afterlife (e.g., the feast halls, burial mounds, cauldrons, etc), and also because of *Annen Verden*’s contrast with Christian expectations (eschatology, perceptions of heaven and hell, final judgment, etc). This conception of the Otherworld can be glimpsed in the *Mabinogion*, a collection of eleven Middle Welsh prose stories that include folktales and historical accounts, some of which were incorporated into Arthurian lore. Besides drawing explicit connections between what was once thought as disparate mythological traditions, recent scholarship has shown that the shape-shifters, dragons, faeries, giants, and witches in the *Mabinogion* reflected a variety of material remains that were foci of encounter between monastic Christianity and pagan inhabitants of Celtic and Gaelic lands. For example, in Ireland, a mainstay of Christianity in the Late Antique and early medieval periods, *sidhe* burial mounds in the countryside were said to be the line of defense behind which lived in an Otherworld the pre-Christian Celtic gods, the *Tuatha Dé Danaan*. The most pronounced example of these mounds is the megalithic *Brugh ná Bóinne* (Newgrange) in eastern Ireland, built in 3500 B.C., with a stone passageway and chambers whose purposes are still being debated to this day. For our purpose

---


55 For general folklore milieus, see Hilda R. Ellis Davidson, “Myths and Symbols in Religion and Folklore,” in *Folklore* 100.2 (1989), 131-142; and Davidson, *Myths and Symbols*, 167-195; esp. at 183.


57 For best general assessment with updated bibliography, see Gabriel Cooney, “Newgrange—a view from the platform,” in *Antiquity* 80 (Sep 2006), 697-710.
in understanding the Christian encounter with pagan sacred sites, early medieval tradition held that on the festival of Samhain (31 Oct/1 Nov)—the halfway point between the autumn equinox and winter solstice—the portal to Annen Verden opened at Newgrange, and families and friends of the dead could pass into the Otherworld, and, too, so could the dead return to visit the living. What were monastic houses to do when confronted with such a potent example of pre-Christian pagan beliefs? The Cistercian abbey of Mellifont bought the mound of Newgrange and the lands around it in 1142.

Iceland provides one of the clearest examples of Nordic sacred spaces being appropriated by both Christian missionaries and monarchies. Helgafell (“Holy Mountain,” on the western peninsula of Snæfellsness), is a natural outcropping of rock that might have inspired early saga writers’ perception of Odin’s “high seat,” Hlidskjalf, from which he overlooked the Nine Worlds. Helgafell was so venerated by the early settlers from Norway that local custom demanded anyone who would climb the hill should wash and cleanse for the occasion; the locals believed that Helgafell might be a possible portal to the Norse and Celtic Otherworld (Annen Verden) and the realms of the undead. For Christian missionaries, upon learning how the Vikings perceived this site, they built a small Augustinian church near the rock in 1134. Farther south and west of Helgafell is þingvellir (Thingvellir), a sacred site located along a volcanic


60 Byock, Medieval Iceland, 151-183.

61 For aspects of the undead and draugr (“ghosts”), see Ármann Jakobsson, “Vampires and Watchmen: Categorizing the Mediaeval Icelandic Undead,” in Journal of English and Germanic Philology 110.3 (July 2011), 281-300.

rift in a sunken valley, with twisting rocks that carry sound well, and whose layout encouraged early Icelanders to establish their turf and stone booths at the annual, two-week All-Thing (Law Assembly for Iceland). How did Christian missionaries contend with such a massive monument? It was at this location that the Icelandic parliamentary Alþingi (Althing) declared allegiance to Christianity in A.D. 1000, with a variety of Christian monastic houses integrated across Iceland within the next century and a half.

Other types of evidence: Narratives, Hagiographies, Martyrologies, Cults, Relics, and Shrines

Alongside geographical descriptions and conversion narratives, sermons offer evidence as to how monastic discourse incorporated Nordic sacred topography into existing Christian discourses. Sermons introduced Old and New Testament stories of battles and saga-like descriptions of Abraham, Moses, and David as a means of countering myths and legends that glorified bellicose pagan deities in the European hinterlands. Such figures deliberately challenged the old Germanic cultic deities or adopted members of the Roman pantheon to persuade unbelievers of the Christian God’s efficacy.

Likewise, hagiographical discourse provided a new means of engaging pagan peoples and environments. Accessible figures such


64 Davidson, Myths and Symbols in Pagan Europe, 13-14. A significant moment, because in 1000 the Alþingi was only seventy years’ old but well-founded; its proto-parliamentary representative government evolved into the Icelandic Commonwealth that exists to this day (based now in Reykjavík). For more on the history of the Alþingi (All-Thing) and its relationship to newly arrived Christians in the early medieval period, see Jenny Jochens, “Late and peaceful: Iceland’s Conversion through Arbitration in 1000,” in Speculum 74.3 (1999), 621-655. For documentary sources on the Thingvellir (particularly literary), see Gíslis Sigurðsson, “Old Sagas, Poems, and Lore,” in Sigurðsson and Olason, Manuscripts, 1-11. For caution regarding conceptions of Icelandic conversion and (mis)uses of lawbooks, see Jonas Wellendorf, “The Interplay of Pagan and Christian Traditions in Icelandic Settlement Myths,” in Journal of English and Germanic Philology 109.1 (2010), 1-21; and Jón Vidar Sigurðsson, “Historical Writing and the Political Situation in Iceland, 1100-1400,” in Eriksen and Sigurðsson, Negotiating Pasts, 59-78.


66 Respectively, see Wallace-Hadrill, The Frankish Church, 18-19; and Ian Wood, “Paganism and superstition east of the Rhine from the fifth century to the ninth century,” in Ausenda, After Empire, 253-279.
as St. Taurinis, Bishop of Evreux (d. 410), St. Philibert (d. 685), and Ansgar, Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen (d. 865) provided new models of divine power and the interventions of that power in everyday life.67 Martyrologies, such as those of the British saints Sunniva and Henrik (10th-12th c.), are also instructive for their ability to inspire admiration among both monks and noble laymen in Norway and Finland.68 Third, well into the tenth century, cultic activity around local saints and shrines continued the long-standing Roman patrician tradition of the veneration for holy relics and influential people.69 Oftentimes, as John Blair notes in a discussion of religious cults of King Oswald of Northumbria (d. c. 642, following Bede’s account), the high regard with which the local populace held the holy dust (or dismembered body parts) from Oswald’s burial place blended old pagan and new Christian traditions.70 For those members of society not yet in the grave, even medicinal tracts, a fourth bit of evidence, reveal that priests and sermon writers were very willing to incorporate folklore customs for treating humans and animals in their homilies (for example, Karen Jolly’s work on how


70 Blair, Church in Anglo-Saxon Society, 147-148.
recipes for off-setting ill effects of “elf-arrows” or “elf-spears” were incorporated into liturgical language as Christianization took hold in Britain.⁷¹ Lastly, the image of Jerusalem itself found widespread purchase and recognition among monks of the early medieval period (Fulda, Corvey, Werden): the Old Saxon anonymous poem *Heliand* (“the Savior”) demonstrated the appearance of this rhetorical discourse about Jerusalem in a different medium and the kind of cross-pollination that occurred between pagan mythology and Christian tenets.⁷² In *Heliand*, Christ was depicted as a king or “guardian of the land” (*landes uuard*) and the disciples described as loyal *thegns*, with the feast of Herod a drinking contest, and the desert landscapes of the Bible were transposed into Germanic forests. Besides adapting traditional biblical scenes into a northern setting, *Heliand* also addressed aspects of Saxon beliefs in Fate and Augustinian expectations of Divine Providence.⁷³

### The Contribution of Sermons to the Conversionary Process

Sermons, however, provide some of the most extensive evidence concerning the ‘sacred topography’ of conversion. In this genre, members of the episcopate and monastic orders were well versed in explaining both to the clergy (*ad clericos*) and to the people (*ad populum*) the often complex and paradoxical doctrines of Christianity.⁷⁴ One need think only of King Ethelbert’s response to Augustine of Canterbury’s preaching (c. 597), when the king

---


allowed pagan shrines to be re-consecrated and heathen fertility feasts transformed to banquets for English martyrs to understand the efficacy that sermonizing could have in adapting Christianity to particular environments.\textsuperscript{75} Besides taking advantage of a reverence for a well-established cult of the saints and growing relic culture, sermons from this period reveal a reliance on biblical typologies, particularly \textit{in re} sermons that explained how new Christian connotations could be made for certain pagan feast days or worldviews.\textsuperscript{76} Caesarius of Arles (ca. 470-542) wrote sermons that, in one instance, postponed a traditional agrarian blessing over fields at the onset of spring so that the day would coincide with the Church celebration of Christ’s baptism in the Jordan River, and, in another sermon, compared missionaries’ work in northern and western Gaul to that done by Moses upon reaching the Holy Land or King David acclimating to his new city of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{77} Farther north on Iona, Columba’s (521-597) monks were described in a sermon as setting forth in search of a “desert” reminiscent of that which lay before Moses’ Promised Land and finding one in an ocean bounded by Pictish and Irish landfalls.\textsuperscript{78} Indeed, sermon authors of the early medieval period began to elaborate their descriptions of \textit{loca sancta} with attributes that were meaningful to Continental monastic audiences.\textsuperscript{79}

Sermon authors also focused on moral instruction and church reform in sermons intended to reinforce existing tenets and mores in nominally Christian communities. In the tenth-century Blickling Homilies, one of the earliest collections of homilies written in Old English, the \textit{sermones ad populum} were characterized by moral


\textsuperscript{76} Ian Wood, “Pagans and Holy Men, 600-800,” in Chatháin and Richter, \textit{Irland und die Christenheit /Ireland and Christendom}, 347-361; for processes involving cult of saints and relic veneration, see particularly, Bailey, Christianity’s Quiet Success, 60-81; Van Dam, \textit{Leadership & Community in Late Antique Gaul}, 177-300.

\textsuperscript{77} Caesarius of Arles, \textit{Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis Sermones}, ed. G. Morin, CCSL 103 (Turnout, 1953); respectively, 33.4 (Jordan River); 95-99, 102-103, and 106 (Promised Land); 120-121 (King David and Jerusalem).

\textsuperscript{78} Adomnán, \textit{De locis sanctis}, L. Bieler, ed., CCSL 175 (Turnout: 1965), II.39: 188.

instruction, especially the preparations a good Christian should make for Easter during the Lenten season (alms-giving, fasting, etc).\footnote{80} When exemplifying the process of how monastic-trained writers incorporated pagan realities into homiletic literature, the sermons of Wulfstan and Aelfric deserve particular attention here, because these works were part of a reform movement that sought to improve training in monasteries, and also to instruct Anglo-Saxon laypeople on fundamentals needful for understanding the Christian religion.\footnote{81}

Wulfstan, Archbishop of York (d. 1023) made it clear in his sermons that he and King Cnut were concerned with increased Viking raids that marked the end of the first millennium.\footnote{82} Wulfstan’s sermons—especially \textit{Sermo Lupi ad anglos} ("Sermon of the Wolf to the English")—repeatedly use the experience of Vikings raids as emblems of deserved punishment for Englishmen’s sins, and also as the fulfillment of end-of-the-world expectations.\footnote{83} In this, Wulfstan even brought in references to the Nordic “Valhalla” ("Hall of the Slain"), when he used the term \textit{wælcyrian} (cognate of Old Norse \textit{valkyrjur}, "valkyries").\footnote{84}

These monastic writers on the front lines of the Viking invasions also had to ensure that there was no recidivism to pagan ways among either lay or clerical audience members in new or even well established Christian communities.\footnote{85} In the extant sermons, invocation of looming Nordic depredations was often attended by

\footnote{80}{Kelly, \textit{The Blickling Homilies}; see also Kelly, \textit{The Blickling Concordance}.}
\footnote{82}{Mary Richards, “Wulfstan and the Millennium,” in Frassetto, \textit{The Year 1000}, 41-48.}
\footnote{84}{Orchard, \textit{Dictionary of Norse Myth and Legend}, p. 184.}
an admonition to clergy and parishioners to atone for present-day sins. For instance, Aelfric of Aynsham “Grammaticus” (fl. c. 955-c.1025) wrote sermons in his well-known Catholic Homilies (990-992) that share Wulfstan’s awareness of increased Viking raids; however, in contrast to Wulfstan’s tendency to associate end-times with the incursions, Aelfric’s deep understanding of the Church Fathers allowed him to write sermons more moderate in tone, and to acknowledge that there was a way to survive the coming and passing of the year 1000. Aelfric’s sermons also dealt directly with the Norsemen when he addressed the threat of recidivism, including one homily where he explicitly instructed those who came across old Viking sacred sites in the district to avoid the spiritual crime of hoethen-gild (“heathen-worship”), and where he urged his audience to make correlations instead to martyrdom sites of Christian saints in England or from the Holy Land. In another homily, Aelfric wrote of the role of Satan in Christian cosmology, and how his Anglo-Saxon audience could recognize the Devil’s work. Lastly, Aelfric (fl. c. 955-c.1025) wrote a sermon, De falsis diis, that asserted the superiority of Christianity over pagan gods and demons.

Historians of literature and religion have amply documented missionaries’ attempts to compare the deities of Norse myths (unfavorably) with the Christian God as a conversion strategy, but the dynamics of these comparisons in eddic and saga literature in monastic written culture deserves further attention. As the Scandinavian countries entered the Christian orbit after the turn of the millennium, the means of transmission here often began with Anglo-Saxon missionaries, preaching bishops (Ebo of Rheims, Ansgar), dynastic relationships (for example, the Norwegian king Olav Tryggvason’s 994 baptism that saw Æthelred II serve as

88 Aelfric, Homilies of Aelfric, ed. Thorpe, (see I: 556, I: 342, etc).
godfather), and an increase in hagiographical writing and the rise of saints’ cults into the twelfth century.  

Building upon such diverse material, monastic authors writing in and about newly converted territories often had to transform traditional understandings of Norse and Germanic gods and goddesses into explicitly Christian cosmological constructions. Old English homilies are among the most explicit examples of how this transmission took place because they enjoyed a widespread influence on vernacular preaching in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Iceland. Indeed, sermon models were even incorporated in skaldic and saga literature, and some Christian sermons had influence on the 11th century law-making of Æthelred II and Cnut.  


A twelfth century theologian, Honorius of Autun, illustrates the monastic tendency toward defining the world in Christological terms as well as expressing himself by means of widely read texts and sermons. Properly known as Honorius Augustodunensis of Regensburg (b. 1075/1080-c. 1156), he was both a Benedictine scholar whose career began in the Canterbury of St. Anselm of Bec (d. 1109) in the late eleventh century, and — for the interests of this paper — Honorius exemplifies a monastic writer who took an interest in matters spiritual and political, with works that had a long-lasting (and, geographically, far-reaching) impact for the rest of the Middle Ages. He also is a figure who spent his early life in England, and ended his days in Germany, in regions and among personalities that shaped the age.

Working with Anselm had a profound impact on Honorius, and much of his remaining years and writings (e.g., *Elucidarium*, *Speculum Ecclesiae*, and *Imago Mundi*) can be understood only by reference to Anselm and England. Honorius also placed much pride in his post-1103 work as a *scholasticus* in the *Alte Kappel* of Regensburg under the patronage of the emperor Henry V and affiliated German bishops (e.g., Hartwig and Cuno). Moreover, his time in Germany coincided with the reign of one of the only emperors to undertake the crusade, Conrad III, who himself passed through Regensburg (as did Louis VII) in making preparations for the Second Crusade.


96 For general works on Honorius Augustodunensis, see the following: M.O. Garrigues, “Quelques Recherches sur l’Oeuvre d’Honorius Augustodunensis,” in *Revue d’Histoire Ecclesiastique* 70 (1975), 388-425, and Garrigues, “Qui’était Honorius Augustodunensis?” in *Angelicum* 50 (1973), 20-49; E.M. Sanford, “Honorius, ‘Presbyter’ and ‘Scholasticus,’” in *Speculum* 23 (1948), 397-425; and, especially, the monograph by Valerie I. J. Flint, “Honorius Augustodunensis of Regensburg,” in Patrick J. Geary, gen. ed., *Authors of the Middle Ages* Volume II, Nos. 5-6. *Historical and Religious Writers of the Latin West* (Brookfield, Vermont: Variorum, 1995). In this characterization of Honorius’s life, my consideration of this often-mysterious source is informed by Flint’s persuasive work, and the thesis that she puts forth concerning the time that Honorius spent at both Canterbury and Regensburg, as well as relevant conditions in twelfth-century Regensburg — e.g., the pride he took in promoting Benedictine ideals via works such as the *Elucidarium*, the location and importance of the alte Kapelle in Honorius’s life, as well as marriage alliance of Emperor Henry V and Queen Mathilda of England (in which Anselm of Canterbury was heavily involved in negotiating the marriage of Mathilda’s daughter, with Honorius benefiting by receiving a canonry in Regensburg).

97 Honorius Augustodunensis was near the end of his life when Edessa fell to Zengi (Dec. 1144) and the call for a crusade went forth in the following year by Pope Eugenius III. Otto of Freising’s account of the Second Crusade mentions the Germans taking the cross
For our purpose in examining sermons to glimpse possible monastic culture transmission evidence between Continental, Scandinavian, the British Isles and beyond, Honorius’s “Sermon 15”—delivered on a Sunday in the middle of Lent (“Dominica in Media Quadragesima”)—focuses on three great themes: the city of Jerusalem as the visio pacis and manifestation of the Ecclesia on earth, the Holy Land encompassing the entirety of Biblical history as comprised of six successive ages that intimated the coming of Christ, and, finally, a concluding passage that began with John 8: 3-11 (wherein the Pharisees brought an adulteress to Jesus and sought death by stoning) and ended with an apocalyptic vision of Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven. This vision used a reference to “Malchus the Captive Monk” as a point of departure for a dream tour by Honorius and his brethren of Hell and Heaven. Like Malchus, Honorius told his audience, a certain person gave up his family and worldly possessions to become a monk in the monastery in which Honorius was serving.

In the vision, when Honorius and his brethren inquired what this new monk wanted them to see, the man replied, “Dress and face the light which is leading me.” The monks followed and the rest of Honorius’s sermon related the discovery of an incredibly high and lengthy wall to (or of) “the north”, to the left of which was an immense abyss whose one side burned with a great fire while the other was thoroughly frozen with dreadful ice. Thinking that at a council in Bavaria in 1146, with Conrad III making sure that episcopal representation was there to show support; Honorius’s bishop, Henry of Regensburg, was one of the three bishops who took the crusade vow that day (MGH SS, 20 [Extracts]), and we might assume that for such a prestigious occasion Honorius could have been there (although I have not been able to find any letters or proof that he was present). In regard to crusade activity touching upon his life, Odo of Deuil also situated the French king, Louis VII, at Regensburg a year after Conrad III had passed through the city. (De profectione Ludovici VII in Orientem, trans. V.G. Berry, 1948).

98 Honorius Augustodunensis, Sermo XV, PL 172: col. 893C-898D.


100 Honorius Augustodunensis, Sermo XV, PL 172: col. 897C. […]ad plagam aquilonis erat a laeva vallis immensae profunditatis, nimiae latitudinis, infinitae longitudinalis, cujus
this surely must be Hell, Honorius says as much to his guide and was told, “this is not the inferno” (Ductor autem meus respondit cogitationi meae dicens hoc infernum non esse), and proceeded to take Honorius deeper into the abyss until they reached a gigantic pit that spewed forth sulphur from a flaming mouth, from whose furnace an intolerable stench ascended, filling everything around that area. At that point, Honorius’s guide disappears, and the monk was left alone to observe a “crowd of souls that wretchedly wailed as they were dragged by demons that cruelly insulted them as they hurled them with malicious laughter into that pit.” Eventually, the guide returned, extricated Honorius from the clutches of the demons, and took the preacher back to the city where the light was rising from the east and found another wall whose entrance reached high into the sky. There followed here a brief description of a Heaven-like tableau that was marked by a broad, light-filled field covered with odiferous, sweet-smelling flowers, and, interestingly (for the martial image evoked), by a “white-clad army that was rejoicing and resounding with a delightful hymn. Yet, this place is not the heavenly kingdom of Jerusalem, the guide warns (Ille vero cordi meo respondit hoc regnum coelorum non esse), and the sermon concludes with the guide telling Honorius and the group of monks that accompanied him through Hell and Heaven that, in order to attain the latter place, they must strive to be free of sin and lead penitent lives. Honorius ended the sermon by adding that, in a quotation from Titus 2:2, his monks (karissimi) must also live soberly, justly, and piously to dwell in the eternal kingdom.
Honorius’s division of a sermon into broad themes and a structure that interwove line-by-line explication of biblical verses was *de rigeur* for monastic writers by the twelfth century.\(^{107}\) However, if one knows the historical context for the 10th-13th century poem, *Rígsþula / Rígsthula* (“The Lay of Ríg”), the structure of Sermon 15 takes on different implications. In *Rígsthula*, Ríg (or, Heimdall, a Norse god) was depicted as the “father of mankind” because he spent three successive nights with three different couples, thereby creating the orders of “slaves, freemen, and nobles.” While provenance of this eddic poem is still in dispute, some scholars have persuasively linked the tripartite perception of social orders in the text with a tract by Honorius’s *Imago Mundi*, a work that enjoyed widespread popularity in the High Middle Ages for its unique blend of cosmology and geography with a sketch of world history—in short, a textbook.\(^{108}\)

For my own research interests of the Crusades in the eastern Mediterranean, Honorius of Autun’s sermons had been instructive in assessments of sermon depictions of *loca sancta* around Jerusalem because I had been looking at Crusader-era sermon and narrative accounts of the Mount of Olives. For that context, Honorius’s Sermon 15 journey up a mountain seemed, if not fanciful, at least without any explicitly physical reference to be found in the Bavarian countryside of Regensburg where Honorius lived, a place bordered by the Danube River, hill country, and plains; admittedly, the low-lying mountains of the Bavarian forest might have inspired his descriptions of ascending a rock-face, but how to explain the sermon’s mention of a path and wall that had an abyss on one side and ice-sheet on the other? However, having made some introductory inroads into the Christian missionary experience in Scandinavia and Iceland—and incorporating Anglo-Saxon trained missionary experience that saw Christians assaying the physical geography and topography of the volcanic and ice-ridden

---


Nordic and Icelandic landscapes—Honorius’s references might reflect a deeper understanding of regions outside the Burgundian and Germanic monasteries where he lived in the later years of his life. Given his formative years in Canterbury, his familiarity with Hibernian lands (or even landscapes farther west) would not be too speculative; there is research that posits Honorius’s birth and early life in Ireland, and there existed inter-monastery transmissions of texts that certainly reveals a monastic scribal network concurrent with the known trajectories of Honorius’s life (Canterbury, Autun, Regensburg), bound by scribal linkages that included libraries in Burgundy, the British Isles, Scandinavia, and Iceland.

Regardless of whether connections between Honorius of Autun and the northern climes can be established, at the very least the commonality of themes in northern sermons and eddic literature could provide grist for future inquiry that might establish a link between Honorius’s base in Regensburg and those monasteries and libraries that began to be established in newly Christianized regions. Regensburg’s role as a disseminator of monastic texts throughout northern Europe and into the British Isles is well established, but what cannot be proven is how far afield (if at all) Honorius himself might have roamed in the early twelfth century to examine or verify the sources for his work on world history and geography. Again, Flint’s work is helpful here in identifying both the proliferation of copies in England of Honorius’s Elucidarium and Imago Mundi, and the Benedictine monk’s presence in Worcester (departing for the Continent at the time of Anselm’s exile in 1103).


110 For beginning literature on transmission of texts between Continent, England, and lands beyond, see David Ganz, “Roman Manuscripts in Francia and Anglo-Saxon England,” in Roma fra Oriente e Occidente: Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull’Alto Medioevo 49 (2002), 687-649; for contacts between Iceland and Scandinavia, see John Lindow, “Cultures in Contact,” in Ross, Old Norse Mythes, 89-109; for assessments and problems in tracing monastic transmissions among Hiberno-Scandinavians in Irish communities where Honorius might have lived, see Lesley Abrams, “Conversion and Church in Viking Age Ireland,” in Sheehan and Corrón, The Viking Age, 1-10, at pp. 5-6 discussion of “top-down” conversions via noble family connections between Dublin and Norway, Wales, and Denmark; for influences of monastic culture on Anglo-Hibernian scriptoria, see Teresa Webber, “Monastic and Cathedral Book Collections in the Late Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries,” in Leedham-Green and Webber, History of Libraries, 109-125.  

Inarguable, though, is the influence that Honorius’s *Imago Mundi, Elucidarium*, and other works had in the reception of monastic ideas by lands in the British Isles and Scandinavia.\textsuperscript{112} For example, by the thirteenth century, the Welsh had three separate translations of Honorius’s *Imago Mundi*, and Carr reveals that a twelfth-century Welsh poet was aware of the encyclopedia.\textsuperscript{113} More investigation is needed, of course, before these threads can be teased into a proper context, but it’s tantalizing that one of Honorius’ most important works, the *Elucidarium*, numbers among the Old Norse translations in the 14th century *Hauksbók*, a codex written by Haukr Erlendsson (d. 1334) that serves as our most important record for Old Icelandic texts (the *Landnámabók*, the *Fóstbrædra saga*, the *Eiríks saga rauda* and the *Völsþát*).\textsuperscript{114}

**Eddic and Saga Literature as Insight into Monastic Consciousness by High Middle Ages**

Eddic literature provides yet another piece of the monastic discourse puzzle, particularly how the often monastic educated scribes or authors rendered physical space and geographical reckoning.\textsuperscript{115}


\textsuperscript{115} For monastic patronage and interaction between skalds, edda writers, and monarchs, see Svanhildur Óskarsdóttir, “The Church and Written Culture,” in Sigurdsson and Olason, *The Manuscripts of Iceland*, 12-23; Benjamin Hudson, “ ‘Brjans Saga,’” in *Medium Aeadica*.
Völuspá, or “The Sibyl’s Prophecy,” is the best known of the Eddic poems—preserved entirely in the Codex Regius (c. 1270s, Icelandic), with ten poems about gods, and nineteen about heroes. Although late, the aforementioned Hauksbók of Haukr Erlendsson (d. 1334), could also offer insight into the pre-Christian worldview against which monastic sermon writers had to work, in that the book related the main events and characters of Norse mythology, beginning with the first living thing, Ymir, (a frost-giant who preceded even the Ginnungagap, or Great Void), and continuing its narrative through Ragnarök, the Twilight of the Gods. Besides evaluating the work’s reflection of the political climate in Iceland from the twelfth through early fourteenth centuries, analysis of the Hauksbók has also offered insight into the influence that Continental monastic schools had upon Scandinavian countries.

Skaldic poetry, which was recorded between the 11th to 13th centuries, formed one of the most important influences upon sermon authors’ perceptions about the Nordic lands. The skalds transmitted aspects of oral tradition and history that spanned back to at least the start of the Viking Age. The skalds, or court poets (wandering minstrels), stood at a crossroads between the pre-Christian Scandinavian culture (especially Iceland) and newly Christianized kingdoms (Norway and Sweden). The skalds’ mnemonic skills were essential to writers such as Snorri Sturluson when mythology and history were transferred into the written, eddic forms.

This interaction between a living, present pagan past and a Christian past that missionaries hoped would supplant it characterized

---


117 See, respectively, Jón Viđar Sigurđsson, “Historical Writing and the Political Situation in Iceland 1000-1400,” in Eriksen and Sigurðsson, Negotiating Pasts in the Nordic Countries, 59-78; and, Hardarson, Litterature et spiritualite en Scandinavie medievale.

118 For beginning discussion of this topic (and updated bibliography), see Pernille Hermann, “Concepts of Memory and Approaches to the Past in Medieval Icelandic Literature,” in Scandinavian Studies 81:3 (Sept., 2009), 287-308, (especially at 295-305, for discussion of interface between newly imposed Christian approaches and skaldic traditions); also, general introduction to subject in Sigurđson, The Medieval Icelandic Saga and Oral Tradition.
the Christian sermon writers’ approach to the Scandinavian lands. For example, even though the Icelandic All-Thing declared for Christianity in 1000, one still gets a remarkable sense of national pride in the pre-Christian Scandinavian language and worldview, best evidenced by Snorri Sturluson’s (1179-1241) *Prose Edda*, which also includes an account (*Gylfaginning*, “The Tricking of Gylfi”) that relates the creation and ending of the Norse cosmology.\(^{119}\) Snorri’s attempt to make a coherent (linear) religious outlook that aligned with Christianity marks one of the biggest differences between his Christian-informed verse and other fragmentary evidence, departing as he did from the skaldic tradition of Bragi Boddason (Norwegian court poet, 9th c.) who wrote “praise poetry” that focused on warriors or tales from a heroic age.\(^ {120}\) The eddas and poems thus reveal a perceptible “consciousness” and engagement among members of the monastic culture between the time of Christian conversion and the age of the great codifiers of Norse mythology.

**Pilgrimage Traditions and Monastic Discourse**

Pilgrimage traditions are another area that needs to qualify any discussion of a monastic discourse, and this is a subject where there exist major differences between monastic expressions about *loca sancta* in the Mediterranean World and holy places of the northern climes. Briefly, when considering how monastic sermon writers described eastern Mediterranean Holy Places for their audiences, they were working within established traditions for both pilgrimage and relics.\(^ {121}\) When one reads the works of Gregory of Tours, there is sometimes apparent a separate agenda vis-à-vis relics from the Holy Land and those of local saints; for example, there are many places in Gregory’s *Book of the Martyrs* where he seemingly compensated for the common folk’s awe at the healing power of the True Cross (or the growing number of shrines dedicated to the Virgin Mary) by emphasis on the powers of “local,” non-easterners such St. Hilary of Poitiers (d. 368) and Saint Martin of Tours (d. 397).\(^ {122}\)

---


120 See Turville-Petre, *Scaldic Poetry* and Sorensen, *Saga and Society*.


In these instances, Jerusalem and the Holy Sites could be viewed as presenting a “negative” tension in the discourse of an episcopal elite that strove to convince its populace that the presence of God could be found just as easily close to home as abroad. Jas Elsner has observed that the late antique desire for sharing a religious experience in “communitas” did not necessarily require “contestation” about the value of the pilgrimage objective itself, but only that the pilgrim achieved his/her desired experience with the divine. Given that, Gregory’s willingness to make allowance for his flock to venerate both Jerusalem- and Gallic-based saints and relics becomes for us an indication that the early medieval episcopate was both willing to modify long-held patristic and Augustinian beliefs about pilgrimage, and, potentially (following Sverre Bagge), transmit literary traditions from southern Europe and the Mediterranean world in much the same way that the Roman papacy conveyed its diplomatic expectations (via letters, charters, etc.).

By doing so, moreover, Gregory seemed to realize his parishioners could participate in the pilgrimage experience at home and not have to endure what Victor and Edith Turner called a pilgrim’s “liminality” (that is, a pilgrim as one who lacks social status in a sojourn to a holy site and becomes an exile to all but God).

The methodological paradigm for understanding the notion of pilgrimage in Scandinavian monastic accounts is quite different from the literature that was generated in the Mediterranean regions


that actually contained the Holy Land and its sacred sites. For the thirteenth century, Victor Turner found a combination of what he called “pilgrimage, history, myth, and saga” in the Icelandic saga, Thómas Saga Erkibyskups (which relates the tale of St. Thomas á Beckett’s martyrdom), where a Scandinavian-trained writer used an explicitly literary type (the saga) to describe the backstory to a Christian pilgrimage destination (Canterbury).

When we delve into earlier centuries of the Christian-pagan encounter at loca sancta, we find that members of monastic houses such as the Augustinian Victorines (Norway) and Cistercians (Iceland) were not just dismantling or burning the Viking sacred spaces; they were actively transforming pagan holy sites, and appropriating both the language and symbology that the local inhabitants were used to associating with those sites.

Some scholars have seen evidence of this in Irish influence on sermon writing in Anglo-Saxon England (with evidence from Norway and Iceland), and in the observations of Adam of Bremen (when he assessed the cults in Uppsala during Sweden’s conversion).

Perhaps one of the starkest examples here is the site of Mære in western Norway (on Trondheim Fjord), where...
we know from archaeological evidence that a pre-Christian shrine (hof) once stood, but to what gods or goddesses it was dedicated we don’t know because of the Christian church built on its remains.\(^{130}\)

**Conclusion: Needful Qualifications and Future Lines of Inquiry**

Lastly, any attempt to historicize medieval sermon literature entails provision of a context that addresses questions of transmission and audience. For my interest in sermons, the profusion of Scandinavian literature in Latin from the twelfth century coincides with the period of conversion for many of the northern countries, as well as the desultory rise of monastic houses.\(^{131}\) To give one example, we know that the latter 12th century saw Victorines seriously involved in proselytization of Scandinavia; indeed, the order itself organized a chapter of canons in Trondheim (Nidaros), Norway, shortly after the country’s conversion in 1152.\(^{132}\) In addition to the aforementioned inclusion of Honorius of Autun’s *Elucidarium* in tomes containing Icelandic sagas, historical approaches to other eddic and skaldic literatures might reveal how transmissions occurred via educational centers between Paris and the former Baltic and North Sea hinterlands; for instance, there’s Thorlak Thorhallson (þorlákr þórhallson, d. 1193), the patron saint of Iceland, who studied in Paris in the 1150s and may have been in the orbit of Richard of St. Victor.\(^{133}\)

Evidence from the eddas and skaldic poetry is voluminous, and has been used to shed light on a variety of Christian-pagan encounters that might have informed a monastic sermon writer’s perceptions of northern climes, including: heathen and Norse world-


\(^{131}\) For introduction and qualifications to the subject, see Nyberg, *Monasticism in North-Western Europe*.

\(^{132}\) See Neijmann, *A History of Icelandic Literature*.

views, kinship structures, a pro-Aesir interpretation of history, archetypal comparisons between Odin and the Judeo-Christian God, and various approaches to the role of the Norns. Any approach to sermon studies that strives to comment meaningfully on the intellectual environments wherein homilies were written must also take these kinds of sources into account.

In conclusion, this paper has demonstrated that historians most familiar with sermon evidence from the high and late medieval periods—that is, when homiletics reached florescence in the scholastic environments of 13th century monastic and cathedral schools—can also use the often-fragmentary Late Antique and early medieval sermon tradition to penetrate monastic consciousness. To do so, this article has urged that evidence should be assessed with reference to the historical milieus that informed each discrete stage of homiletic development. Indeed, when the heterogeneous elements of early and high medieval monastic culture are assessed in context, the story of the Germanic and Scandinavian conversions seems to be nothing but the tale of manifold expressions and exportation of “monastic consciousness” from the 6th through 13th centuries.

expressed in strictly Christian terms and which made little allowance for indigenous Nordic views and cosmologies. When adaptations did occur, this study has also shown that transformations of pagan beliefs or physical spaces were appropriated into a well-developed Continental monastic culture that eventually pervaded northern regions by means of supportive Christian kings, missionaries, monasteries, missionary and royal schools, biblical and learned texts, and conquest.

Lastly, the insistence by Christian clergy and rulers on portraying (and appropriating) landscapes according to biblical typologies reveal a closed system of thought that needed no references beyond the preacher or missionary’s immediate homiletic needs. By recognizing the disparate historical contexts that influenced those needs, careful readers can begin to identify the boundaries that monastic sermon writers set for themselves, limits which were made impermeable by a monastic need to explain the world in Biblical terms, and ever defined by a desire to promote Christianity no matter the violence and harsh realities of either the Viking Age, or the later Northern and Baltic Crusades.  

Todd Upton’s background includes history degrees from the University of Colorado at Boulder (Ph.D.), the University of Denver (M.A.), and the University of California at Santa Cruz (B.A.). He has taught at CU Boulder, Santa Clara University, and Metropolitan State University of Denver, and currently he is preparing a monograph, Sacred Topography, Vol. 1: Jerusalem and the Holy Sites, 1095-1291. His research interests include the Crusades, Church history, scholasticism, sermon studies, Norse mythology, and Arthurian literature. Recently elected as RMMRA Treasurer (through 2016), Todd is also co-organizing the association’s annual meeting in Denver, 2014. E-mail: tj_upton@icloud.com

135 This paper attempted to remain within the titular topics and time frame, and therefore only tangentially addressed the monastic milieu that existed during the Northern and Baltic Crusades launched by the kings of Denmark and Sweden in the later medieval period. For preliminary studies relevant to the topoi in this article, see Kurt Villads, “Sacralization of the Landscape: Converting Trees and Measuring Land in the Danish Crusades against the Wends,” in Murray, The Clash of Cultures, 141-150; Kaspars Klavins, “The Ideology of Christianity and Pagan Practice among the Teutonic Knights: The Case of the Baltic Region,” in Journal of Baltic Studies 37:3 (2006), 260-276; and, finally, for critique see John H. Lind, “Puzzling Approaches to the Crusading Movement in Recent Scandinavian Historiography. Danish Historians on Crusades and Source Editions as well as a Swedish Historian on Crusading in Finland,” in Lehtonen and Villads, Medieval History Writing and Crusade Ideology, 264-283.
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The critical drive to make fundamental, substantive distinctions between Catholic and Protestant dogma and culture has always been central to early modern English studies, but over the past fifty years a prominent contingent of literary and historical scholars has endeavored more specifically to identify and articulate significant differences between Catholic and Protestant perceptions of women and marriage. According to one familiar, now widely accepted theory advanced primarily by Miltonists, a relatively feminist and pro-marriage Protestant ethic emerged in response to the extreme, aggressively misogynistic attitudes attributed to late-medieval Catholic thought. This paper will seek to demonstrate, through a close comparative review of four English mystery play Eve portrayals (Chester, N-Town, York, and Norwich), that the supposedly “crabbed” (to use Milton’s term), male chauvinist Catholic culture actually accommodated a surprising variety of perspectives on female nature and function, many predictably and emphatically antifeminist, but others notably more tolerant and respectful, and a few even anticipating Milton’s most liberal and celebratory views. The range of outlooks observed here may be partly the result of revision, as the traditional pageants produced annually over more than a century’s span must have been altered occasionally to suit changing times and tastes (the Norwich Creation and Fall account, for instance, survives in two sharply divergent pre- and post-Reformation texts). Still, the evidence from these essentially and undeniably Catholic plays—especially from the York and Norwich examples—should probably encourage us to revise persisting reductionist views of Protestant culture as uniquely pro-marriage and Catholic as narrowly antifeminist. In any case, these dramatic Eve depictions testify to an under-acknowledged ideological diversity and complexity already present in late-medieval gender theory.

While our critical preoccupation with the anti-marriage and antifeminist ethics of medieval Catholicism often blinds us to the fact, throughout the Middle Ages clerics and theologians acknowledged (or simply assumed) that the Adam and Eve account should be read, not only as a Creation tale and an explanation of the origin of sin, but as an archetypal (or rather, the archetypal) story of marriage. It stood as an ancient, unchallenged commonplace inherited from
Augustine\(^1\) and the early Church Fathers that God had, at least originally, instituted marriage as a natural and honorable state of life, and had sanctioned it as a crucial social unit in his Providential design, when he had formed Eve as Adam's helpmate (i.e., meet help), when he had created “male and female . . . blessed them, and . . . said unto them, ‘Be Fruitful and multiply. . .’”

In the last half-century, a large and influential group of cultural historians and literary critics (especially Miltonists) have observed that the later Protestant theologians made much of this time-honored notion that marriage had been ordained by God at the dawn of time. In light of their special purpose to elevate marriage and discredit the Catholic tradition advocating celibacy and withdrawal from the world as conditions favorable (or even essential) to a genuinely spiritual life, the Reformers focused unprecedented attention on the original man and woman in their prelapsarian state and found there the basis for a utopian image of wedlock.\(^2\) For a prominent strain of Protestant writers culminating in Milton, the innocent Adam and Eve came to represent the perfect husband and wife: the pre-fallen pair came to serve as a paradigm of ideal marriage to which contemporary postlapsarian spouses might still aspire.\(^3\)

In the medieval Roman context from which the mystery plays developed (at least, as it is often narrowly and no doubt stereotypically represented), the Adam and Eve relationship had functioned just as vitally as a paradigm of marriage, but here the Fall had tended to be the central focus. From the earlier Catholic point of view, the biblical history of the original human pair contained,

---

1 See Augustine, City of God 14.22. Augustine is citing Genesis 1: 27-28.

2 Arnold Williams writes that, of the [later] Renaissance commentators on Genesis, “All . . . note that the first marriage was between Adam and Eve and was celebrated in Paradise.” He adds that “[m]ost take this occasion to praise marriage, especially the Protestants who see a chance to score a point against the Catholic doctrine of celibacy” (The Common Expositor, 88). See also Diane Kelsey McColley’s A Gust for Paradise for an extended discussion of the early modern celebratory pre-Fall/hexaemeron tradition.

3 Classic commentaries on the Protestant marriage ethic derived from the Adam and Eve model include William and Malleville Haller’s “The Puritan Art of Love” and John Halkett’s Milton and the Idea of Matrimony.
specifically, a type of troubled marriage: it was usually perceived as an exemplum—cautioning men against the potential dangers of the conjugal life. Clerical antifeminism was a significant governing principle in the late-medieval conceptual scheme, and the weakness of woman is invariably a prominent theme in the Corpus Christi Fall reenactments. While Eve is often portrayed as basically good willing, the mystery plays usually remind us that she functions, finally and inevitably, as a temptress and snare. Still, I would argue that these plays are more complex in their gender dynamics, and more dimensional in their portraits of female nature, than it has been commonly supposed or critically acknowledged.

It has long been assumed that the English mystery plays are essentially medieval and Catholic in character, and since all of the surviving cycles have roots traceable to the late fourteenth century or earlier, there is undoubtedly a basic aptness in the standard period assignation. What we sometimes fail to remember, however, is that these bible-based dramas remained popular and in continuous yearly performance in some cases into the latter half of the sixteenth century, when they were finally suppressed by hostile Protestant forces. Moreover, recent scholarship has promoted and confirmed, increasingly, a notion of the English craft cycles as evolving drama in the truest sense: some of the surviving manuscripts show clear evidence of revision, and it seems probable that, over their several-hundred-year history, many of the play texts were altered and adapted to suit changing times and tastes.

Whether their diversity can be explained by this hypothesized long-term revision process, or whether, as I strongly suspect, it simply reflects an under-acknowledged variety of perspective inherent in late-medieval Catholic thought, the four extant Corpus Christi Creation/Fall accounts reviewed below (Chester, N-Town, York, and Norwich) contain a startlingly wide range of images, ideas, and attitudes relating to Eve and Adam and the archetypal heterosexual bond—from predictably traditional/medieval to surprisingly

---

progressive/early modern, from aggressively misogynist to at least subtly feminist. A close comparative reading of these texts, as I hope to demonstrate, may help to increase our understanding of the Renaissance marriage debate in that crucial interim period between Chaucer and Shakespeare, with its unique and complex dynamic between continuity and change. And while it would be foolish to suggest that, a century after their effective demise, these Catholic "pageants" might have influenced England's quintessential Protestant poet directly; nonetheless, taken as a whole, the mystery plays articulated a rich vocabulary of ideas about gender and marriage that Milton and his culture surely inherited, and from which he drew selectively in the process of developing his own great synthesis.  

I

Of the marriage paradigms found in the surviving English mystery cycles, the Chester Adam and Eve portrait may provide the clearest and most demonstrative expression of medieval antifeminist attitudes. It is interesting to note, however, that, even here, one finds elements of the eternal debate: the presentation is not absolutely one-sided. If the antifeminist themes finally prevail emphatically, they are nonetheless set off against a number of apparently marriage- and woman-affirming motifs that grace the prelapsarian portion of the play. The image of wedlock projected initially is one of more or less equal partnership and sexual parity. In the opening monologue, God's proclamation in regard to the creation of humanity ("To oure shape now make I thee; / man and woman I will there be" [play 2, ll. 85-86]) would seem to suggest that both male and female are to be made in His image.

The original words of Genesis lend themselves easily enough to a like interpretation, but this had not prevented literalists from sticking on the scriptural statement that "God created man in his own image" (my emphasis) and, thus, doubting that woman shared

5 All mystery cycle play excerpts below are from the following editions unless indicated otherwise in the footnotes: Lumiansky and Mills, The Chester Mystery Cycle; Spector, The N-Town Play; Beadle, The York Plays; England, The Towneley Plays. Parenthetical glosses rely on the editorial apparatus of the play text and the Oxford English Dictionary.
the distinction of divine likeness. After all, the subsequent more detailed biblical description of the creation of Adam and Eve (Gen. 2:4+) includes an account of what many commentators took to be man's reception of the soul (commonly identified with God's image) directly from the Creator (“And the Lord God . . . breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul”), whereas there is no mention of this process in the course of Eve's creation.

In his review of the most influential Renaissance commentaries on Genesis, Arnold Williams observes that "[i]n the early church it was often thought that woman was not made in the image of God," or that she was made thus only indirectly: that is, she derived her likeness from man (having been fashioned out of his rib), who, in turn, derived his from God. Thus she was a less perfect, second-generation copy—a reflection of God's image (significantly) once removed. Some extremists even went so far as to question whether she had a soul. By the late sixteenth century, however, the more blatant forms of the old misogyny (outside of the satiric context, in which it found a second life) had become outmoded: most Protestant and Catholic religious writers had come to perceive men and women as spiritually equal, at least in theory.7

As in the case of the Genesis original, the question of woman's soul and its origin is never explicitly raised in the Chester Creation account. What is emphasized is the physical and formative relation between man and woman. The process of Eve's creation, God's fashioning of her from the "bone . . . and flesh also" of Adam is graphically described and dramatized. And upon waking from his prophetic slumber and encountering his "make" [mate], Adam seems almost narcissistically pleased: he clearly perceives woman

---

6 Williams, The Common Expositor, 87-88.

7 According to Williams, the Spanish Jesuit Benedictus Pererius (1535-1610) “pronounces . . . that woman is made in the image of God equally with man, though both he and Pareus [(1548-1622) “a prominent Calvinist theologian” (273)] hint that woman resembles ‘less His image who made both’” (Common Expositor, 87). In regard to the crucial issue of the soul, Williams remarks that, among the Renaissance biblical commentators, “No one disputes that woman has a soul, though Pareus asks where she got it, from God directly or from Adam?” (87). In the York Creation of Adam and Eve (play 3), God invests both the man and the woman with souls directly and simultaneously. See section III, below.
as a mirror-like image of himself. Note, for instance, his repeated celebratory emphasis on the generative link and intimate physical connection between himself and Eve in the following passage:

    I see well, lord, through thy grace
    bonne of my bones thou hir [her] mase [makes] ;
    and fleshe of my fleshe shee hase,
    and my shape through thy sawe [word].
    Therfore shee shalbe called, iwise.
    'viragoo', nothinge amisse;
    for out of man taken shee is,
    and to man shee shall drawe.
    Of earth thou madest first mee,
    both bone and fleshe; now I see
    thou hast her given through thy postee [power]
    of that I in me had.
    Therfore man kyndely [naturally] shall forsake
    father and mother, and to wife take;
    too [two] in one fleshe, as thou can make,
    eyther other for to glad.  (play 2, ll. 145-160)

    Clearly Adam thinks he is praising Eve here. By stressing woman's origin in man (which to us might suggest a degrading dependence: i.e., the replica is usually thought inferior to the original), his intent is to elevate her to near-equal status. By asserting that Eve is worthy of the name “virago” (“. . . nothinge amisse; / for out of man taken shee is”), Adam means to attest that she is neither different from, nor inferior to, himself in essential nature. He would recognize in her that dignity accorded automatically to the human male (“thou hast her given . . . / of that I in me had”).

8 As editor David Mills reminds us, the word root vir denotes "man" in Latin, and virago was the term employed in the Vulgate version [Gen. 2: 23] (Chester . . . Modernized). Of course, in our Western, patriarchal culture, this root is powerfully affirmative and ennobling, as words like virtue and virtuoso demonstrate. Williams observes that "the Hebrew word for woman, isha, is but the feminine of the word for man, ish. The translators all wrestled with the problem of preserving this semi-pun in other languages than Hebrew" (The Common Expositor, 87).

9 In the Norwich Grocers' Play, Adam applies the term virago in a similarly commendatory sense (ll. 19-21; see discussion, section IV). The OED lists examples of this complimentary, or at least, non-derogatory, usage of "virago" (as simply 'woman, derived from man') in English works from Ælfric's eleventh-century Homilies to Gascoigne's Droume Doomes Day (1576). This latter example suggests (as does the Chester play) that the name became inappropriate after the Fall: "Before Eva sinned, she was called Virago, and after she sinned she deserved to be called Eva." Gascoigne's comment is inspired by the name shift
the natural marriage bond between man and woman in terms that emphasize perfect union and mutual responsibility. The familiar images of male dominance and female subjection are conspicuously muted in his encomium to a relationship whose express purpose is "eyther other for to glad" (l. 160).

Of course, this Adam is profoundly naive, as subsequent events will prove, and as our knowledge of later historical meanings of virago must lead us to suspect, as he pours forth his ardent tribute to Eve. By the late fourteenth century, the derogatory connotations of virago were established. At best, the term meant (Oxford English Dictionary) “a man-like, vigorous and heroic woman; a female warrior; an amazon”—a definition derived from classical Latin and re-popularized with the rise of the chronicle and epic romance genres. Applied to the context of Adam's brief epithalamium, it must have seemed comically incongruous, although not wholly inconsistent with the husband's quaint intent to extol. At worst, virago had come to designate “[a] bold, impudent (or wicked) woman; a termagant; a scold.” Certainly, the irony of Adam's use of the word as a term of praise would not have escaped a late-medieval audience.

With the entrance of the Devil, the tone turns suddenly and decidedly cynical, and the remainder of the drama plays as a barefaced catalogue of antifeminist ideas centering on Eve. Satan targets Adam's wife because she is weak-willed (“shee will doe as I her saye” [l. 183]) and easily deceived. Susceptible to evil present in the original Genesis text (specifically the Vulgate): Eve is referred to as simply "the woman" until Adam names her ("Eve . . . the mother of all living") after the Fall. The Chester playwright's shift from "Viragoo" to (implied) "Woe-man" is a satiric variation.

10 The first example of this usage recorded in the OED is from John of Trevesa's 1387 translation of Ranulf Higden's compendious Latin history of the world, the Polychronicon. Quotations from Robert Fabyan's Chronicles and Gawin Douglas's Aeneid (both 1513) are given as additional early examples.

11 OED. The apostrophe in Chaucer's "Man of Law's Tale": "O Sowdanesse, roote of Iniquitee, Virago, thou Semyrame the secounde"--is the earliest example given.

12 Nor does it escape Adam himself. Immediately following the Fall, undeceived, he bitterly recalls his naming of Eve, only this time he translates the Latin into plain English:

Yea, sooth [the truth] sayde I in prophecye
when thou was taken of my bodye--
mans woe thou would bee witterlye [certainly];
therfore thou was soe named. (ll. 269-272)
commands, she is, nonetheless (in her vanity, her idle curiosity, and her intolerance of restraint), irrationally resistant to legitimate authority; hence, "That woman is forbydden to doe / for anythinge the[y] will therto" (ll. 185-186). Above all, the Devil perceives Eve as a compulsive, incontinent pleasure seeker. In his envious desire to pluck man from Paradise, he determines to exploit this propensity in woman: "soe shall they both for her delyte [delight] / bee banyshed from that blysse" (ll. 191-192). Despite Satan's reputation as the father of lies, his critical assessment of Eve's character proves sadly accurate. Thus in the aftermath of the Fall (and in one of play's most blatantly antifeminist passages), Adam identifies the undisciplined, covetous nature of his wife—figured in her "glotonye" [gluttony]—as the basis for her sisterly alliance with the fiend:

My licourouse [greedy] wyfe hath bynne my foe;
The devylls envy shente mee alsoe.
These too [two] together well may goe,
The suster and the brother!
His wrathe hathe donne me muche woe;
Hir [her] glotonye greved mee alsoe.
God lett never man trust you too [two],
The one more then [than] the other. (ll. 353-360)

If, through the characterization of Eve, woman's (presumably) flawed and susceptible nature becomes closely associated with evil, the effect is only accentuated when the Devil assumes a female shape. In the aggressively antifeminist scheme of the play, all things feminine gravitate toward evil, and most things evil take feminine form.  

And so the fiend forecasts:

A maner of an edder [adder] is in this place
That wynges like a bryde [bird] shee hase--
Feete as an edder, a mayden[']s face--
Hir kynde [form] I will take.
And of the tree of paradice
Shee shall eate through my contyse [cunning];
For wemen they be full licourouse [greedy],
That will shee not forsake. (ll. 193-200)

Chaucer (or his character, the lawyer) employs a similar antifeminist strategy—placing extreme emphasis on the Satan/Eve bond—in his grandiloquent condemnation of the wicked mother-in-law in the Man of Law's Tale (ll. 358-371, following the text in Fisher, Complete Poetry and Prose of Geoffrey Chaucer).
While the maiden-faced adder became a popular motif in the visual arts between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, of the extant English cycle plays, only the Chester *Adam and Eve* (play 2) portrays the serpent as an explicitly, unmistakably female figure. As David Mills observes, “The serpent was held to be erect before the Fall, and exegetes such as Bede considered it to have a woman's face, which enabled it to establish a rapport with Eve.” Certainly the notion that Eve would have felt more at ease conversing with a female, would have been more naturally trusting of her own sex, is intriguing psychologically. But we should not ignore the fact that the maiden-faced serpent adds powerful mythic reinforcement to the themes of woman as deceiver, and woman as bad counselor, that the Chester dramatist deliberately develops in his Eve characterization. The chain of deceit acquires a neat feminine consistency when, called to account before God, Adam can blame "this woman . . . that thou gave [me] to [be] my feare [partner]" (ll. 289-290), and Eve in turn can justly maintain, "This edder, lorde, shee was my foe / and sothly [truly] mee disceaved alsoe" (ll. 294-295).

The cautionary emphasis on female wiles is only further accentuated by the fact that Adam is portrayed here as an apparently unsuspecting, innocent victim. Eve never alerts him to the implications of eating the fruit, never tempts him with vain promises of power or wisdom to be gained. She simply bids him "eate some of this apple here" (l. 250), remarking "[i]t is fayre [fair]" (l. 251), and the poor man, ignorant presumably of its origin, and conceding

15 The play thus proved crucial to Bonnell’s seminal 1917 argument that the artists who employed this image took their inspiration from the Corpus Christi dramatizations. It was his intent there to demonstrate “that the representation of the serpent in Eden as having a human head was common in drama and iconography; that it is first noticeable in the thirteenth, or the early part of the fourteenth century, being then a startling innovation in art; and that in all probability it was the mystery play which, to facilitate the dialogue between Eve and the serpent, first adopted it, from a literary source” (255).
17 That Satan, in assuming a maiden’s face, appeals to Eve’s vanity or egotism is another interesting possibility. In his edition of Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, Roy Flannagan notes that "many commentators and visual artists, such as Andrew Willet and the painter Raphael, acknowledged that the Serpent may have had the face of a virgin--mirroring Eve's face narcissistically" (486--note).
"the fruit is sweete and passinge feare" (254), accepts "one morsell" to his utter ruin. The scene would seem to suggest that this Adam (unlike Milton's) was deceived. His surprised response to the sense of nakedness that follows his eating would likewise tend to indicate that he did not knowingly partake of the forbidden fruit, although he certainly comes to a swift realization of his error:

Out, alas, what ayleth mee?
I am naked, well I see.
Woman, cursed mote thou bee,
for wee [be] bothe nowe shente [destroyed].
I wotte [know] not for shame whyther to flee,
for this fruite was forbydden mee.
Now have I brooken, through reade [counsel] of thee,
my lorde’s commandemente. 18 (ll. 257-264)

Again, it is left to Eve to pass the charge of ill counsel on to the she-serpent: "Alas this edder hathe done mee nye [harm]!" she complains; "Alas, hir reade [advice] why did I [follow]?" (ll. 265-266); while in pronouncing the curse of work upon man, God clearly identifies Adam's heeding of Eve's bad advice as an immediate cause of his punishment:

for thou haste not donne after mee,
thy wyves counsell for to flee,
but donne soe hir byddinge
to eate the fruite of thys tree,
in thy worke warryed the earthe shalbe. . . . (ll. 322-326)

Finally, one may perceive in Eve's markedly greater burden of punishment, a reflection of her assumedly greater culpability. If the fallen Adam faces a future encumbered with "greate travell [labor]," fallen Eve is destined to confront a virtual catalogue of hardships and challenges. There will be the traditional pangs of childbirth, but in addition, God informs her, "man shall master thee alwaye; / and under his power thou shalt bee aye, / thee for to dryve and deare [discipline]" (ll. 318-320).

18 To be fair, one must also acknowledge that God imputes full consciousness of action to Adam in His retrospective remarks just prior to the Expulsion (ll. 369-374).
Woman's existence after the Fall as intimated in the Chester *Adam and Eve: Cain and Abel* seems a particularly gloomy and miserable one. With man she shares in the curse of tedious work, although her specific task is to make clothing ("I suffer on yearth for my misdeede; / and of this wooll I spyn threede by threede, / to hill mee from the could" [ll. 502-504]). And in the sorrow-filled denouement following Cain's murder of Abel, while Adam declares that "Noe more joye to me is leade, / save only Eve my wyfe" (ll. 687-688), Eve confesses herself *utterly* desolate. At the conclusion of the play, the Chester Eve presents a grim figure of woman eternally barred from happiness (in this life at least) by sin. It is she who, in her dramatic non-Scriptural lament and self-recrimination (quite possibly over her son's body\(^\text{19}\)), takes primary responsibility for (and must suffer presumably the most for) original sin, now perpetuated in the sin of Cain:

> Alas, nowe is my sonne slayne!
> Alas, marred is all my mayne [power]!
> Alas, muste I never be fayne [happy],
> but in woe and mo[ul]minge?
> Well I wott and knowe iwysse [indeed]
> that verye [just] vengeance it is.
> For I to God soo did amysse,
> mone [must] I never have lykinge [pleasure]. (ll. 689-696)

**II**

The N-Town *Creation and Fall* (play 2), like the Chester *Adam and Eve*, is notable for its idiosyncrasies of emphasis and its variations on the Genesis original. The antifeminism in this version as compared with the Chester is just as potent finally, although significantly less overt and virulent at first glance. There is much less open railing against woman here: but if she is less an object of censure, she is also less an object of attention generally. Perhaps the most striking feature of the marriage paradigm suggested by the N-Town Adam and Eve portrait is its impersonal and negligible treatment of the wife. Eve remains a decidedly minor character throughout the play; she seems strangely excluded from the central dramatic focus.

\(^{19}\) Mills observes in his introduction to the play (*Chester . . . Modernized*) that "[n]o provision seems to be made for the removal of Abel's body, and the laments of Adam and Eve at the end may well be over it while Cain departs" (26).
In the opening Creation segment, for instance, God addresses Adam directly and exclusively. A scant two lines are devoted to the formation of Eve and, even then, the account seems deliberately scarfed into the general Creation catalogue, as if she is just one more inferior being for Adam to name and govern. As Adam's wife, it would appear her primary function is for propagation of the kind:

\[\text{[DEUS]}\]
Flesch of thi flesch and bon[e] of thi bon[e],
Adam, here is thi wyf and make.
Bothe fysche and foulys that swymyny and gon,
To everych of hem [each of them] a name thu take;
Bothe tre, and frute, and bestys echon,
Red and qwyte, bothe blew and blake,
Thu yeve hem [Thou give them] name be thiself alon[e],
Erbys and gresse, both beetys and brake;
Thi wyff thu yeve name also.
Loke that ye not ses [cease]
Youre frute to encres,
That ther may be pres [a throng],
Me worchipe for to do. (ll. 18-30)

Thus while one prominent strain of the clerical antifeminist tradition sought to amplify woman's responsibility for the Fall, to draw connections between her and the Devil, and to identify her nature as, if not positively malignant, at least tending inevitably toward evil, another less reactionary but no less powerful school sought simply to belittle or deny her importance outside of her strictly biological function. This time-honored position had been fostered and perpetuated by some of the most respected theologians of the Middle Ages; it served as bedrock for the Church's defense of celibacy. Williams deftly summarizes the basic pattern of thinking:
the opinion of many of the fathers, most strongly expressed in Jerome’s letter to Jovinian, that woman was an inferior creature of only biological utility. According to this concept, Eve was a help in only one respect, in the procreation of children. A male friend would have been better, Augustine is reported as saying, for society and enjoyment. Woman is not made for herself, but for man. She is an "occasional animal," made only by occasion of the defect in man which required aid in the generation of children. At best, according to Paul’s sentence that it is better to marry than to burn, she is a remedy for illicit love.

In the N-Town play, the sense of distance and impersonality in the treatment of Eve is further heightened by the fact that Adam never acts upon God’s directive (see quotation above) to name his wife. She is addressed, usually in a tone of command, as "Womman" or "Wyff," but never as "Eve," throughout the play. This might be attributable to contemporary social custom and notions of family decorum. Certainly the issue of proper terms of address between husband and wife was much discussed by later Protestant moralists and conduct book writers. The fact remains, however, that the authors of the other surviving cycles show little hesitancy in allowing Adam to call Eve, Eve.

The N-Town Creation and Fall does contain a brief prelapsarian episode in which Adam and Eve in turn celebrate the fruits of the garden and give thanks and praise to the Lord. The scene seems purposely designed to indicate that both are acutely aware of how generous God has been to them, and to show that both clearly understand the sole prohibition concerning the fatal tree. Both acknowledge beforehand that they have been granted

20 Williams, Common Expositor, 85. As Williams further notes, "Against these 'harsh and crabbed' sentiments, as Milton calls them, there is another attitude, well represented in the [Renaissance] commentaries. Man is a social animal, needing the 'meet conversation' of woman" (85). This view, that "procreation is not the sole, even the principal, function of marriage" (86), is commonly associated with Protestant writers such as Milton and Pareus. Thus the two prevailing beliefs about the role of the wife promoted by late medieval and Renaissance writers reflect the "debate between Catholics anxious to uphold the doctrine of celibacy and the superiority of the celibate over the married life and Protestants, who, as Pererius says, use the text 'it is not good for man to be alone' to oppose the monastic vow of celibacy" (86). Nonetheless, Williams prudently adds, “it is unfair not to note that the debate is partly too between an older and a newer view of marriage, unfair also not to note that Catholic commentators like Pererius list among the ends of marriage the social, though they do insist on the higher merit of the celibate life for those who can receive it” (86).
everything they need to be happy, and that, given the circumstances, the one commandment should be easy to obey. This emphasis on pre-Fall awareness is especially significant in regard to Eve. Since she has been thus far silent and scarcely visible, and since God's earlier warning against eating the fruit had been addressed expressly to Adam (in Genesis, the prohibition is given before Eve's creation, and we are left to assume that Adam communicated it to his wife sometime before her encounter with the serpent), the author would clearly disallow, before the Fall, any plea of ignorance that might be entered for her after the fact.  

The N-Town author anticipates Milton's radically augmented prelapsarian treatment in his insistence on the sufficiency and abundance of Paradise, in his deliberate depiction of the perfect content of the pre-fallen pair (their irrepressible, spontaneous expressions of gratitude foreshadow the more formal, but likewise spontaneous, morning and evening prayers uttered in unison by Milton's happy couple), and in his emphasis on gardening as the chief primordial human activity. It is also interesting to note that here, as in Paradise Lost, a subtle division of labor is suggested (it would seem that Adam tends, specifically, the fruit; Eve, specifically, the flowers), and Eve initiates the fatal separation when she declares:

In this gardeyn I wyl go se
All the flourys of fayr bewté,
And tastyn the frutys of gret plenté
That be in paradyse. (ll. 83-86)

21 In order to stress “the entire freedom of the will of man,” Williams observes, “... the [Genesis] commentators usually state that Eve, as well as Adam, knew the command. A few of the less responsible ancients had thought that Eve had not received the command as had Adam, hence was ignorant that the deed to which the serpent urged her was forbidden by God. True it was that God gave the command to Adam before Eve’s creation. ... But, as Pererius points out, since she repeats the command to the serpent, she must have known it” (Common Expositor, 114).

22 Paradise Lost 4.720-735; 5.144-208.

23 In the Towneley Creation fragment it is Adam who proposes to wend forth in search of the undiscovered trees and flowers of the neighborhood. See note 36 below for a summary of the surviving Towneley Adam and Eve material. Cf. also the Norwich Grocers’ Play (discussed in section IV).
Another peculiar aspect of the N-Town Eve, but one that contributes to the sense of her invisibility or facelessness, is her apparent tendency to experience vicariously through Adam. For instance, after accepting two apples from the serpent (one for herself and one for Adam), this Eve shows little inclination to satisfy her own desire. She seems much more concerned that her husband should taste of the fruit. Her focus shifts immediately to him, and to her goal of persuading him to eat:

[Serpens]  Ete this appyl and in certeyn,
That I am trewe so[o]ne xalt th[o]u se[e].

[Eva]  To myn husbond with herte ful fayn
This appyl I bere, as thu byddyst me.
This frute to ete I xal asayn
So wys as God is yf we may be,
And Goddys pere of myth [might].
To myn husbond I walke my way,
And of this appyl I xal asay
To make hym to ete, yf that I may,
And of this frewte to byth. (ll. 115-125)

The specific temptations that the N-Town Eve falls to only further our impression of what might be called, in modern terms, her lack of ego or weak sense of self. The text makes it clear that she is not simply entranced by the serpent's rhetoric, bullied by his aggressiveness, nor driven by her own gluttonous desire. "So wys as God is in his gret mayn / And felaw in kunnyng, fayn wold I be" (ll. 113-114), she declares. This Eve seems particularly enticed by the promise of God-like wisdom, a fact that may reflect her intellectual insecurity. She desires wisdom because she lacks it, and knows that she lacks it, we may be tempted to conclude. At times, the N-Town Eve seems a portrait of the maternal creative impulse perverted or gone awry--infected by delusions of grandeur: for it is not simple wisdom she seems to covet, but in particular the wisdom manifested in the act of divine creation. In tempting Adam, Eve promises (in a projection of her own wish fulfillment?) that eating the apple will render him:
Goddys felaw to be alway
All his wysdam to vnderstonde,
And Goddys pere to be for ay,
Allthyng for to make:
Both fysch and foule, se and sond,
Byrd and best, watyr and lond.  (ll. 131-136)

The N-Town Eve is clearly attracted to power as well as wisdom and, again, we may suspect that her wish to gain a controlling influence in the world may arise from her intuitive sense of her own ineffectuality. As a partner to Adam, she never acts in the least bit propitiously or constructively. She proves a bad counselor and a dubious helpmate--less than helpful--throughout. Her advice brings (predictably) disastrous results: "My flesly frend my fo I fynde" (l. 166), Adam later complains. Even in strictly practical terms, she fails miserably in her wifely duties. While tradition held that the woman (as the clothing expert) had proposed an immediate remedy to the couple's post-Fall nakedness, here it is Adam who must devise the fig leaves (ll. 171-175). She conquers Adam's stubborn resistance to her entreaties, not by cleverness, but through sheer nagging persistence. She seems a narrow-minded, ignorant woman, whose consistently errant thinking renders her dangerous in the assertive mode. At the conclusion of the play, her desperate proposal to Adam to strangle her serves as a final emphatic testament to her essentially foolish and counterproductive nature:

[Eva]  My wytt awey is fro[m] me gon!
Wrythe onto my neckebon[e]
With hardnesse of thin[e] honde.

[Adam] Wyff, thi wytt is not wurth a rosch.
Leve woman, tune thi thought.
I wyl not sle [slay] flescly of my flesch,
For of my flesh thi flesch was wrought.  (ll. 307-312)

While the N-Town Eve seeks wisdom and power, she proves, after all, profoundly stupid (even God addresses her as "Vnwise womman" after the Fall), and effectual only in terms of causing harm and creating chaos. The moral of the story, of course, is that she should have accepted the fact of her weakness and limited
understanding—should not have aspired above her humble station, nor encouraged Adam to aspire above his. As in the case of the Chester version, the N-town *Fall of Man* places the burden of guilt squarely on the woman, and argues vigorously for her strict subjection to male authority:

\[
[\text{Deus}] \text{ Womman, thu sowsyst this synnyng}
\]
\[
\text{And bad hym breke myn byddyng.}
\]
\[
\text{Therfore thu xalt ben vndyrlyng;}
\]
\[
\text{To mannys byddyng bend. (ll. 251-254)\textsuperscript{24}}
\]

### III

In contrast to the Chester and N-Town versions, the York dramatization of the Adam and Eve story (played out in four short plays) is considerably more balanced in its attribution of blame for the Fall, and refreshingly free of the intense, unqualified antifeminist sentiments that the former cycles so liberally indulge.\textsuperscript{25} The difference becomes clearly evident in the first play of the series, the cardmakers' *Creation of Adam and Eve*. Here the pair are formed almost simultaneously. Adam's origin in "erthe" is emphasized (as a check to his prideful tendencies—lest he feel himself too superior) (ll. 25-32), and Eve is made out of Adam's left rib (i.e., close to his heart)\textsuperscript{26} expressly for the purpose of society as opposed to propagation:

24  A final note: one may remark the conspicuous (and non-Scriptural) disconnection of Eve from the N-Town prophecies of Mary (ll. 261-265; 291-295) (traditionally the "Second Eve") and the Incarnation. Here, it is not explicitly the "woman’s [i.e., Eve’s] seed" (as it is in Genesis and Milton) that will crush the serpent’s head and “save all that ye haue forlorn / Youre welth for to restore” (ll. 294-295), but the “chylde of a mayd” (l. 292) to come. It would appear that the N-Town dramatist did not see his Eve as worthy of association with the pristine Virgin Mary and deliberately wished to oust her from the Providential scheme.

25  In her comparative survey of the Noah plays, Rosemary Woolf likewise finds that “the author of the York plays does not rely at all on satirical anti-feminist generalizations . . .” (*The English Mystery Plays*, 141).

26  Williams notes that the rib motif, in early Hebraic tradition, was often interpreted satirically: hence, “Woman was not made from the head . . . lest she dominate man, nor from the foot lest she be despised and trodden underfoot, but from the rib, a middle part of the body, so that she should have a middle position and equal dignity with man” (91). In the Renaissance commentaries, “the satire disappears” and the specifying of the left rib, with its affective symbolic resonances, becomes common. Williams cites examples from (the Jesuit) Pererius and Milton. The former explains that woman was made: “from the left side, in which the human heart is located, because of the great love that should be between a man and his wife, and the union of souls and concord of wills” (qtd. in Williams, 91). Cf. *Paradise Lost* 4.482-488.
The stanza that follows is even more startling in its (by period standards) respectful treatment of the woman and powerfully affirmative marriage implications. Here, immediately after their creation, male and female receive both the breath of life and their souls, simultaneously and directly from God. A marriage ceremony, complete with vows and performed by the Supreme Being Himself, is suggested. And while, traditionally, Adam had been charged to name his helpmate along with the other creatures (as in Genesis, or the Chester Creation [play 2]), here the Lord names both the man and the woman in a gesture that cannot help but imply their equal dignity in His eyes. That both sexes were formed in God's image seems affirmed by Adam's plural pronoun reference in his grateful response to his Maker:

[Deus] Takys now here the gast [spirit] of lyffe
And ressayue [receive] both youre saules [souls] of me;
This femall take thou to thi wyffe,
Adam and Eue your names sall be. (ll. 41-44)

[Adam] Mony diueris thyngis now here es,
Off bestis and foulis bathe wylde and tame;
Yet is nan [none] made to thi liknes
But we alone--A, louyd by thi name. (ll. 49-52)

One will note that the “Be fruitful and multiply” command (typically given after the formation of Eve, and tending to emphasize her limited function—as in the N-Town version) is never issued directly to humanity in the York Creation narrative. (God does direct the rest of his creatures to "wax furth fayre plenté" at the end of the fifth day, and he tells Adam and Eve succinctly, "Thy kynd shall multeply," in the succeeding pageant [play 4, l. 65].)²⁷ Here, Man is formed deliberately to fill a void in the Providential design.

²⁷ God also recalls charging the couple to multiply at the opening of the York Flood narrative (play 8, The Building of the Ark, ll. 9-16). An emphasis on Eve's sexual function is more readily discernable in this later reference to the propagation command.
God made the universe out of love, yet (after five days) there is no creature capable of returning that love, no creature capable of appreciating the divine care invested in Creation. Humanity becomes the divine solution to this cosmic dilemma (ll. 13-24). Thus it is to man's unique and presumably higher purpose, not to the common/universal function of propagation, that God later refers in reminding Adam and Eve of their primary duty:

For this skyl made I you this day,
My name to worshipp ay-whare [everywhere];
Louys [Love] me, forthi [therefore], and louys me ay [ever]
For my makyng [act of creating], I axke [ask] no mare.  (ll. 65-68)

Significantly, this divine directive, like most in the prelapsarian York narrative, is given to both Adam and Eve together. In the fullers' Adam and Eve in Eden (play 4), God does assign "Lordship in erthe" specifically to Adam, and His initial disclosure of the prohibition is likewise addressed to the man. Still, in a subsequent reference to the forbidden tree, He insists: "Luke nother thowe nor Eve thy wyf / Lay ye no handes theretyll" (ll. 84-85). The York dramatist is unique in his penchant for having God address the pair together, using the proper names of both, as in the opening and closing lines of the fullers' play:

Adam and Eve, this is the place
That I haue graunte you of my grace  (ll. 1-2)

Adam, and Eve thy wyfe,
My blyssyng haue ye here. 28  (ll. 98-99)

In short, the York cycle boasts the longest and most fully developed prelapsarian segment found in the extant English mysteries. An entire (albeit brief) play (Adam and Eve in Eden, fourth overall in the series) is built around prayers of praise and vows of obedience, spoken alternately by Adam and Eve in their state of

28 References to “Adam and Eve” continue in the cooper’s Fall of Man (play 5). God decrees the curse of work (traditionally placed on Adam alone) thus: "Adam and Eue alsoo, yhe / In erthe than shalle ye swete and swynke, / And traualye for youre foode" (ll. 160-162). The Angel sent to escort the tandem out of Paradise likewise addresses both by name: "Adam and Eue, do you to goo, / For here may ye make no dwellyng" (ll. 171-172).
innocence. No other mystery cycle takes such pains to establish them as a married couple and to develop a harmonious image of them together in Eden before the Fall. Moreover, the Adam and Eve marriage paradigm evident here is much more egalitarian than the others we have reviewed. Eve is a strong presence throughout the York prelapsarian scenes: neither Adam nor God ignores her (as both seem to do in the N-Town version, for instance), and she and her husband are granted a comparable number of lines.

While the York prelapsarian depiction of Adam and Eve seems remarkably liberal by the standards of its time, it remains to be seen whether the dramatist maintains his relatively positive view of women and marriage through the Fall and Expulsion episodes. A hasty review of the fifth and sixth plays in the York series may lead us to conclude that there is very little difference between this and the (at times) shamelessly misogynistic Chester and N-Town Fall reenactments. In the course of the coopers’ Fall of Man and the armourers’ Expulsion both Satan and Adam have much to say against the character and nature of Eve. All (or nearly all) of the antifeminist themes found in the Chester and N-Town versions (e.g., woman as the weak link—the "ready way" [l. 16] by which evil enters the world; foolish woman susceptible to the promise of wisdom; woman as bad counselor and incompetent helpmate) figure prominently in the York dramatization.

What are significantly different are the complicating contexts in which these themes appear, contexts that (in true Miltonic fashion) serve almost invariably to challenge, or even to undermine, the misogynist content, and that allow for the perception of a stronger, more thoughtful, more dignified, though still fallible Eve. For instance, the York Eve does succumb finally to the temptation to be wise, but only after withstanding a much more sustained, rigorous, and sophisticated verbal assault from Satan than we have elsewhere seen. The tempter employs an impressive range of rhetorical strategies on his victim here. He presents himself as a rather bossy

29 In their introduction to the play (York Mystery Plays... Modern Spelling, 8), Richard Beadle and Pamela M. King declare of this scene that “...verbally he [the playwright] achieves some subtly realized dialogue as the serpent proceeds to flatter, seduce, and bully Eve into eating the fruit.”
and cavalier “frende” who knows the inside story about the tree, and
who would not leave Eve in ignorance (ll. 41, 45-48). Startled, no
doubt by his blasphemous remarks (and perhaps by his capacity for
speech”), she asks assertively: “Why, what-kynne thyng [what kind
of thing] art thou / That telles this tale to me?” (ll. 52-53). The fiend
(a little abashed perhaps) now assumes a posture of servility. “A
worme, that wotith [knows] wele how / That yhe may wirshipped be”
(ll. 54-55), he answers. If affected friendship gained him little credit
with the woman, he will see what flattery will do. Again his ploy
falls flat as Eve responds with unmoved, unassailable rationality:

What wirshippe shulde we wynne therby?
To ete therof vs nedith it nought,
We have lordshippe to make maistrie [mastery]
O alle thynge that in erthe is wrought. (ll. 56-59)

By now Satan is clearly exasperated and seems almost beaten (in
dramatic terms, one might say that he is beaten here). He loses
his composure. He resorts to blank commands. He is reduced to a
blustering bully:

Woman, do way!
To gretter state ye may be broughte
And ye will do as I schall saye. (ll. 60-62)

Of course, the dramatist could not re-write the story: Eve still falls in
the York play. But there is a difference in her manner of falling. She
does not go gently, as they say. At least she mounts a respectable
resistance, makes Satan work a little, shows some integrity of
character, in the advent of the disaster.

And again, there can be no point in refuting it: the York Eve
proves a bad counselor and a dubious helper to her husband. But
again there is a difference. When Eve presents the fruit to Adam the
prohibition is clearly in his mind and he rebukes her immediately:
"Alas woman, why toke thou this? / Oure lorde comaunded vs bothe
/ To tente [tend/look after] the tree of his. . . . Allas, thou hast done
amys" (ll. 84-86, 88). This Adam, like Milton's, is not deceived. He

is not tricked. He knows this is the forbidden fruit and he makes a conscious, deliberate choice to eat it, yielding apparently to the same desire for power and wisdom that had so recently corrupted his wife's will. He is no innocent victim of Eve's wiles. To be sure, he would fix the burden on her and her "[i]lle counsaille" (l. 107). At the first pangs of shame that follow his moral lapse, Adam protests, "A, Eue, thou art to blame, / To this entysed thou me" (ll. 108-109). But the assessment is clearly subjective and unfair: he is fully responsible for his own fall. What is more, he knows it, as the following passage (which begins as a bitter critique of Eve, then ends in self-rebuke) duly indicates:

[Adam] Allas, that I lete at [took notice of] thy lare [counsel]  
Or trowed [believed] the trufuls [lies] that thou me saide.  
So may I byde,  
For I may banne [curse] that bittir brayde [rash act]  
And drery de[s]de, that I it dyde. (ll. 124-128)

Though Adam continues to harp upon his wife's offenses, this is clearly a defense mechanism: he cannot face the fact of his own culpability, so he finds a scapegoat in her. Two key passages in the armourers' Expulsion (play 6) serve to expose Adam's antifeminist complaints as ill founded and less than constructive. The first of these correction scenes occurs when Adam, reminded of his sin by the Angel, tries once again to shift the burden of guilt to his wife. In a passage that would seem to anticipate Michael's famous reproach of Adam in Book 11 of Milton's epic, the celestial ambassador insists that this would-be shirker take responsibility for his actions:

31 In Paradise Lost, Adam, at the moment of his fall, ", . . . scrup'l'd not to eat / Against his better knowledge, not deceav'd, / But fondly overcome with Femal charm" (9.997-999). Milton's primal husband, seeing his wife lost, cannot bear the thought of separation from her, and thus, in despair, determines to share her doom. The York Adam's motives for accepting the fruit are much more sketchy and primitive. He is apparently persuaded by Eve's insistence that they "shalle be goddis and knawe al thyng" (l. 103). Beadle and King (York Mystery Plays . . . Modern Spelling, 8) remark that "Adam is not of particularly impressive moral stature in this play: he accepts the fruit for the same selfish reasons as Eve, rather than out of love of her. Later, when God confronts him with his crime, far from presenting an example of contrition, Adam peevishly blames his wife." (Of course, this latter charge might be leveled just as easily against the scriptural Adam or Milton's.)

32 Beadle and King maintain that here the York playwright "devises the first domestic quarrel in the cycle, as Adam turns on his wife for deuding him with 'trifles'" (8).

33 Cf. Paradise Lost 11.632-636.
[Angelus] Adam, thyselfe made al this syte [sorrow],
For to the tree thou wente full tyte [quickly]
And boldely on the frute gan byte
My lord forbed.

[Adam] Yaa, allas, my wiffe that may I wite [blame],
For scho [she] me red [advised].

[Angelus] Adam, for thou trowyd [believed] hir tale,
He sendis the worde and sais thou shale
Lyffe ay in sorowe. . . . (ll. 30-38)

But the most effective challenge to Adam's antifeminist complaints comes, appropriately enough, from his wife. Eve readily admits her mistake. She concedes that her action in the Fall would seem to demonstrate woman's lack of wisdom. Still, she is not so obtuse or naive as to be blind to the implications of mutual blame that even her Fall alone must evoke. If she acted foolishly according to her foolish nature, Adam, to whom God granted supreme "Lordeship in erthe" (play 4, l. 18) (assumedly, based on his moral and intellectual superiority to all creatures), should have exercised his wisdom and authority more aggressively. If the man is indeed the wiser and stronger being (nothing in the play suggests that he actually is; the assertion is merely implicit in Adam's bitter remarks), then it becomes his responsibility to save the woman from her weak and foolish self:

[Adam] Allas, what womans witte was light [fickle]!
That was wele se[e]ne.

[Eue] Sethyn [Since] it was so me knyth it sore [I regret it deeply],
Bot sethyn that woman witteles ware
Mans maistrie [mastery] shulde haue bene more
Agayns the gilte [fault].

[Adam] Nay, at my speche wolde thou never spare [forbear],
That has vs spilte [ruined].

[Eue] Iff I hadde spoken youe oughte to spill [anything to harm]
Ye shulde haue taken go[o]de tent [heed] theretyll,
And turnyd my thought. 34 (play 6, ll. 133-143)

34 Answering Adam’s post-Fall rebukes, Milton’s Eve employs a similar argument (see Paradise Lost 9.1155-1161).
Adam can complain that Eve would have ignored his commands had he given them. But of course, this we will never know. In any case, his persistent after-the-fact bellyaching and mindless indulging in antifeminist invective serve no constructive end. Eve, weary of his simplistic, none-too-rational, indiscriminate abuse of her sex, though wracked with genuine remorse for her sin, acts assertively to quell Adam's ranting. She tells him, in as many words, to shut up:

[Adam] Do way [Cease], woman, and neme it noght,
   For at my biddying wolde thou not be
   And therfore my woo wyte [blame] Y thee;
   Thurgh [Through] ille counsaille thus casten ar[e] we
   In bitter bale.
   Nowe God late [let] never man aftir me
   Triste woman tale [woman's words].

[Eve] Be stille Adam, and nemen [name] it na mare [no more],
   It may not mende.
   For wele I wate [know] I haue done wrange [wrong],
   And therfore euere I morne emange [continually],
   Allas the whille I leue so lange [live so long],
   De[a]de wolde I be. (ll. 144-150; 155-160)

The York Eve represents the most progressive wife model to emerge from the medieval English mystery play tradition. She is a refreshingly assertive character who is more than willing to accept her share of the blame, but who will not blandly approve Adam's escapist tendencies. Again, she anticipates Milton's Eve in accepting her husband's accusations, yet in quietly resisting his self-righteous wrongheadedness, while providing, in her humble acceptance of her own guilt, the immediate, tangible model of contrition that proves

35 Eve’s commanding tone here recalls the bullying rhetoric used against her by both Adam above, and Satan in the temptation scene (e.g., “Woman, do way!” [l. 60]).

36 For an alternate perspective, however, see John Flood, Representations of Eve, 110-13. Flood insists that the York Eve “is not intended as a sympathetic figure” (111), and that the Expulsion here “ends on a note of pessimistic gender conflict greater than any found in the other cycles” (113).
crucial to his moral recovery. One might argue that she is functioning here as a true wife in the Miltonic sense, providing crucial spiritual guidance, genuine meet help--subtly steering her husband back to the true path.

IV

There remains one additional English craft drama portrayal of Adam and Eve that we have not yet considered. The Norwich Grocers’ Play, presumably the lone remnant of a lost cycle, survives in two significantly varying texts. Since the later of these (termed Text B in Norman Davis’s EETS edition of the Non-Cycle Plays and Fragments) is identified in an original headnote as a revision of the first, and dated 1565, we have an opportunity to compare what are

37 I have not included an extended treatment of the Towneley Creation here because only a fragment of the Adam and Eve episode therein survives. In the roughly 100-line portion relevant to the present discussion, Deus creates man in His likeness and endows him with "witt" and "strenght" (l. 174) to govern paradise. Since "[i]t is not good to be alone" (l. 183), God then forms woman from man's rib ("therfor, a rib I from the[e] take, / therof shall be [made] thi make, / And be to thi helpyng" [ll. 186-188]). The prohibition against eating from the "tre of life" is issued first to both Adam and "eue thi wife" (l. 198-199), but the reiteration of the command and warning of the fatal consequences of transgression given by both God and the Cherubyn are addressed specifically to the man ("Adam, if thou breke my rede, / thou shall dye a dulfull dede [doleful death]" [ll. 202-203]). Once the pair are left alone in paradise, Adam bids Eva stay put while he ventures forth to survey the surrounding trees and flowers (hence, contrary to Miltonic tradition, the man proposes the fatal separation here, although he duly reminds his helpmate of the prohibition before leaving [ll. 234-245]). An envious Lucifer meanwhile conspires with his "felows" in hell to destroy man's bliss (". . . now ar they in paradise; / bot thens [thence] they shall, if we be wise" [ll. 266-267]). At this point George Englund notes in his EETS edition of the Towneley plays: "The MS. has apparently lost 12 leaves here, containing (no doubt) the Temptation of Eve and the Expulsion of her and Adam from Paradise" (9).

38 Davis, Non-Cycle Plays. Quotations from the Norwich Grocers’ Play are based on this edition.

apparently pre- and post-Reformation versions of the same basic play. As we shall see, the differences prove predictable in some instances, surprising in others.

Oddly enough, the ostensibly older, more authentically medieval A Text is distinguished by its deliberate and primary (and relatively uncensorious) focus on Eve. In fact, the introductory headnote terms this “The Story of the Creacion of Eve, with the expellyng of Adam and Eve out of Paradyce.” The play opens with Pater remarking, “Yt ys not semely for man, sine adjutorio [without help], / To be allone, nor very convenient” (ll. 3-4). Immediately God determines (in impressive, ceremonious Creation jargon) to “make an adjutory [helper] of our formacion / To hys [man’s] symylutude, lyke in plasmacion [moulding]” (ll. 7-8); he descends into Eden with his “mynysters angelicall” and performs the task with wonderful efficiency:

A rybbe out of mannys syde I do here take;
Bothe flesche and bone I do thys creatur blysse;
And a woman I fourme, to be his make,
Semblable to man; beholde, here she ys. (ll. 13-16)

The Norwich Adam, in like manner to his Chester cousin, responds first with exuberant thanks and praise to the Lord, then pays a glowing tribute to Eva based on her man-like virtues:

40 It is important to acknowledge that Davis’s edition is not based on an original manuscript or an early printed text of the Norwich Gocers' Play (neither of which has survived), but is rather a collation of the Victorian and Edwardian editions of Robert Fitch (1856) and [?] Waterhouse (1909) respectively. The Fitch and Waterhouse texts were in turn derived from an eighteenth-century transcript (now lost) of the original (non-extant) Grocers' Book. By Waterhouse's account, a dated introductory paragraph indicated that "[t]he Grocers' Book . . . was begun on June 16, 1533." The A Text ("The Story of the Creacion of Eve . . .").which followed this opening statement, was thus in the scholar's estimation "the version of the play in use in 1533" (quoted in Davis, xxiv; the B Text is, as already noted, dated in its headnote). By this process tentative dates of 1533 and 1565 for the A Text and B Text respectively have been established. Davis claims that the first surviving reference to the Norwich cycle dates from 1527 (xxvi), however, and evidence from other cycles suggests that craft play activity in the town probably began much earlier.

41 Davis, Non-Cycle Plays, 8.
[Adam] O my Lorde God, incomprehensyble, withowt mysse,
Ys thy hyghe excellent magnyficens.
Thys creature to me ys nowe ex ossibus meis [now from my bones],
And virago I call hyr in thy presens,
Lyke onto me in natural preemynens.
Laude, honor, and glory to the I make.
Both father and mother man shall for hyr forsake. (ll. 17-23)

In the passage that follows it would appear that God issues the prohibition more directly to Adam, for in parting He bids him “Showe thys to thy spowse nowe bye and bye” (l. 34). Adam then withdraws from Eva, saying he “wyll walk a whyle for . . . recreacion” (l. 50).

Presently, the serpent approaches Eva, addressing her with the flattering apostrophe, "O gemme of felicyté and femynyne love" (l. 55), and asking her, "Why hathe God under precept prohybyte thys frute, / That ye shuld not ete therof to your behofe?" (ll. 56-57). Eva clearly attests to her knowledge of the commandment, so no plea of ignorance can be made for her. Still, the temptation tactics of the serpent are particularly unsportsmanlike here, and Eva's motives in taking the fruit are by no means obviously corrupt. At the climactic moment, the arch-deceiver entreats his victim: "Eate of thys apple at my requeste. / To the[e] Almyghty God dyd me send" (ll. 67-68). In claiming he has been sent by God, Serpens implies that the request to eat is also of divine origin. Hence he poses as a heavenly messenger conveying a divinely-sanctioned reversal of the prohibitive decree. That Eva mistakes the serpent for just such an authentic holy emissary is evident in the account she gives Adam upon his return from his perambulations:

[Adam] I have walkyd abouth for my solace;
My spowse, howe do you? tell me.

[Eva] An angell cam from Godes grace
And gaffè me an apple of thys tre.
Part therof I geffe to the;
Eate therof for thy pleasure,
For thys frute ys Godes own treasure. (ll. 72-78)

The Norwich Eva mistakes Serpens for a good angel; she is clearly deceived. Moreover, her expressed motive in taking the fruit is to please her husband and to gain knowledge (and the power or invulnerability that comes therewith) only in conjunction with him:
Nowe wyll I take therof; and I entend
To please my spowe, therof to fede,
To knowe good and ylle for owr mede.  (ll. 69-71)

The fiend works upon Eva's unfortunate (though comparatively
innocent?) credulity and uses her good intentions against her. She
is naive and weak-minded, perhaps, but not aggressively selfish or
power-hungry as she often is in medieval Fall accounts (e.g., the
Chester Adam and Eve).

Finally, in the brief post-Expulsion lament that follows a
gap in the A Text manuscript, a startlingly vivid image of mutual
suffering is evoked. Husband and wife take turns voicing, not their
respective subjective complaints, but rather their common sorrows.
Both characters maintain the first person plural throughout this
affecting epilogue, and both are allotted an equal number of lines
in a scene that would seem to anticipate the solemn show of marital
solidarity portrayed at the close of Paradise Lost. In the aftermath
of the Fall, as Milton was later to describe it, the displaced Adam
and Eve “hand in hand with wandring steps and slow, / Through
Eden took thir solitarie way” (Book 12, ll. 648-649). Here in the
Norwich Grocers' Play, the couple sing one last “dullfull [doleful]
song” in unison: “Wythe dolorous sorowe, we maye wayle and wepe
/ Both nyght and daye in sory sythys [sighs] full depe” (ll. 89-90).
The stage directions contribute to the poignant effect, indicating that
“thei xall [shall] syng, walkyng together about the place, wryngyng
the[i]r handes.”

Shifting our attention to the B Text, we find two prologues
added (designated B1 and B2 by Davis). These are expressly
designed to serve in the event that "the Grocers Pageant is played
withowte eny other goenge befor yt." In both of these post-
Reformation introductions to the play proper, woman's frailty is
identified implicitly as the primary cause of the Fall and the ultimate
source of Original Sin: the weakness presumably inherent in the
female from the beginning becomes the type of general latter-day
fallen human nature. Thus in the First Prologue (B1) the Prolocutor
informs the audience:

42 Davis, Non-Cycle Plays, 11.
43 Davis, Non-Cycle Plays, 11.
The story sheweth . . . that after man was blyste,
The Lord did create woman owte of a ribbe of man;
Which woman was deceyvyd with the Serpentes darkned myste;
By whose synn owr nature is so weak no good we can. . . .  (ll. 22-25)

Likewise, the Alternative Prologue (B2) promises to treat “of the deavilles temptacion, diseaivinge with a lye / The woman, beinge weakest, that cawsed man to tast[e]” (ll. 15-16).

The actual revised dramatization of the Creation and Fall (B3) varies from the A Text in a host of fascinating ways. The action, as in the earlier version, moves quickly to the formation of Eve, although here God first proclaims Adam dresser of the garden and forbids him access to the Tree of Knowledge. As one might expect from a post-Reformation text, there is notable emphasis on the woman's companionate role. Thus God assures Adam,

I wyll the[e] make an helper, to comfort the[e] allwaye.
And oute of this thy ribbe, that here I do owte take,
A creature for thy help behold I do the[e] make.
... 
... [T]ake hyr unto the[e], and you both be as one
To comfort one th'other when from you I am gone. (ll. 10-16)

The prohibition is repeated after Eve's creation, and at the Father's withdrawal both husband and wife offer thanks and praise in unison. The theme of marriage as (above all) meet and helpful companionship surfaces again in the subsequent exchange. Adam rejoices over Eve, stressing her derivation from (and likeness to) himself. But here (by comparison with the A Text) a greater sense of sexual balance and mutual companionate function is achieved when Eve, not content to play the silent, passive object of praise, returns the tribute:

[Man] Oh bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh eke,
Thow shalte be called Woman, bycaus thow art of me.
Oh gyfte of God most goodlye, that hath us made so lyke,
Most lovyng spowse, I muche do here rejoice of the[e].

[Woman] And I lykewyse, swete lover, do much reioyce of the[e].
God therefore be praised, such comforte have us gyve
That ech of us with other thus pleasantly do lyve.  (ll. 25-31)
One will note the absence of proper names here. In fact, Adam and Eve are simply referred to as the Man and the Woman throughout most of the play. As the exchange above attests, however, the B Text couple compensate for their impersonal name tags with a distinct rhetoric of endearment (not found in Text A). Even as the Adam figure leaves “[t]o walke abowt this garden” (l. 32), he showers his wife with terms of affection, and the Eve character seems as eager to show her fondness for her husband in her manner of address. “Farewell, myn owne swete spouse . . . ,” says the Man; and the Woman answers, “. . . farewell, my dere lover, whom my heart doth conteyn” (ll. 34-35). This language of love persists throughout the first half of the play, and seems even hypocritically pronounced in the advent of Adam's Fall:

[Man] My love, for my solace, I have here walkyd longe.  Howe ys yt nowe with you?  I pray you do declare.

[Woman] Indede, lovely lover, the Heavenly Kyng most stronge  To eate of this apple his angell hath prepare;  Take therof at my hande th'other frutes emonge,  For yt shall make you wyse and even as God to fare.  (ll. 59-64)

As this Temptation of Adam passage confirms, the B Text Woman (like the A Text Eva) is deceived into believing that the Serpent is a good angel (here the subtle villain prepares us beforehand when in a short prelude soliloquy to his “attempt” he declares, “. . . angell of lyght I shew myselfe to be; / With hyr [her] for to dyscemble” [ll. 40-41]). Still, this female victim may strike us as less innocent than her original, for the B Text Serpent does not expressly claim to have been sent by God (even if his angelic appearance may imply as much). Rather, in more traditional and more firmly scripture-based fashion, he challenges God and His prohibition directly: he maintains that the commandment was designed merely to protect God's power, that it was calculated to intimidate and to inhibit those who might otherwise easily attain to His level. The promise of death for transgression the tempter dismisses as a hollow threat. “Ye shall not dye the deth[,]” he insists; “he make [God made] you butt agaste [afraid]” (l. 50). Thus when the Woman later informs
the Man, “Indede, lovely lover, the Heavenly Kyng most stronge / To eate of this apple his angell hath prepare” (ll. 61-62), she appears to be functioning as something more than a passive relayer of the Serpent's lie. It is she who draws the explicit connection between the tempter and God in the interest of persuading the Man to eat. Thus she is active in deceit, subtly augmenting the untruths she inherits from the fiend.

Moreover, the motives of the B Text Woman in accepting the fruit are more clearly flawed than those of the A Text Eva. The intent to please or to benefit her husband is not among her reasons for accepting the Serpent's proposition. Her purposes are more clearly selfish and carnal here. Like other vain, ignorant, and ambitious Eves we have seen (e.g., the Chester and N. Town), the B Text Woman is intoxicated with the prospect of gaining wisdom and power:

[Woman] To be as God indede and in his place to sytt,  
Thereto for to agre my lust conceyve somewhat;  
Besydes the tre[e] is pleasante to gett wysedome and wytt,  
And nothyng is to be comparyd unto that. (ll. 54-57)

Subsequent to the Fall, Adam blames the Woman, justly enough it would seem; and the female's greater burden of guilt is apparently confirmed when the Father turns a censorious eye on the Eve figure and demands, “Thow woman, why hast thou done unto him [i.e., Adam] thy trespace?” (l. 77).

While the theme of companionate marriage is prominent initially as we have seen, the image of shared suffering is not as strongly or deliberately projected in the latter stages of the revised Norwich text as it had been in the prototype. In response to the Expulsion, both the Man and the Woman revert to the subjective mode; both employ the first person singular, although their

44 As in the Chester version, God’s curse on the Woman here also implies her moral inferiority to the Man (evident in her perpetual condition of lust), while it tacitly affirms the subjection of the wife to the husband as a basic principle of the natural and divinely sanctioned social order:

[THE FATHER.] Thou, Woman, bryngyng chyldren with payne shall be dystylde,  
And be subject to thy husbonde; and thy lust shall pertayne  
To hym: I hav determynyd this ever to remayne. (ll. 87-89)
respective individual laments are invariably linked to, even resolve into, expressions of common sorrow (ll. 104-110).

The contrast in tone and emphasis between the A Text and B Text endings, the decreased sense in the latter of marital union amid suffering and of balanced focus on male and female, becomes strikingly evident in the mini-allegory with which the revised version concludes. Here the Eve character seems virtually suppressed. Throughout this morality play-like epilogue of forty-three lines wherein the fallen pair are assailed by figures of Dolor and Mysereye and finally cheered by the Holy Ghost, the Woman remains speechless and inactive, although never quite forgotten. When Dolor and Mysereye enter, they immediately “taketh Man by both armys,” and it is to him specifically that they address themselves:

[Dolor] Cum furth, O Man, take hold of me!  
Through envy hast lost thy heavenly light  
By eatinge; in bondage from hence shall be.  
Now must thou me, Dolor, have allways in sight.  

[Mysereye] And also of me, Mysereye, thou must taste and byte. . . .  
(ll. 111-115)

The focus remains firmly centered on the Man through most of this final scene. It is Adam who voices the general human complaint over life’s pains and sorrows. And it is he to whom the Holy Ghost speaks directly the words of comfort and reassurance that bring release from despair:

[Holy Ghost] Be of good cheare, Man, and sorowe no more.  
This Dolor and Miserie that thou hast taste,  
Is nott in respect, layd up in store,  
To the joyes for the[e] that ever shall last.  (ll. 123-126)

Of course, one could argue that the references to Man in this highly figurative portion of the play are meant to be inclusive of male and female—that they are references to general humanity. Still, a choice has been made to isolate the male figure on stage as the everyman; and even though the choice is made silently, even in the absence of overt sexist commentary, it is a choice that carries
inescapable implications. Why does the Holy Ghost speak directly to Adam? Presumably because the Man is more competent morally and spiritually--more capable of receiving, understanding, and acting upon (being less carnal and emotional in essential nature) the divine counsel to “kylle affectes that by lust in the[e] reygne” (l. 135). In fairness to the author, as noted above, he never allows the Woman to disappear altogether from view. The subsequent rally cry to don the spiritual armor of Christ, for instance, is clearly extended to both male and female:

Theis armors ar preparyd, yf thou wylt turn ageyne,  
To fyght wyth; take to the, and reach Woman the same;  
The brest-plate of rightousnes Saynte Paule wyll the retayne. . . .  
(ll. 137-140)

But again, it is Adam who (while the Woman remains in the wings, consigned to a silence that one suspects the playwright deemed admirable and appropriate) pours forth his praise to “The[e], Most Holye, that hast with me abode, / In mystery premonshynge [advising/admonishing beforehand] by this Thy Holy Spright” (ll. 144-145), and it is he who testifies to his exhilarating sense of release from sin: “Nowe fele I such great conforte, my syns they be unlode / And layde on Chrystes back, which is my joye and light” [ll. 146-147]). Indeed, it is not until the closing five lines that Adam again recognizes the presence of his “swett spous” and some measure of sexual balance returns in the final image of the pair singing together a hymn of praise. In its overall effect, however, the conclusion of the Norwich B Text, with its conspicuous de-emphasis of the Eve role, cannot help but affirm patriarchal notions of the husband as the proper spiritual head and the more appropriate direct recipient of revealed truth.

Our comparison of the A and B Texts of the Norwich Grocers’ Play should alert us to the hazards of generalizing about medieval or early modern, Catholic or Protestant perceptions of women and wedlock. On the one hand, the companionate wife ideal, frequently associated with Protestant marriage theory, finds more convincing and dramatic expression in the A Text epilogue, even if it figures more prominently in the affectionate rhetoric of Text B. The misogynist
content of the post-Reformation B Text, on the other hand, seems at least as pronounced, and in some respects more potent, than that of the earlier version, which, logically, should have been more directly influenced by medieval clerical antifeminism.

And in general our review of the Adam and Eve mystery plays has revealed no single monolithic, prevailing marriage paradigm, but a surprising diversity of images, attitudes, and ideas, some clearly traceable to traditional medieval and patristic sources, others that seem comparatively progressive, and which might almost be termed proto-Protestant. The evidence from these undeniably Catholic plays—especially from the York and Norwich examples—should encourage us to revise persisting reductionist views of Protestant culture as uniquely pro-marriage and Catholic tradition as narrowly antifeminist. In any case, it is clear here that the marriage controversy had invaded the English stage long before the Age of Elizabeth. The predominant tone of the debate at this early juncture is admittedly patriarchal, but there are definite feminist and egalitarian glimmerings. Inevitably, the Fall pageants remind us (subtly, or not so subtly) of the chaos that can come of an ungoverned or "unruly" woman; occasionally (e.g., in York), they might also be seen to prefigure Milton's complex and multidimensional, "accomplisht Eve."  

45 Compare James H. Forse, who finds "clues in the play scripts of the English cycle plays that some notion of marriage as a "companionate" relationship may have existed among the common classes during the Middle Ages" ("Love and Marriage," 228).

46 The term employed by Theresa Coletti in "A Feminist Approach," 81-84. In the course of this essay, Coletti refers to "medieval drama's problematic representation of women, which does not easily break down into positive and negative but is intensely qualified, remarkably diverse, and frequently ambiguous" (81). See also Flood, who reports a similar diversity of representation in his broader (antiquity through late-Middle Ages) survey of Eve characterizations: "the majority of the accounts of her were negative, but . . . negative in significantly different ways. At the same time, the more positive depictions of Eve should not be forgotten" (Representations, 6).

47 Paradise Lost 4.660.
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*The Creation: God Introduces Adam and Eve*

Jean Fouquet: *Antiquités Judaïques* (c. 1470-76)
This paper argues that Christopher Marlowe’s Edward II (1594) questions gender expectations and sexuality. The analysis finds that the same-sex attraction and affective relationship that develops between King Edward and Gaveston can be seen as neither simply sodomy nor exclusively as male friendship. Instead, the emotional bonds and marriage-like relationship between the king and his minion suggest that their identities are, in part, formed by their same-sex attraction.

Much of the criticism on early modern homosexuality identifies a strong difference between “pre-modern” homosexuality and “modern” homosexuality. According to Kenneth Borris, the phrase “pre-modern sexuality” addresses the historical and sociological development of sexual orientations: “pre-modern sexuality” focuses on sexual acts and assumes that any person might fall victim to the complex sin of sodomy while “modern sexuality” includes “same-sex preferences and consequent self-recognition[s which] only became possible . . . through medical and psychological development beginning in the nineteenth or sometimes eighteenth century.”

Modern understandings of homosexuality are based on a shift from the assumption that same-sex attraction is defined by sinful acts to an understanding that same-sex attraction is an aspect of an individual’s identity. Yet such historical categories beg the question: how did we get from one to the other? Where can we see the development of the “modern” in the “pre-modern?”

I argue that in the early modern stories of Edward II (1284-1327; reign 1307-1327), we can see authors attempting to conceive same-sex desire as something more than an act, but not as a pathology.

Borris. Same-Sex Desire in the English Renaissance, 4.
that is, something approaching an identity. Qualifying the works of Alan Bray and Jonathan Goldberg, I propose that the fluid nature of sexuality offers writers various ways to adapt the content to meet his or her own needs as an artist and a social commentator. In this paper I look specifically at ways that Christopher Marlowe’s Edward II (1594) allows readers to see same-sex attraction as more than just an act, moving toward the development of an identity that is, in part, built on the emotional and sexual attractions between men.

The study of pre-modern constructs of sexuality has long held the idea that people of early modern England did not see sexuality as a category used to create one’s identity. Because sexuality, according to Michel Foucault, is always defined within specific social and historical contexts, critics and historians of pre-modern sexuality hold that the heterosexual/homosexual dichotomy as terms used to define an individual’s identity did not exist in early modern England. Sex acts, rather than sexual identity, dominate the way historians and literary critics discuss sexuality in the early modern era. Social constructionists see sexuality as a social construct, not an innate quality within the individual. For instance, Jonathan Goldberg, in Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities, qualifies his argument about sexuality in these terms: “I do not mean to suggest that anyone in the period [Renaissance], or that characters represented in literature, have modern sexual identities.” Alan Bray, in his groundbreaking Homosexuality in Renaissance England, addresses the sexual acts and moral paradigms as he closely examines legal records for cases of sodomy. The conclusion he draws is that these cases were primarily focused on the acts committed, examining the moral failings of the prosecuted.

Instead of analyzing sexuality in terms of an identity category, many scholars focus on how Renaissance texts discuss sexual behavior and sexual acts to define and discuss morality. Kenneth Borris calls critics such as Bray and Goldberg followers of “the acts paradigm” and refers specifically to them as “recent

2  Goldberg, Sodometries, 22.
constructionists” because of the focus on the relatively recent development of the identity category of homosexual. Joseph Cady suggests that the existence of the term “masculine love” outside the criminal and sinful acts of sodomy illustrates the difficulties surrounding a theory based in “new-inventionism,” his term for those who believe that homosexuality is a relatively recent invention, such as Bray and Goldberg. Cady’s “new-inventionism” corresponds with Borris’s term “recent constructionists.”

Despite these thoughtful and persuasive arguments, scholars have offered little insight into when the identity category begins to develop. Alan Bray, in *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*, describes the emergence of the “Molly” in the eighteenth century as one of the first connections between one’s gender presentation and sexuality with an identity category. Yet most ideas, such as identity categories or political concepts, must emerge slowly over time before we recognize them as fully formed ideas. The slow development of ideas can be understood if we turn to Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, who describe such development in terms of layers, or strata, that build up to the point of a discernible meaning or concept. These strata build on one another, often with little distinction between them until the point that a new stratum is clearly visible. In their discussion of signs and signifier, they suggest that signs or words must emerge from the strata or particles that make up meaning. Concepts must be built of particles of understanding before language emerges to describe or name the concept. Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of how ideas coalesce and emerge into language is useful when thinking of the history of sexuality and the use of sexuality as an identity category beyond the acts performed.

3 “New-inventionsim” and “recent constructionists” both refer to homosexuality as an identity marker developing in the nineteenth century.

4 Borris. *Same-Sex Desire in the English Renaissance*, 4-5.


6 Bray describes a “Molly” as a man who, in the privacy of a molly house or club, takes on a feminine identity and participates in same-sex relations.
The emergence of the word “homosexual” can only be coined once the concept of an identity that is formed around same-sex desire has begun to emerge.

Bray and Goldberg have argued that there was no such thing as a homosexual identity in the early modern period. Although the identity category did not exist, some writers who adapted the history of Edward II can be seen as trying to conceive such an identity. They describe same-sex desire in ways that exist outside of the two dominant categories for conceptualizing male relationships at the time – that is either “male friendship” or “sodomy.” The complex emotional connection between Edward and Gaveston do not always fit into either of these categories of same-sex relationships.

I contend that we benefit from looking at how early modern English writers begin layering definitions and identity categories using Edward II’s history. I am not arguing that those who represent Edward as an early modern construct create a definition of homosexuality as an identity category, but I do see his story and the way that writers address the details as layering meaning that ultimately builds toward the modern definition of homosexuality. In order to demonstrate this layering effect, I turn to Marlowe’s 1594 play because it is the best known of the Edward II narratives and, arguably the earliest.

While Marlowe does refer to the traditional definition of sodomy as a sinful act in the play, he also creates moments when same-sex attraction is discussed not as a solitary act, but as a component, good or bad, of a person’s nature. It is then that we can begin to see a glimpse of an identity formed around that same-sex attraction. The depiction of Edward’s relationship with Gaveston is often described as a form of supernatural possession or witchcraft which fits a Renaissance definition of sodomy. But at the same time, we can see that it is not the sex act itself that is being discussed;

7 Bray’s “Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England” discusses sodomy and the friendship as the only ways of understanding same-sex attraction in Renaissance England.
instead the bond, emotional or supernatural, is the focus of much of the writing. The idea that these two men have a bond that mimics heterosexual relationships begins to establish their same-sex attraction as something more than just a casual sex act.

In the first scene of the play, the newly crowned Edward II recalls Gaveston from the exile imposed by Edward I, and by examining the language, we can see how homoerotic qualities and gendered expectations are conflated to describe the affections between the king and his minion. As Gaveston plans his return to Edward’s side, his soliloquy describes a homoerotic masque used to “draw the pliant king which way I please.”

This is the audience’s first clear exposure to the sexual nature of the king’s relationship with other men. Gaveston plans to use an Italian masque to seduce the king. The “lovely boy” dressed as Diana uses “an olive tree/ to hide those parts which men delight to see,”

Goldberg points out that the masque Gaveston describes is not literally presented on the stage, a point he uses to dismiss its sexualized nature, but I would argue that the words Gaveston speaks on the stage create a picture of same-sex desire and transgendered images coming to life in the audience’s mind. Diana is “a lovely boy” and Gaveston uses masculine pronouns to describe his parts and actions: “his naked arms,” “his sportful hands,” and “bathe him” (1.62-65). Gaveston’s speech may present a transgendered boy, but never shies away from the fact that the person being observed by Actaeon is male.

Ultimately, the speech ends with “One like Actaeon” being killed for his transgression of looking at “those parts which men delight to see.”

One could argue that the Greek myth Marlowe uses to produce the image of same-sex desire and illustrate how early modern English culture might destroy that desire, foreshadows

---

8 Marlowe, Edward II, 1.52.
9 Marlowe, Edward II, 1.60, 64-5.
10 Marlowe, Edward II, 1.66.
Edward’s own end. If, at the end of the play, we remember the destruction of Actaeon in Edward’s murder, the link between the deaths may well incorporate same-sex desire and the punishment that that illicit desire earns. I disagree with Goldberg’s idea that the speech must be seen as Gaveston “defining in advance precisely the kind of theatricalization Edward II will not offer, the sexual sphere in which the play does not operate.”[^11] This speech establishes the expectation of sexualized themes and the roles of sex and gender within the larger scope of the play.

Goldberg’s willingness to dismiss the transgressive qualities of this speech because no man “wears dresses” oversimplifies the possibilities for subversive sexualities being demonstrated. Goldberg seems to ignore the fact that in the sixth scene of the play, Mortimer accuses Edward of being a weak king through his reference to fact that “The idle triumphs, masques, lascivious shows,/ And prodigal gifts bestowed on Gaveston/ Have drawn thy treasure dry and made thee weak.”[^12] The masque that Gaveston describes early in the play seems to have taken place within the world of the play, despite the fact that Marlowe does not show it on his own stage. We cannot dismiss the opening speech simply because it was not performed on Marlowe’s stage. Instead, we should see that Gaveston blends gender performance and sexual desire to complicate the understanding of same-sex attraction.

While the sexualized masque may never appear on the stage, the reunion between Edward and Gaveston does, demonstrating not a sexualized relationship, but an emotional one. Instead of Marlowe simplifying this reunion to a question of social status and dismissing the representations of same-sex desire in it, he uses the titles offered to Gaveston upon his return to England as emblems of Edward’s devotion to him, saying “Thy worth, sweet friend, is far above my gifts,/ Therefore, to equal it, receive my heart.”[^13] The intimacy and

emotional bond between the king and his minion is paramount here. We see the emotional depth expressed in the king’s gifts to his returned lover instead of a bewitched king and power-hungry minion. The language of emotion mimics the love of heterosexuality.

As Edward is forced to banish Gaveston in scene four, Marlowe’s language illustrates the emotional bond between the king and his minion. While the banishment, driven by Canterbury and the power of the pope, presents a very clear anti-Catholic sentiment of the power-driven Church controlling the will of an English king, the emotional distress that Edward expresses helps the viewer see the depth of Edward’s love. He loves Gaveston even though “the world hates [him] so.”

Edward’s desire to prevent the banishment focuses on Gaveston’s feelings toward the king; Edward loves Gaveston “Because he loves me more than all the world.”

This line is ambiguous: either Gaveston loves the king more than the whole world loves Edward, or Gaveston loves Edward more than Gaveston loves the world. Either Edward feels unloved by his people or Gaveston has convinced the king that his minion truly loves the king beyond all worldly pleasures. The image of a king unloved by his barons and his people is more in keeping with the play. It seems that Gaveston’s love of earthly pleasures is well established, in his own lines about sharing wealth with Edward and in Edward’s own promises that during Gaveston’s exile, Edward “will send gold enough.”

More importantly, Edward’s language reflects a shared soul, that these two men are one being. Gaveston is banished “from this land, I from myself am banished.” The physical banishment of Gaveston is simple, but for Edward, he sees the loss of Gaveston as a loss of his true self. His understanding of himself is inextricably

linked to his relationship with Gaveston. Gaveston seems to share this view because he does not mourn losing a physical place in his banishment; instead he grieves “to forsake you [Edward], in whose gracious looks/ The blessedness of Gaveston remains,/ For nowhere else seeks he felicity.” Gaveston’s happiness is sought only in the looks from Edward. By being removed from the king’s grace, Gaveston loses his own understanding of himself. While this may reflect a loss in social status for Gaveston, the language of his grief focuses more on Edward’s person. Their happiness exists only with their reunion. When parted, they are “most miserable.” Words become too difficult and they embrace instead of speak.

Once they are truly parted, the language that the king uses to mourn his loss continues to blend the emotional bond with social class. He suggests that he “would freely give [his crown] to [Gaveston’s] enemies” in exchange for Gaveston’s return. His grief causes him to wish he could abdicate his throne and simply be with Gaveston. He even suggests his own death at the hands of “some bloodless Fury” would be better than the pain he experiences at the loss of Gaveston. His own life lacks any value or purpose without his other half. Interestingly enough, Marlowe places Isabel the queen, on the stage, to hear the king’s grief over his minion. In order to retain her marriage, nominally at least, she is forced to convince the barons to allow Gaveston to return. She is rewarded with “A second marriage” to Edward because she is able to secure the repeal of Gaveston’ banishment. Marriage here seems more about social status or a reward than an act of love between two people. The contrast between the mournful love that Edward feels at his loss of Gaveston and the social status of marriage is striking.

17 Marlowe, Edward II, 4.119-121.
18 Marlowe, Edward II, 4.129.
19 Marlowe, Edward II, 4.308.
20 Marlowe, Edward II, 4.315.
As the king’s reunion with Gaveston takes place, once again, each man confesses his love for the other, illustrating an emotional bond. They are both overcome with joy to be reunited; Edward suggests that the sight of Gaveston “Is sweeter far than was thy parting hence/ Bitter and irksome to my sobbing heart.”21 The reunion compensates for the agony of being away from each other. The union between them can overcome the forced exile, as Gaveston points out, as spring makes up for the “biting winter’s rage.”22 Their love for each other outweighs the struggles of the exile, but cannot force the barons to accept Gaveston. Together, within a few lines of the scene, Gaveston and Edward exile the barons from court for their rudeness toward Gaveston. The king allows Gaveston the voice to banish them, saying that he, Edward, would be Gaveston’s “warrant” against the barons. The love they feel toward one another motivates their reaction to restructure the peers of England. Certainly we see class come up here, but I argue that the sentiment that the two men feel toward one another is paramount in motivating them to act against the barons. The “Base, leaden earls” are seen as less socially significant than the reunited king and minion.

When, as Goldberg points out, Edward loses Gaveston, he finds another man (Spencer) instead of returning to his wife.23 If the Renaissance construct of sodomy is, in Foucault’s words, “a temporary aberration”24 that Bray suggests “could break out anywhere,”25 one must wonder why Edward finds love with yet another man. Goldberg writes, “The substitution of man for woman is irreversible.”26 Goldberg, though he does not see the play as creating an identity category centered on same-sex desire, he does

21 Marlowe, Edward II, 6.57-8.
22 Marlowe, Edward II, 6.61.
23 Goldberg, Sodometries, 125.
24 Foucault, History of Sexuality: An Introduction, 43.
26 Goldberg, Sodometries, 125.
see that Edward does not simply end his “temporary aberration” of being attracted to men. How, then, if Edward is permanently attracted to men, is he not, in part, defined as a man who loves men?

While the emotional bond between the two men goes beyond the traditional definition of sodomy, and thereby violates the act theory, Marlowe contrasts the love felt between the king and Gaveston with the king’s tempestuous relationship with his queen. The play specifically places Gaveston on stage as the replacement of Queen Isabella emphasizing that the playwright sees the male lover as competition for the queen’s position. The queen illustrates how her position at court has been subverted when she asks Gaveston, “Is’t not enough that thou corrupts my lord/ And art a bawd to his affections, / But thou must call mine honour thus in question?”27 Here we see the competition between the king’s minion and his queen, which offers the reader an opportunity to question the traditional roles of marriage and love.

Marlowe stages this competition quite literally. Both Isabel and Gaveston suggest that the other is trying to “rob me of my lord”28; Isabel insinuates that Gaveston has stolen the affections of the king from her and taken her rightful place at his side while Gaveston insinuates that his second exile is caused by the queen’s manipulation. We see the two argue about who deserves Edward’s love more, culminating with Isabella referring to Gaveston as Edward’s “Ganymede,”29 a common reference to homoerotic relationships in the Renaissance.30 They argue over which more fully deserves to be at Edward’s side, each seeing the other as a rival for the same position in Edward’s life. Goldberg suggests that the fact that the king may have both a wife and a male lover “makes

27  Marlowe, Edward II, 4.150-2
30  Bray, Homosexuality 13. Bray argues that the classical reference to Zeus’ cup-bearer and male lover would have been a commonplace term in Renaissance England for a sodomite.
those relations separate and supplementary.”

31 If they are indeed separate from each other, why then must these two characters fight constantly for Edward’s affections?

Perhaps we must see the queen’s role as wife as a social role and the role of Gaveston as an emotional one. But if, as Goldberg suggests, the relationships of wife and minion are “supplementary,” the queen and Gaveston fail to see how one supplements the other. They struggle quite publically against one another. They compete for the king’s attention and affections, which indicates that they vie for the same place in his life. Because the king’s own wife sees herself competing with a man for her husband, the text begins to show Edward as somehow defined by his love for Gaveston in a way that Deleuze and Guattari might say will lead to a modern understanding of homosexuality, even if the concept, or a word naming the concept, does not yet exist. Marlowe’s play, as well as other adaptations of Edward’s story, contributes to our understanding and our construction of a modern concept of sexuality.

Isabel sees the flaws in her own marriage when in the fourth scene she wishes she had never married Edward. She imagines her own death, by poison or by strangulation, as better than the eventual loss of her husband’s affections. She wishes she had drunk poison at her marriage so she would not have to admit that her husband cares more about Gaveston than he does for her. Edward forbids Isabel from court until she is able to convince the barons that Gaveston should return to England. Her dismal situation is highlighted when she compares her own tragic situation to Juno who is forced to accept Jove’s relationship with Ganymede. In fact, Isabel’s suffering outweighs that of Juno because “never doted Jove on Ganymede/ So much as he [Edward] on cursed Gaveston.”

32 She is in an impossible situation; she has no role in court until Gaveston is allowed to return, but if he returns, Edward will dote on him and ignore Isabel. Either

31 Goldberg, Sodometries, 125.

32 Marlowe, Edward II, 4. 180-1.
way, she is displaced. Her marriage contract does not guarantee her a place in Edward’s sphere. Instead she must reunite her husband with his lover if she hopes to be allowed to come to court.

As the fourth scene continues, the topic of marriage centers on the concept of love. Isabel tells Mortimer that her husband “confesseth that he loves me not.” In response, Mortimer suggests she “Cry quittance,” relieving herself of any obligation to love Edward. She should stop loving Edward, the insinuation that love and marriage are not directly connected. Mortimer seems to think that she has the option of not loving her husband but does not suggest that the marriage end. Isabel sees marriage and love, on her part at least, as being wholly intertwined: “No, rather will I die a thousand deaths./ And yet I love in vain; he’ll ne’er love me.” Isabel’s emotional bond with Edward does not allow her to separate love from marriage, no matter how much Edward dotes on Gaveston.

The struggle between queen and minion for Edward’s affections is quite clear. She protests constantly when accused of being the lover of Mortimer. As civil war begins, she says in her brief soliloquy that “I love none but you” after Edward accuses her of being Mortimer’s lover for a third time. Her problem is not that she is having an affair with Mortimer, but that she cannot keep her husband from his lover: “From my embracements thus he [Edward] breaks away.” Instead he prefers the “embracements” of Gaveston. When the barons interrupt her soliloquy, she tells them that she is exhausted by the loss of her husband’s affections: “These hands are tired with haling of my lord/ From Gaveston, from wicked Gaveston” She has lost her husband to Gaveston once again, and Edward ignores her attempts to win his affections; instead of listening to her, “He turns away and smiles upon his minion.” His love for Gaveston trumps his social contract with Isabel.

33 Marlowe, Edward II, 4.195.
34 Marlowe, Edward II, 4.196-7.
35 Marlowe, Edward II, 8.16-17.
36 Marlowe, Edward II, 8.27-9.
These examples of how Marlowe complicates the nature of same-sex desire both resist easy categories of sodomy or male friendship. Gaveston’s opening speech illustrates the transgressive nature of his desire for the king, but also refuses to allow the existence of same-sex desire to be hidden in a heteronormative manner. Marlowe further complicates the emotional relationship of Edward and Gaveston by displacing Isabella’s role as queen with Gaveston. Marlowe does not create a simple message about kingly power, sexual desire, or rebellion. The play refuses to present one thesis. Instead we must examine how Marlowe’s portrayal of same-sex desire fits into a complicated social and political world. By seeing same-sex desire as part of the struggle, together with social status and marriage roles, we see that Marlowe presents a play in which same-sex desire can become part of Edward’s identity, even if Marlowe’s language did not possess a word to describe that desire.

Michael John Lee is an associate professor of English at Columbia Basin College in Pasco, WA, where he teaches composition and literature. He earned his PhD in English and the Teaching of English from Idaho State University in 2012. His dissertation, “Adapting Edward II: Eight Representations of Early Modern Sexuality,” argues that same-sex attraction can be seen, in part, as an identity marker in early modern adaptations of the history of Edward II.
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“Nothing but sit, and sit, and eat, and eat”: the Cantankerous Teacher in *The Taming of the Shrew*

**Eric L. De Barros**

*State University of New York at Oswego*

By definition, all comedies must end by praising and/or celebrating the elimination of a serious threat to the patriarchy order, and Shakespeare sets up the final scene of *The Taming of the Shrew*, one of his earliest comedies, to do just that. In short, by the time we reach Lucentio and Bianca’s wedding banquet, Petruccio has effectively tamed Katherine of her shrewishness. However, despite this scene of and cause for celebration, Petruccio remains oddly dissatisfied, as he responds to Lucentio’s encouragement of the sitting, chatting, and eating appropriate to such a festive occasion with these mood-killing words: “Nothing but sit, and sit, and eat, and eat” (5.2.12). Although critics and editors have paid little attention to this oddly dissonant expression, in what follows, I argue that it constitutes an affective echo of both the period’s “confusion,” as Lisa Jardine terms it, about the education of women as well as Petruccio’s attempt to resolve that “confusion” in the direction of the body- and diet-oriented recommendations of Juan Luis Vives: one of the most conservative educational theorists of the period.

In the final act of Shakespeare’s *The Taming of the Shrew*, after the play has reached its denouement, Lucentio announces his and Bianca’s wedding banquet as the perfect way to mark the occasion and, for us, formally end the play:

> At last, though long, our jarring notes agree,  
> And time it is when raging war is done  
> To smile at scapes and perils overblown  
> .............................................................................  
> My banquet is to close our stomachs up  
> After our great good cheer. Pray you sit down,  
> For now we sit to chat as well as eat. (5.2.1-3/9-11)

Generically, this short speech describes how every comedy needs to end. However, Petruccio is not in a cooperative mood, as he responds with a somewhat cryptic jarring note that threatens the

---

1 Quotations from *Shrew* throughout are from the *Norton Shakespeare: Second Edition*. 
banquet as a useful device for the play’s formal demands: “Nothing but sit, and sit, and eat, and eat” (5.2. 12). As if to say that sitting and eating are acceptable because this is how comedies must end, Baptista attempts to explain Paduan customs to his seemingly unwitting Veronese son-in-law: “Padua affords this kindness, son Petruccio” (5.2. 13). Unsatisfied with this brief lesson in cultural and generic literacy, Petruccio once again jars the scene: “Padua affords nothing but what is kind” (5.2. 14).

Critics and editors don not typically spend much time on the question of Petruccio’s moodiness in these lines. If they acknowledge it at all, they usually do so to dismiss it as some sort of temperamental quirk. For instance, in the most recent Arden edition of the play, Barbara Hodgdon surmises that his sit-eat comment might be “a sign that Petruccio is bored by conventional manners (?).”2 Ironically, despite the tenability of her suggestion, which I have specifically begun to think of in terms of genre, Hodgdon’s non-committal parenthetical question-mark also suggests an awareness that something more significant might be going on. As I have suggested, that something poses a generic and interpretive threat that inconveniently folds back on the preceding four acts of the play. That is, by preventing the play from smoothly proceeding to an uncomplicated resolution, Petruccio’s moodiness prompts us to reflect seriously on his problem with Paduan eating, sitting, and kindness.

We might also understand the events that follow his jarring notes as themselves representing precisely that kind of serious reflection. Indeed, without the moodiness of Petruccio’s “Padua affords nothing but what is kind,” there would be no occasion for Hortensio to question the kindness of his Widow and Katherine and no occasion for Petruccio to re-define the scene in terms of a kind of educational competition to determine who has the most obedient wife and therefore who is the most effective and legitimate teacher-

2 Barbara Hodgdon, The Taming of the Shrew, Arden Shakespeare, 292.
husband. In other words, Petruccio’s moodiness triggers a series of events that reminds us that this has been a play about competing educational philosophies—competing theories of shrew taming—centered on the practical implications of sitting, eating, and the choice between kind and decidedly unkind methods of regulating both.

Although, in the specific context of the Elizabethan period, many of Shakespeare’s plays arguably take advantage of the “confusion,” as Lisa Jardine terms it, around women’s learning, what I am arguing is that Petruccio’s moodiness reflects that confusion and his taming method represents an attempt to eliminate it. To appreciate him in these terms, let us begin by taking a closer look at precisely how the period’s most influential educational theorists—the theorists Petruccio is affectively echoing—confronted the issue. First, in a 1523 letter of reply to his eldest daughter, Margaret Roper, after explaining how shocked and incredulous Reginald Pole, who he describes as a virtuous and learned young man, is by the display of Latin mastery in her “most charming” letter, More reflects on what it means for Margaret or any woman to be educated in his society:

Meanwhile, something I once said to you in joke came back to my mind, and I realized how true it was. It was to the effect that you were to be pitied, because the incredulity of men would rob you of the praise you so richly deserved for your laborious vigils, as they would never believe, when they read what you have written, that you had not often availed yourself of another’s help: whereas of all the writers you least deserve to be thus suspected. Even when a tiny child you could never endure to be decked out in another’s finery. But, my sweetest Margaret, you are all the more deserving of praise on this account. Although you cannot hope for an adequate reward for your labor, yet nevertheless you continue to unite to your singular love of virtue the pursuit of literature and art. Content with the profit and pleasure of your conscience, in your modesty you do not seek for the praise of the public, nor value it overmuch even if you receive it, but because of the great love you bear us, you regard us—your husband and myself—as a sufficiently large circle of readers for all that you write.


4 More, Selected Letters, 154.
In your letter you speak of your imminent confinement. We pray most earnestly that all may go happily and successfully with you. May God and our blessed Lady grant you happily and safely to increase your family by a little one like his mother in everything except sex. Yet let it by all means be a girl, if only she will make up for the inferiority of her sex by her zeal to imitate her mother’s virtue and learning. Such a girl I should prefer to three boys. Good-bye, my dearest child. 

In this complex expression of fatherly love, pride, and pity, More represents Margaret not as proof of women’s intellectual equality but an exception to the rule of women’s inferiority. As a reflection of the period’s misogyny, it was difficult, arguably impossible, for him to categorically rethink her mastery of Latin, as it was difficult for Pole and most men of the period to believe his account of it. These difficulties are rooted in the belief that women were thought intellectually inferior because physically inferior. In that regard, it is significant that More concludes this letter by acknowledging Margaret’s pregnancy and imminent labor and delivery, by identifying, in other words, the peculiar material-bodily basis of her intellectual inferiority, before sharing his hope that she has “a little one like his mother in everything except sex” (my italics) or at least a girl who “makes up for the inferiority of her sex.” More’s pity, however, is also and relatedly about the absence of any professional outlet or recognition for the “laborious vigils” that Margaret spent in the advancement of her learning.

Since the rediscovery of the classical tradition and the emergence, in particular, of Ciceronian political thought in Quattrocento Italy, the life of the stoic sage—the vita contemplativa or the vita solitaria—was no longer justifiable. In this new sociopolitically engaged milieu, the point of education, specifically the emphasis on rhetoric in the studia humanitatis, was to prepare boys for public or political service. As we might imagine, the inability to contribute to society in some meaningful way—the inability to do what your education prepared you to do and expect—often resulted in a profound identity crisis for the products of that

5 More, Selected Letters, 155.
system; we need only read More’s own struggle to reconcile his hankering for the monastery with his sense of sociopolitical duty in the book-one dialogue of *Utopia* to get a sense of the extent to which public recognition and service defined educational and professional success. More pitied his daughter because her sex-gender difference effectively barred her from succeeding by these standards. In fact, because women’s public speech was associated with sexual license, any learned woman bold enough to pursue public distinctions had to confront questions about her chastity. More’s particular challenge, as an advocate of women’s education, is to critique his society’s skepticism about women’s educability as well as its association of women’s education with lasciviousness in precisely the misogynistic terms that his society could understand and would possibly accept. To that end, by praising Margaret’s singular love of virtue and her contentment with the profit and pleasure of her conscience, More’s letter engages in what Pierre Bourdieu might describe as a process of a turning that pitiful necessity of Margaret’s limitations into the gender-specific virtue of the contented modesty of a socio-politically detached conscience.⁶

In another letter written to William Gonell, one of his children’s tutors, just a few years earlier in 1518, More seems directly to contradict his society’s view of women’s inferiority, when he asserts that men and women “are equally suited for the knowledge of learning by which reason is cultivated.”⁷ However, elaborating on the agricultural metaphor, he immediately makes a conditional concession that reveals women’s bodies once again qualifying their intellectual equality:

---

⁶ Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, 54. Bourdieu explains, “if a very close correlation is regularly observed between the scientifically constructed objective probabilities (for example, the chances of access to a particular good) and agents’ subjective aspirations (‘motivations’ and ‘needs’), this is not because agents consciously adjust their aspirations to the exact evaluation of their chances of success. . . . In reality, the dispositions durably inculcated by the possibilities and impossibilities, freedoms and necessities, opportunities and prohibitions in the objective conditions . . . generate dispositions objectively compatible these conditions. . . . The most improbable practices are therefore excluded, as unthinkable, by a kind of immediate submission to order that inclines agents to make a virtue of necessity, that is, to refuse what is anyway denied and to will the inevitable.”

But if the soil of a woman be naturally bad, and apter to bear fern than grain, by which saying many keep women from study, I think, on the contrary, that a women’s wit is the more diligently to be cultivated, so that nature’s defect may be redressed by industry.  

Although More’s “if” indicates that he doesn’t share this view of women’s nature and educability, these materializing and therefore masculinizing terms of cultivation—terms, in other words, of a masculinist and largely agricultural society—shift attention away from the basis of More’s initial assessment of cognitive equality to the material realities of embodiment, specifically sex-gender difference. And by materializing women in this way—by identifying their reproductive peculiarity and accepting the metaphorically “bad soil” of their defective bodies—More concedes that women are not equal to men and therefore not fit for the intellectual or public spheres.

But the question remains, what’s the point of educating women in good letters, even if we accept that it’s possible to do so? More’s 1518 letter to Gonell gives us an answer that by now we might expect. This letter is actually a response to one of Gonell’s, which expresses his concern with the way in which More’s educational program was threatening to debase or limit Margaret’s “lofty and exalted character of mind.” More’s defense is that an educational program should aggressively discourage a desire for public approval—which he variously describes as pride, haughtiness, and vainglory—and encourage “most whatever may teach them piety towards God, charity to all, and modesty and Christian humility in themselves.” Of course, these educational goals were not gender specific. John, More’s son, was trained in the same educational philosophy as his sisters, and More’s own refusal to take the Oath of Supremacy—a refusal that led to his removal from public life, his imprisonment, and ultimately his execution—is indisputable evidence that religious integrity was more important than what he

8 More, Selected Letters, 105.
9 More, Selected Letters, 104.
10 More, Selected Letters, 105.
determined was immoral public service. The difference is that he and his son had a choice. For his daughters, learned piety was the only option, and, as I have said, More focuses on that option as a way of turning a misogynistic necessity into a gender-specific virtue.

The paradoxical nature of More’s misogynistic argument illustrates the confusion about the nature and role of women that the early modern humanists inherited from both the classical and biblical traditions. That is, while Aristotelian-inspired misogyny and Christianity traditionally pathologized women as the irrational and immoral weaker vessel, classical mythology and history as well as early modern history are littered with representations of powerful learned women, such as the Muses, Pallas Athena, Minerva, Dido, Cleopatra, Zenobia, Christine de Pizan, Isotta Nogarola, Elisabetta Gonzaga, etc. More’s co-educational home school was an attempt to resolve this mixed message, and it proved persuasive enough to change the mind of the most significant educational theorist of the sixteenth-century: his friend and fellow humanist Desiderius Erasmus. In a 1521 letter to the French humanist Guillaume Budé, Erasmus explains,

Again, scarcely any mortal man was not under the conviction that, for the female sex, education had nothing to offer in the way of either virtue or reputation. Nor was I myself in the old days so completely free of this opinion; but More has quite put that out of my head. For two things in particular are perilous to a girl’s virtue, idleness and improper amusements, against both of these the love of literature is a protection. There is no better way to maintain a spotless reputation than faultless behaviour, and no women’s chastity is more secure than her’s who is chaste by deliberate choice. Not that I disapprove the ideas of those who plan to protect their daughter’s honour by teaching them the domestic arts; but nothing so occupies a girl’s whole heart as the love of reading. And besides this advantage, that the mind is kept from pernicious idleness, this is the way to absorb the highest principles, which can both instruct and inspire the mind in the pursuit of virtue.11

11 More, Selected Letters, 297.
More’s education of virtuous daughters helps Erasmus realize that the love of literature is an effective means of socio-sexual control, because that love—the occupation of a girl’s whole heart in the love of reading—makes the “deliberate choice” of the faultless behavior of chastity more secure than traditional domestic training. As several early modern historians and literary critics have argued, the point of a humanistic education was not simply to produce free individuals as much as free, willing, or consensual male subjects. For Erasmus, what More’s co-educational home school proves is that a humanistic education could do the same thing to and for women. That is, with the right curriculum—one which, as More recommends, excludes or limits rhetoric and history and strongly emphasizes religious figures like St. Jerome and St. Augustine and other ancient authors who promote women’s moral probity and humility—classical learning promised to socialize women to accept their confined roles as domestic partners.

By way of contrast, Sir Thomas Elyot is the only major educational theorist of the sixteenth century to reject this intellectual and political confinement in *The Defence of Good Women* (1540). At the decisive point in the dialogue, Candidus, the dialogue’s defender of women, overwhelms Caninus, the dialogue’s Aristotelian misogynist, with an impressive list of female classical figures intended to demonstrate women’s educational and political ability:

And perdy, many arts and necessary occupations have been invented by Women, as I will bring now some unto your remembrance. Latin letters were firstfounded by Lisostrata, called also Carmentis. The VII liberal arts and poetry by their maidens called the Muses. Why was Minerva honored for a goddess? But because she founded first in Greece, planting or setting trees: also the use of armor: and as some do testify, she invented making of fortresses, and many necessary and notable sciences. Also that the wits of women be not unapt to laudable studies, it appears by Diotima and Aspasia two honest maidens. . . . Hundreds of such women are in stories remembered, but for speed of time I will pass them over, since I trust that these be sufficient to prove, that the whole kind of women be not unapt unto wisdom. . . . As concerning strength and valiant courage, which you surmise to lack in them, I could make to
you no less replication, and by old stories and late experience prove, that in armies women have been found of no little reputation, but I will omit that for this time, for as much as to the more part of wise men it shall not be found much to their commendation: Saving that we now have one example among us, as well as of fortitude as of all other virtues, which in my opinion shall not be inconvenient, to have at this time declared, and so of this matter to make a conclusion.  

Zenobia, the third-century Syrian queen who conquered Egypt and successfully resisted Roman invasion, is the “real-life” embodiment of Candidus’s argument, and his inclusion of her—his inclusion of a virtuous and powerful woman speaking for women—at the end of the dialogue is presented as the coup de grace against Caninus and the other opponents of women’s educational and political equality. However, there is a striking inconsistency between Candidus’s laudatory introductory description and Zenobia’s “actual” embodied presence in the dialogue. Despite proving herself an exceptional ruler and military leader, what brings her to Rome and into the dialogue is her eventual defeat at the hands of the Roman emperor Aurelian. As a prisoner of war pardoned for her “nobility, virtue, and courage,” she paradoxically represents an equality qualified by the military superiority of men.

This qualification is also borne out in the dialogue itself. Zenobia immediately expresses deep anxieties about accepting Candidus’s invitation to dinner because venturing out of her home at night will likely raise questions about her chastity. “For I dread infamy,” she tells Candidus, “more than even I did the loss of my liberty.” After assuring her that “no such thing shall happen” because she is in the company of “no men but of honest condition,” Candidus proceeds to ask the questions intended to illustrate the type of educational program appropriate to women as well as why

12 Elyot, The Defence of Good Vvomen, D5r-D6v.
13 Elyot, The Defence of Good Vvomen, D8r.
14 Elyot, The Defence of Good Vvomen, D8r.
15 Elyot, The Defence of Good Vvomen, E1v.
educated women ultimately make the best rulers. Zenobia’s answers reveal an educational program, much like More’s and Erasmus’s, where women are educated in moral philosophy with an emphasis on prudence, constancy, and obedience to their husbands. As Elyot through Zenobia explains, the specific goal of such a program is to instill within women the ultimate virtue of Temperance:

But in a woman [Zenobia declares,] no virtue is equal to Temperance, whereby in her words and deeds she always uses a just moderation, knowing when time is to speak, when to keep silence, when to be occupied, and when to be merry. And if she measures it to the will of her husband, she does the more wisely: except it may turn them both to loss or dishonesty. Yet then should she seem rather to give him wise counsel, than to appear dishonest and sturdy.16

Constance Jordan argues that, in the second sentence, Zenobia “insists that a wife is exempt from these constraints on her freedom if her husband’s wishes ‘may turn them both to loss and dishonesty.’”17 However, the loose punctuation so typical of early modern prose and the repetition of the vague pronoun “it” makes this a particularly slippery or difficult-to-interpret passage that seems, at least, to raise questions about the simplicity of Jordan’s reading. In other words, while the first “it” seems to refer to a clearly defined understanding of “Temperance,” by the time we reach the second “it,” the effects of the conditional statement and the modifying clause transforms “it” and “Temperance” in an important—although confusing—way. In that regard, it is reasonable to read the second “it” as representing a wife’s temperance wisely measured to her husband’s will and the “except” clause as saying that if she doesn’t do so—if she does not measure it wisely—her unwillingness or inability will hurt them both. Therefore, rather than freeing a wife from her husband’s will, as Jordan would have it, this passage arguably suggests the exact opposite, that is, the responsibility for what he does falls solely on her ability to counsel him wisely.

This enormous responsibility, which, of course, makes Zenobia and all women convenient Eve-like scapegoats, is a consequence of Candidus’s bold inversion of the somatic basis of sex-gender inequality articulated at the beginning of the dialogue. That is, after establishing that rational greatness, not physical strength, is that which distinguishes humanity from other animals, Candidus proceeds to dismantle the Aristotelian correlation between women’s physical weakness and their moral and intellectual inferiority. By this logic, men are less rational than women because they are stronger and therefore more inclined to potentially tyrannical physical force, and women, by virtue of their relative weakness and subsequent reliance on reason factored as “Discretion, Election, and Prudence,” are “more perfect [human beings] than men” with the potential to rule more justly. 18

This reversal represents an interesting feminization of nonviolent humanistic theories of educational and political rule. Indeed, the same gender-specific educational training in moral philosophy that prepared Zenobia to serve her husband— King Odaenathus— as a wise, temperate and, above all, obedient wife prepared her for the rational and nonviolent— that is, the just and effective rule—of her people after his death. During her reign, she explains to Candidus, she “made Justice chief ruler of [her] affections,” which enabled her to enact the kinds of policies that “added much more to [her] empire, not so much by force, as by renown of trust and politic governance.”19 In fact, these policies prove so effective “that diverse of [Palmyra’s] enemies . . . chase rather to leave [the hostility of their own country], and to remain in [Palmyrene] subjection.”20 Humanists like Erasmus and More extended this political transformation to absolute monarchs or princes by charging that war and violent rule are tyrannical, and they implored princes to acknowledge the free will of their subjects and rule them, as God rules all humanity, consensually.

18 Elyot, The Defence of Good Vvomen, D4v.
19 Elyot, The Defence of Good Vvomen, E5v-E5r.
20 Elyot, The Defence of Good Vvomen, E5r.
The Defence is Elyot’s contribution to this ethos. However, it is significant, as I have already noted, that the patriarchal military ethos of Aurelian Roman imperialism wins out in the end. Even more paradoxically, not only does Zenobia’s education prepare her for marriage and nonviolent just rule, it also prepares her for Roman captivity. That is, through her study of “noble philosophy” she “acquired such magnanimity” that once in Rome she is able to “keep in as straight subjection all [her] affections, and passions.”

And if we consider more closely the irenic policies of her rule, it becomes clear that nonviolent self-control ultimately means the acknowledgement of male authority. First, in order to protect “the name of a woman” from the contempt of the people, Zenobia tells us that she “always stayed abroad among [her] nobles and counselors, and said [her] opinion, so that it seemed to them all, that it stood with good reason”; also, she tells us that she often reminded the people of the liberty and honor they received “by the excellent prowess of [her] noble husband showing to them [her] children . . . exhorting them with sundry orations to retain their fidelity.”

In both instances, the legitimation of men—nobles, counselors, and the memory of her late husband—sanctioned her rule by protecting her from charges that she ruled “womanly, “which in these instances is implicitly factored as emotional and irrational.” Therefore, despite Elyot’s efforts to invert the somatic basis of sex-gender inequality, Zenobia’s own political strategies reveal a woman trapped within traditional notions of sex-gender difference, ruling her empire as any woman would have ruled her household. In the final analysis, Elyot’s feminization of nonviolent rule seems, at best, ambivalent and, at worst, ironic.

21 Elyot, The Defence of Good Vvomen, E5r.
22 Elyot, The Defence of Good Vvomen, E4r-E5v
23 Elyot, The Defence of Good Vvomen, E5v.
24 Elyot, The Defence of Good Vvomen, E4r.
While Plato practically disqualifies or, at least, significantly minimizes the importance of the sexed-gendered body in the Republic, no major educational theorist of the sixteenth century was able or willing to go that far. However, their promotion of a Greek and Latin curriculum for women logically points in the direction of a transcendent Platonic equality. Although these educational theorists attempted to have it both ways, that is, to unlock the door to women’s equality only to leave it shut, their complex constructions of educated women are still logically and imaginatively threatening to the early modern patriarchal system. And complexity is always more threatening to a social order than simplicity, no matter how confusing, paradoxical, ambivalent, and/or ironic.

With that in mind, it is my contention that Juan Luis Vives, the Spanish humanist and tutor to the English princess Mary Tudor, attempts to eliminate that complexity and therefore end that confusion with a bodily centered simplicity: what, as I will soon return to, Petruccio identifies as sitting and eating. Like More, Erasmus, and Elyot, Vives cites classical, Biblical, and contemporary examples of learned women throughout his treatise and recommends curricular content intended to ensure chastity and wifely obedience. However, he goes beyond the others in vividly and repeatedly explaining or materializing women’s socio-sexual inferiority in terms of health and physical discipline. Specifically, in The Instruction of a Christen Woman (1524), Vives represents the weak psychosomatic constitution of women as prone to indiscretion and therefore in need of a ascetic dietary regimen. 25 For him, this misogynous myth of inferiority is rooted in the Biblical story of the Fall. And although at one point he stresses the important role that mothers play in the early formative development of children, he goes on to explain women’s unfitness to teach in terms of Eve’s originary indiscretion.

25 Vives, Christen Woman.
But I gyve no licence to a woman to be a teacher, nor to have authorite of the man but to be in silence. For Adam was the first mayde, and after Eve, and Adam was nat betrayed, the woman was betrayed in to the breche of the commandement. Therfore because a woman is a fraile thynge, and of weake discretion, and that maye lightlye be disceyved: whiche thing our first mother Eve sheweth, whom the devyll caught with a light argument. Therfore a woman shulde nat teache, leste whan she hath taken a false opinion and beleve of any thing, she spred hit into the herars, by the autorite of maistershyp, and lightly bringe other into the same errour, for the lerners commenly do after the teacher with good wyll.26

A proper or improper diet is what ultimately distinguishes the pre- from the post-lapsarian mind/body nexus, and Satan “betrays,” as Vives terms it, Eve instead of Adam—women instead of men—because he identified in her the kind of weakness that “a light argument” might persuade to abandon the nourishing or fortifying innocence of the Edenic diet for the sinful and therefore lust provoking fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Furthermore, women’s cognitive inferiority factored as a lack of discretion is ultimately rooted in a gender-specific defect of the stomach:

For the man is nat so yrefull as the woman. And that is nat in mankynde onyle, but also in all kyndes of beastis, as Aristotle saythe. For males, bycause they have more bolde stomackes, and are more lusty of corage, therfore be they simple and lesse noysome, for they have the more noble myndes. And females contrary be more malicious, and more set to do harme. Wherfore the woman wylbe takyn with light suspicions, and ofte complayne and vex their husbands, and anger them with pervyshe pueling: but the man is easier to reconcile than the woman. Lykewise, as of men he, who is most stomacked unto a woman, nor lusty coraged, wyl remembre injury longest, and seke for vengeance the most violently, nor can be content with a mean revengeance.27

Referencing Aristotle’s somatic theory of women’s inferiority, this passage importantly illustrates the extent to which the stomach and implicitly digestion are as sexed and gendered as any other

27 Vives, Christen Woman, 110.
part and function of the body. In this instance, Vives represents the stomach as the determinative site of socio-sexual control, and men are ultimately “simple and less noysome”—that is, more controlled—not because they function within a society designed for the perpetuation of their own authority, but because they have “more bolde stomackes,” which also means they are “more lusty of corage” and “have the more noble myndes.”

In chapter eight of book one, which is entitled “Of the ordrying of the body in a virgin,” Vives again references Eve’s dietary indiscretion in the process of imploring parents to regulate their daughters’ diet: “And they ought to remembre that our first mother for meate [that is, food] was caste out of paradise. And many yonge women that had been used to delicate meates . . . have gone forth from home and jeoperded theyr honestie” (34-35). Indeed, the wrong diet, as Vives goes on to explain, results in the kind of irrational and materialistic behavior that renders women unable to maintain their chastity. In Vives’s estimation, these undisciplined women conduct themselves like animals—female wolves to be exact—who end up choosing men who are no better than animals themselves. “Oh folysshe mayde” he castigates these women, “whiche haddest leaver have contynuall sorrowe in golde and sylke, than have pleasure in wollen cloth: whiche had leaver be hated and beaten in rayment of purple and ryche color, than be loved and set by in a course garmet

28 This gendering of the stomach and digestion complicates the downplaying of gender in Schoenfeldt, Bodies and Selves. Even in Schoenfeldt’s otherwise instructive reading of eating as a physiological and ethical phenomenon in Paradise Lost, the sociopolitical significance of sex-gender difference—the difference between Eve’s eating and Adam’s eating—is, for the most part, only cursorily registered.

29 In terms of the female-wolf analogy, Vives states, “Wherfore it was well and aptlye spoken, that a countrey man of myne sayd, that the nature of women was in chosynge men, lyke unto the female wolves: Whiche amonge a great sorte of males, take the fouleste and worste favoured” (78). In terms of the male-animal analogy, he states, “And in tyme passed I thought it had bene a fable, that men tell, howe Pasyphae the queen of Candy, dyd lye with a bulle . . . but nowe me thinke theym all lykelye mough to be true, when I se women can fynde in theyr harters, to tomble and lye with vicious and sylthy men, and dronkerdes, and brawlers, and dawyshe, and brayneles, cruell and murderars. For what dif-
In this powerful expression of Christian anti-materialism, the abdominal and dietary weaknesses of undisciplined women distort their intellectual and sensory perceptions to the point that the feeling and sight of expensive materials—gold, silk, purple, and other rich colors—anesthetizes them to their unhappy lives with abusive husbands. Because women are essentially incapable of controlling themselves, Vives implores parents to regulate their daughters’ diets, as I have already illustrated, and, as importantly, to limit their public exposure:

Wher to shulde I tell how much occasion of vyce and noughtynes is abrode? Wherfore the poet seemeth to have sayd nat without cause: It is nat lauful for maydes to be sene abrode. Howe moche were hit better to abyde at home, than go forth and here so many judgementes, and so dyvers upon the, and so many jeopardies? 

But when it is absolutely necessary for a maiden to leave home—for example, to attend Mass—Vives charges that “afore she go forth at dore, let her prepare her mynde and stomake none other wyse, than if she went to fyght” and that she should be “well covered, leste [she] either gyve or take occasion of suavyng. A Christen mayde ought to have nothing a do with weddynge feastis, bankettes, and resortynges of men.” In this restrictive view of women’s place in early modern society, there is, of course, little need for anything in the way of formal humanistic learning, especially rhetoric. Indeed, the only books Vives recommends are those that “may teche good maners.” Unlike a man, who should “have knowlege of many and diverse things that may both profet hym selfe and the common welle,” a woman, in Vives’s estimation, “is a fraile thynge, and of weak discretion” that must avoid the public sphere and spend her

30 Vives, Christen Woman, 78. We find a comparable anti-materialistic strain of thought in Vives’s major educational treatise for boys entitled De Tradendis Disciplinis (1531). See Vives: On Education; a Translation of the De Tradendis.
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virtually confined existence engaged in “the study of wysedome . . .
whiche dothe enstruct [her] maners, and enfurme [her] lyvyng, and
teacheth [her] the waye of a good and holy lyfe.”

Written and performed at about the same time that the last edition of Vives’s Christen Woman was published, The Shrew opens by immediately establishing the bodily centered simplicity of a Vivesian critique. After Lucentio, a typical well-to-do young man, announces his intentions to pursue “[a] course of learning and ingenious studies” (1.1. 9), he commands Tranio, his servant, to evaluate his plans:

And therefore, Tranio, for the time I study,
Virtue and that part of philosophy
Will I apply that treats of happiness
By virtue specially to be achieved.
Tell me thy mind, for I have Pisa left
And am to Padua come as he that leaves
A shallow plash to plunge him into the deep,
And with satiety seeks to quench his thirst. (1.1. 17-24)

Of course, Lucentio’s scholarly enthusiasm represents the passion for learning that humanists themselves exemplified and attempted to spread. But his decision to analogize it to potentially excessive or gluttonous drinking also suggests a youthful disregard or ignorance of the fact that, with the proliferation of available ancient texts, there is a point at which learning, like eating and drinking, becomes dangerous or unhealthy to both the mind and the body. In other words, by recklessly diving into the deep pool of Paduan learning without the direction of a wise and mature tutor as well as a manageable course of study structured by an academic timetable, there is a good chance that he will be overwhelmed— that he will drown. That he looks to Tranio for educational advice only highlights the extent of his lack of guidance, for Tranio’s recommendation makes learning a vehicle of pleasure rather than an instrument of self-control:

36 Vives, Christen Woman, 22-23.
37 For informative discussions of the humanist response to that proliferation, see Dohrn-Van Rossum, History of the Hour, 252-260, and Bushnell, A Culture of Teaching, 17-143.
Mi perdonate, gentle master mine.
I am in all affected as yourself,
Glad that you thus continue your resolve
To suck the sweets of sweet philosophy.
Only, good master, while we do admire
This virtue and this moral discipline,
Let’s be no stoics nor no stocks, I pray,
Or so devote to Aristotle’s checks
As Ovid be an outcast quite abjured.
Balk logic with acquaintance that you have,
And practise rhetoric in your common talk.
Music and poesy use to quicken you;
The mathematics and the metaphysics,
Fall to them as you find your stomach serves you
No profit grows where is no pleasure ta’en.
In brief, sir, study what you most affect. (1.1. 25-40)

In his critique of Aristotelian moderation and his advocacy of Ovidian eroticism, Tranio ensures the play’s festive tone and comic trajectory: that the play will not be concerned with the boring matter of bodily self-discipline but the erotic or Ovidian challenges to it. To that end, he picks up on Lucentio’s dietary metaphor, agreeing that his master should be resolved “to suck the sweets of sweet philosophy,” in the process of encouraging him to allow his “stomach,” that is, his appetite or his youthful desires, to guide his Paduan course of study. In this way, as Lynn Enterline argues in her recent study of early modern education, Shakespeare employs Ovidian eroticism “[to mock] school habits” and “bring into question the humanist claim that the Latin curriculum and methods of discipline would produce recognizable ‘gentlemen’ for the good of the commonwealth.” Tranio certainly serves this mocking questioning function. However, he is just one part of the story. That is, the tension between discipline and eroticism remains throughout the play, and Shakespeare, as I argue, employs Vivesian misogyny (which we might understand as a gender-specific version of Aristotelian self-discipline) to reconstitute ‘gentlemen’ or, as I have termed them, traditional knight-warriors for nonviolent service in domestic and political affairs.

38 Enterline, Shakespeare’s Schoolroom, 99.
39 Enterline, Shakespeare’s Schoolroom, 118.
In that sense, Lucentio’s openness to Tranio’s pedagogical philosophy creates the conditions for the parental nightmare of sexually promiscuous children that humanistic educational theorists variously described. Therefore, it is not surprising that before Lucentio has a chance to enter a classroom at the University of Padua or at least hire a tutor, the sight of Bianca on the streets of Padua triggers a potentially dangerous case of lovesickness:

O Tranio, till I found it to be true
I never thought it possible or likely
But see, while idly I stood looking on
I found the effects of love in idleness,
And now in plainness do confess to thee,
That art to me as secret and as dear
As Anna to the Queen of Carthage was,
Tranio, I burn, I pine, I perish, Tranio,
If I achieve not this young modest girl.
Counsel me, Tranio, for I know thou wilt. (1.1. 142-152)

As Robert Burton, a seventeenth-century scholar, tells us, “[Lovesickness] rageth with all sorts and conditions of men, yet it is most evident among such as are young and lusty, in the flower of their years, nobly descended, high fed, such as live idly and at ease.”40 This clearly applies to Lucentio, as he enters into a confused identification with Dido instead Aeneas only to be followed by an even more disturbing identification with a raping Jove. Indeed, it appears that Tranio’s role in his educational planning, which suggests the problematic centrality of Ovid in the grammar school curriculum, has taken its toll, for he ends up identifying with both “the love in idleness” of Dido’s suicidal effeminacy and the out-of-control sexual desire of Jove.41 Setting the stage, as it were, with these illegitimate socio-sexual alternatives, it is as if Shakespeare is

40 Burton, The Anatomy of Melancholy, The Third Partition, Section 2, 56. Also for a suggestive reading of lovesickness in Shakespeare’s Twelfth Night and As You Like It, see Neely, Distracted Subjects, 99-135.

41 See Phillippy, “‘Loitering in Love,’” 27-43. Phillippy usefully argues that what explains Lucentio’s gender reversal is that Shakespeare, following George Turberville’s English translation of Ovid’s Heroides, rejects traditional gender roles and the privileging of the military concerns over domestic or amorous one.
subtly critiquing the Ovidian-based education of the early modern curriculum and questioning whether men can remain in and in control of the potentially effeminating, comically-oriented sphere of the home without jeopardizing their manhood.

Typical of comedy, this problem centers on the failure of two fathers to manage their children’s sexuality. In fact, as I have already referenced, it is Baptista’s public display of his daughters as commodities on the Paduan marriage market that triggers Lucentio’s lovesickness and subsequent play of identities to begin with. In terms of the educational theorists we have considered, what is fundamentally wrong with Baptista is that he defines his love for his daughters in terms of the satisfaction of their intellectual pleasure instead of a responsibility to instill within them socio-sexual discipline.

After Bianca apparently begins to cry in response to Baptista’s decision to “mew her up” (1.1. 88), as Gremio describes it, Baptista continues with a promise of compensatory love: “And let it not displease thee, good Bianca,/For I will love thee ne’er the less my girl” (1.1. 76-77). Significantly, this guilty promise reveals that for Baptista love has been defined by allowing his daughters the relative freedom of public exposure that his betrothal scheme now forces him to restrict. And although Bianca’s crying reflects just how spoiled that freedom has made her (“a pretty peat!” [1.1. 78], as Katherine mocks), she allays Baptista’s guilt by assuring him that her books and instruments will keep her company and thereby take the place of her freedom: “My books and instruments shall be my company,/On them to look and practice by myself” (1.1. 82-83; my italics). While I will return to the interpretive as well as sociopolitical implications of her revelation of independent study, for now it is sufficient to note that learning emergences as an alternative way for Baptista to express his love, which allows him to more confidently reiterate his decision to confine her:
Gentlemen, content ye. I am resolved.
Go in, Bianca.
And for I know she taketh most delight
In music, instruments, and poetry,
Schoolmasters will I keep within my house
Fit to instruct her youth. If you, Hortensio,
Or, Signor Gremio, you know any such,
Prefer them hither; for to cunning men
I will be very kind, and liberal
To mine own children in good bringing up.
And so farewell, Katherina, you may stay,
For I have more to commune with Bianca. (1.1. 90-101)

Like the domesticated piety recommended by Elyot, More, and Erasmus, confined learning or studying potentially represents a practical solution to Baptista’s and, more generally, Paduan corruption in that it is a solitary activity that removes women from public view and therefore out of what Katherine initially characterizes as a state of virtual prostitution. However, as we have already seen with Tranio, Baptista’s corrupt ethos of freedom, pleasure, and profit reduces confined learning to nothing more than a stunt ultimately intended to increase his daughters’ marriage-market value.

This nescience about the power of learning and specifically its shrew-making potential pervades the Paduan play world. While all the suitors—Hortensio, Gremio, and Lucentio—devise impersonation schemes that employ the cover of learning, learning, as superficially and materially represented by academic commodities like clothing, musical instruments, fairly bound books, and perfumed paper, functions for them as little more than materialistic cover, as little more than deceptive and simplistic props or tools of amorous and economic motives. What Baptista and the others seem wholly unaware of is that books, no matter how superficially handled, contain potentially corrupting and destructive ideological content available to anyone rebelliously autodidactic enough to open them. Books, in other words, are potentially volatile erotic objects, and educational theorists attempted to defuse, as it were, their explosiveness by either morally framing them or banning the most offensive ones.
altogether. Vives, for instance, criticizes schoolmasters for teaching their scholars “Ovidis bokes of love”; and, in the specific case of women, concludes,

Therfore a woman shuld beware of all these bokes, likewise as of serpents or snakes. And if there be any woman, that hath suche delyte in these bokes, that she wyl nat leave them out of her handes: she shuld nat only be kept from them, but also, if she rede good bokes with an yll wyl and lothe therto, her father and frendes shuld provyde that she maye be kepfe from all redynge. And so by disuse, forrette lernynge, if it can be done.42

This caveat is a far cry from what we have seen so far in The Shrew, for, if Katherine and Bianca are any indication, women are free to read whatever they desire in a corrupt university town with all kinds of potentially explosive books available in great supply.

Despite that, it doesn’t appear that Katherine and Bianca have been reading or desire to read the offending classical books of love that Vives primarily has in mind. Or if they have been, they haven’t been doing so in the corrupting way that Vives fears. If anything, what makes the women threatening to the patriarchal establishment is that their likely reading choices and practices, reflected in Katherine’s violent shrewishness and Bianca’s delight in solitary and independent study, almost turns them so completely against romantic love and eroticism that it almost turns them completely against marriage.

While the association of shrewishness with lasciviousness was a commonplace one in the Renaissance, by denying it in this way, Shakespeare suggests that the dangers of improper learning extend far beyond the problem of controlling women’s erotic desire. Focusing on the act-three scene of Bianca’s instruction, several literary critics have variously commented on precisely what Shakespeare is saying about those dangers. For instance, Kim Walker suggests that “the play reproduces the anxieties attendant on the education of women that are visible in pedagogical treatises
and conduct books of the sixteenth century" and specifically argues that “[Bianca’s] Latin lesson becomes a sight/site of female duplicity”; Thomas Moisan, paying particular attention to what he assumes is Lucentio’s selection of Penelope’s letter to Ulysses from Ovid’s *Heroides*, suggests that “the use of a Latin lesson as camouflage for Lucentio’s pursuit of Bianca” represents, as I have already similarly suggested, a commodifying domestication of learning that “epitomizes the uses, or misuses, to which education and formal ‘learning’ are put throughout the play”; and Patricia Phillippy also similarly argues that by dramatizing Lucentio’s use of the *Heroides* as a tool to court Bianca, “Shakespeare presents the *Heroides* not as a source of moral exempla, but of pleasure, and goes on to cast humanist education itself—or more specifically, its all-too-easy manipulation—as a dangerous and seductive interloper in the household.”

While I generally agree with these assessments, specifically the suggestion that Bianca’s act-three assertiveness anticipates her act-five shrewishness, my concern is that they underestimate the extent of her control during the scene of instruction by either implicitly or explicitly assuming the passage from the *Heroides* is Lucentio’s selection. That is, if the goal of all the suitors is to open Bianca up to their amorous designs, then it does not make sense that Gremio would have included the *Heroides*—a book Erasmus and Vives thought “more chaste” than Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and *Art of Love*—in his packet of lavishly bound “books of love” or, even if he did, that Lucentio would have selected an excerpt from Penelope’s epistle—which Erasmus further classifies as “wholly chaste”—for Bianca’s language lesson. It does not make sense,

43 Walker, Wrangling Pedantry,” 192.
44 Walker, Wrangling Pedantry,” 199.
45 Moisan, “Interlinear Trysting and ‘Household Stuff,’” 104.
46 Phillippy, “‘Loytering in Love,’” 42.
47 Quoted in Moisan 111.
48 Quoted in Moisan 111.
in other words, for Lucentio to select a passage taken from a letter that emphasizes both a woman’s faithful chastity as well as what the Elizabethans would have recognized as a petulant or shrewish rhetorical sophistication.

What does make sense is the possibility, if not likelihood, that the *Heroides* is one of the books she presumably owned before her formal instruction, that is, one of the books she references in act one, where she expresses the desire (to continue) to study independently. What I’m suggesting here is that independent study and shrewishness are linked, and that Baptista’s irresponsibly lazy philosophy of liberal education is dangerous mainly because it allows his daughters to independently explore and discover classical models of rhetorical agency contained in books like Ovid’s *Heroides*. In that regard, nothing is surprising about Bianca’s declaration of scholarly independence during the act-three scene of instruction. The scene begins with the two counterfeit tutors quarreling over whether lessons in music or Latin should come first, when Bianca intervenes to explain that she is actually in charge:

Why, gentlemen, you do me double wrong
To strive for that which is my choice.
*I am no breeching scholar in the schools.*
*I’ll not be tied to hours nor ‘pointed times,*
But learn my lessons as I please myself. (3.1. 16-20; my italics)

Several literary critics have also pointed out that a potentially demystifying or deconstructive bit of dramatic irony characterizes her declaration, for, after all, she, as all female characters on the early modern stage, was played by a boy. In this way, although *The Shrew* explicitly explores the implications of women’s learning,

49 That is, as Moisan explains, in this and other instances, *Shrew* “calls attention to its own theatricality . . . [ultimately making] it more difficult for its audience to differentiate the female character Bianca from the boy actor and theatrical apprentice playing her, and, thus, a more complex matter to accept unblinkingly Bianca’s assertion that she is ‘no breeching scholar’” (108). Also, building on the oft-cited feminist argument of Karen Newman, *Fashioning Femininity*, 33-50, Walker rhetorically asks “who is speaking here [when Bianca declares her independence]?” (198) and then concludes it “may be read as a voice that exposes the shrewish woman as cultural construct” (198) as well as a “voice that reaffirms the incipient shrew by doubling it with the boy actor’s resistance to ‘proper’ adult male authority” (198).
and specifically the unauthorized and therefore dangerous speech it enables, its representation of male domestication (in the home, the school, and the theater) and specifically the “de-breeching” effeminization of grammar school boys also obliquely addresses the period’s anxieties about the education of boys and their later, adult socio-sexual performative as men.

With the bureaucratic complexities that came along with the consolidation of power in monarchical courts and the advances in military technology that rendered the martial skills of the individual knight-warrior obsolete, sixteenth-century monarchs faced the difficult task of persuading aristocratic men that their survival as a ruling class depended on bureaucratically serving the state with weapons of learning instead of violently serving themselves with weapons of war. As Norbert Elias famously illustrates in *The Civilizing Process*, early modern educational theorists played a central role in advancing this class and gender re-definition. In fact, educational theorists variously attempted to persuade aristocrats of the manliness of learning in treatises that subtly but recurrently draw on the classical association of rhetoric with physical exercise and combat. In that regard, for as much as *The Shrew* is about addressing the education of women, it is also significantly about re-educating men in a nonviolent direction.

As I suggested at the outset, Shakespeare presents Petruccio and his taming of Katherine as the solution to these challenges. From the initial act-one miscommunication with Grumio that ends with him wringing Grumio’s ear to his act-four verbal and physical abuse of his servants in the seclusion of his country house, Petruccio displays a propensity for violence that highlights just how unmanly the other male characters are and how effeminating Padua’s urban-
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educational milieu is. As the play-logic would have it, what he brings to that world is the corrective energy of an aristocratic, military ethos necessary to keep women in their silent and subordinate place. For instance, when Gremio questions whether Petruchio has “a stomach” (1.2. 189) to woo a shrewish “wildcat” (1.2. 191) like Katherine, Petruchio assures him that he does in a series of rhetorical questions:

Why came I hither but to that intent?
Think you but a little din can daunt mine ears?
Have I not in my time heard lions roar?
Have I not heard the sea, puffed with winds,
Rage like an angry boar chafèd with sweat?
Have I not heard great ordnance in the field,
And heaven’s artillery thunder in the skies?
Have I not in a pitched battle heard
Loud ‘larums, neighing steeds, and trumpets’ clang?
And do you tell me of a woman’s tongue,
That gives not half so great a blow to hear
As will a chestnut in a farmer’s fire?
Tush, tush—fear boys with bugs. (1.2. 193-205)

These are certainly not the sounds of the Paduan street, home, or schoolroom, but Petruchio’s suggestion is that his exposure to them—his exposure to the sounds of the hunt, the sea, and the battlefield and the violent masculinizing training that they metonymically represent—has actually prepared him to tame the shrewish Katherine. On the other hand, the Paduan men’s fear of Katherine’s shrewishness suggests a lack of comparable training that effectively renders them no better than cowardly superstitious boys afraid of the relatively soft sound of a shrewish woman’s voice, which Petruchio comparatively describes as not even half as loud as a chestnut popping in a farmer’s fire.

Petruchio’s function, however, is not simply to bring the violence of the hunt, the sea, or the battlefield to Paduan society; it is to demonstrate that his military prowess and male bravado can be channeled or translated to meet the emerging nonviolent needs of early modern society, specifically as represented by the decidedly
more delicate domestic matters of women’s taming and marital negotiations. However, as the acts of violence that we have already considered as well as the one instance where Petruccio threatens to “cuff” (2.1. 216) Katherine illustrate, The Taming does not represent this civilizing process as an uncomplicated, easy, or automatic one. That is, despite Petruccio distinctive braggadocio, such as warning Baptista that he is “rough . . . and woo not like a babe” (2.1. 135), the Paduan milieu significantly imposes the kind of disciplinary handicap that presumably produces shrewish women and makes controlling or correcting one as shrewish as Katherine nearly impossible or, as Gremio characterizes it, Herculean: “Yea, leave that labour to great Hercules,” Gremio sarcastically responds to Petruccio’s insistent and ostensibly foolish desire to woo Katherine, “And let it be more than Alcides’ twelve” (1.2. 253-254). While an expression of doubt predictably and even understandably uttered by an old and impotent man, its association of an impossible domestic task with Hercules’s mythic feats of ultra-masculinity also ironically represents precisely the kind of figurative-imaginative thinking that enables Petruccio to redefine traditional male aggression.

What in large part makes Petruccio’s domestication of manhood a persuasive alternative to the physical violence of the hunt and the battlefield is that it allows him the performative expression and satisfaction of symbolic violence through his rhetorical domination of Katherine. As Grumio bluntly assures Hortensio,

I pray you, sir, let him go while the humour lasts. O’ My word, an she knew him as well as I do she would think scolding would do little good upon him. She may perhaps call him half a score knaves or so. Why, that’s nothing; an he begin once he’ll rail in his rope-tricks. I’ll tell you what, sir, an she stand him but a little he will throw a figure in her face and so disfigure her with it that she shall have no more eyes to see withal than a cat. You know him not, sir. (1.2. 108-110; my italics)

Despite the failed communication between master and servant that initially reveals Petruccio’s problematic propensity for physical violence, what Grumio reveals about his master—what he knows
more intimately and violently than Hortensio—is that he is a warrior-scholar with a figuratively dangerous and disfiguring tongue to match his literally dangerous and disfiguring hands. That is, by analogizing Petruccio’s rhetorical skill to aggressive and violent physical action, he, like humanistic educational theorists, materializes and masculinizes learning in a way that presents it as a legitimate alternative to traditional aristocratic violence. In his first example, as we have also seen in educational treatises, he likens Petruccio’s likely future verbal assault on Katherine to a physical exercise, specifically a mastery of rope climbing. And in the second instance, he plays on the word “figure,” which means “external form” or “to bring into shape” (OED), to describe the way in which Petruccio will so violently throw, bring into shape, or materialize a blinding figure of speech in Katherine’s face.

These figurative and performative materializations represent tenuous sublimations of traditional male aggression that retain the potential to spill over into real violence. Significantly, Grumio’s excessive descriptive violence draws attention to the substitute nature of that sublimation and thereby threatens to trigger the realization of that potential. In a sense, Grumio is not just a victim of Petruccio’s propensity for violence; he, as his analogy illustrates, also represents it. For instance, before Petruccio catalogues his man-making experiences, Grumio’s interjection takes his master’s examples to their literal conclusion: “Will he woo her? Ay, or I’ll hang her” (1.2. 193). This homicidal expression highlights the extent to which Grumio is like the id that Petruccio must repress.

That repression centrally involves Petruccio selecting a metaphor for Katherine’s taming more consistent than Grumio’s unstable disfiguring one with Paduan nonviolence and humanistic educational theory. And the one that he selects—the one that allows him to retain the masculinizing energy of the hunt and the battlefield without the attendant violence—is that of falcon taming. As Edward Berry argues, [t]o respond adequately to this play, we must come to terms with [falcon taming] as its central metaphor”
and only then, he continues, might we be able “to discover . . . a
way of ‘saving the play from its own [disturbing misogynistic]
ending’ without either evading or romanticizing its main action,
that of ‘taming’ a woman.” Indeed, over the years, this evasive
and romanticizing commitment has characterized many readings of
the play. And although Berry acknowledges as much, by retaining
the role of interpretive savior, he also ends up suggesting a reading
that similarly simplifies or evades the play’s complexities. That is,
developing Coppélia Kahn’s argument that Petruccio represents “a
caricature of male violence and male dominance, and the taming
action a farce,” Berry concludes that Petruccio amounts to no more
than “a source of satiric laughter.”

Perhaps because I do not think The Taming is in need of
salvation, that is, as long as our understanding of Shakespeare is
honest, mature, and encompassing enough to include potentially
disturbing non-celebratory readings, I see Petruccio’s falcon taming
metaphor as much more than a source of satiric laughter or even, as
Berry also more cynically suggests, one that “is insidious precisely
because” it is nonviolent and therefore ostensibly more humane than
typical shrew-taming stories. But, as I have already suggested, if we
think of Petruchio as a warrior-scholar converted by the nonviolent
ethos of humanistic educational theory, it becomes clear that the falcon
taming metaphor represents a response to the civilizing process and
the resultant crisis of masculinity that threatened to render violently
oriented aristocratic men sociopolitically insignificant and therefore
the subjects of the potential farcical satiric laughter that Berry
identifies. In other words, accepting the general plausibility of the
Kahn-Berry satiric laughter suggestion, the falcon taming metaphor
represents a response to that laughter, not one of its triggers.

52 Berry, Shakespeare and the Hunt, 97 (my italics). Berry takes the “saving the play”
quotation from the seminal essay of Lynda Boose, “Scolding Brides and Bridling Scolds,
239-279. My commitment to a serious reading of the play is much indebted to this essay.
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With that in mind, we are in a position to consider Petruccio’s most extensive articulation of the metaphor. At the end of act 4 scene 1, after Petruccio’s has subjected Katherine to a series of ostensibly foolish and mad tactics (the verbal jousting that I have already briefly referenced [2.1.], his embarrassing conduct before, during, and after the wedding [3.2], and denying her sleep and food while sequestering her away in his tyrannically managed country home [4.1.]), he explains his conduct in a soliloquy:

Thus have I politicly begun my reign,
And ‘tis my hope to end successfully.
My falcon now is sharp and passing empty,
And till she stoop she must not be full-gorged,
For then she never looks upon her lure.
Another way I have to man my haggard,
To make her come and know her keeper’s call—
That is, to watch her as we watch these kites
That bate and beat, and will not be obedient.
She ate no meat today, nor none shall eat.
Last night she slept not, nor tonight she shall not.
As with the meat, some undeserved fault
I’ll find about the making of the bed,
And here I’ll fling the pillow, there the bolster,
This way the coverlet, another way the sheets,
Ay, and amid this hurly I intend
That all is done in reverent care of her,
And in conclusion she shall watch all night,
And if she chance to nod I’ll rail and brawl
And with the clamour keep her still awake.
This is a way to kill a wife with kindness,
And thus I’ll curb her mad and headstrong humour,
He that knows better how to tame a shrew,
Now let him speak. ‘Tis charity to show. (4.1. 169-192)

For Petruccio, language or speech for its own sake—what some might term mere academic speech—is part of what’s wrong with a university town like Padua. When Tranio (impersonating Lucentio) introduces himself to the others as a competing suitor for Bianca with a reference to Paris and Helen of Troy, Petruccio impatiently asks, “Hortensio, to what end are all these words”
(1.2. 246). Also, although his taming of Katherine begins with an extensive demonstration of his rhetorical mastery, he reaches a point where he again appears to lose patience and insists on “setting all this chat aside” (2.1. 260). In that light, he presents the falcon taming metaphor as a practical, solutions-oriented form of speech and, in the spirit of male aristocratic competitiveness, challenges other men to out-speak and out-perform him. Indeed, this relationship between language and action is essential for the satisfaction of a warrior-scholar like Petruccio.

Also, what is conveniently lost in his attention to the taming metaphor is that literal falcon taming centers on a loving and gentle process that culminates in the coordinated hunting and killing of other animals. That is, the details of a loving process obscure the performative reality of a deadly purpose. In that way, Katherine’s aggressive final-scene castigation of Bianca and the Widow represents the ultimate expression of loving submission. In both figurative and literal instances, satisfaction comes in a safe and acceptable form of violence: either redirected away from Katherine’s body to domestic objects (against food and dishes earlier in the scene; the pillow, the coverlet, and the sheets in this passage; and, as we will explore later, a hat and a gown in act 4 scene 3) or with Katherine as the physical and rhetorical proxy of male domination. In short, the prescriptive metaphor of an aristocratic sport like falcon taming forces the re-direction and in-direction of a more acceptable method than mere words or brute force by which to achieve “real” physical power over women and perhaps even, as his claim of a “politicly begun . . . reign” suggests, all political subjects.

Redirection, however, does not result in a proto-Cartesian dematerializing transcendence or subordination of the body.⁵⁵ Rather, in the gendered economy of classical and early modern medical thought, Katherine’s problem is that her body, as reflected

⁵⁵ While those treatises are at best ambivalent on the specific health benefits of falcon taming, they share with Petruccio the belief in the importance of the body and exercise to an educational program.
in her violent shrewishness, is too hot. Indeed, as Gail Kern Paster describes, Katherine is a “humoral subject distempered by too much heat . . . [and] must be cooled in order to be socialized as a wife.” Petruccio’s falcon taming method makes possible just such a cooling off of her body by allowing, as Paster also describes, “the transformation of her environment through the manipulation of the six Galenic nonnaturals of air, diet, rest and exercise, sleeping and walking, fullness and emptiness, and passions.” However, if we recall Petruccio’s own propensity for violence, his body is also too hot for the nonviolent milieu of Paduan society and must be subjected to the same manipulation. Of course, this expression of mutual bodily deprivation would fit neatly into a romanticized reading of the play centered on loving companionate marriage. However, as I have been arguing, what we see here instead reflects a fundamental redefinition of manhood that brings men anxiously close to women by prescribing for them comparable nonviolent dispositions and regimens of bodily care.

Within these affective and behavioral limitations, male domination becomes an essentializing and simplifying matter of bodily difference. In other words, all Petruccio has to do to create and securely mystify a belief in the rightness of male dominion—even as his taming of Katherine and his self-taming expose it as a process—is demonstrate his superior ability to endure the challenges of bodily deprivation. We never hear from him the equivalent of Katherine’s “But I, who never knew how to entreat,/Nor never needed that I should entreat,/Am starved for meat, giddy for lack of sleep” (4.3. 7-9). As the embodied hybridized compromise of a warrior-scholar, he complains about a lot of things, but, unlike Katherine, he never complains about the cold, the lack of food, or the lack of sleep: conditions which would not have been uncommon to the battle-tested warrior or the ascetically oriented scholar.
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This difference is, of course, the basis of Katherine’s final-scene disquisition on wifely obedience. In this much-debated closing speech, she first orders Bianca and the Widow— and by extension all women58—to stop casting threatening angry looks at their husbands, because the ruling patriarchal demands of female beauty pathologizes anger in women as a disfiguring emotion fundamentally antithetical to normative happy wifely obedience. As Katherine concludes, the only thing that a husband wants and needs from a wife is “love, fair looks, and true obedience” (5.2.157). Furthermore, to emphasize the incompatibility of anger with that constrained role, Katherine continues by materializing anger with a number of pathologizing, gendered analogies. Anger in a woman is like the frosts that bite the meadows; it is like the whirlwinds that shake the delicate buds; and, most significantly, it is like an exogenous disturbance to a clean fountain, a disturbance which makes the fountain’s water muddy and therefore undesirable to even the thirstiest of men. Even if women could feel and express anger in a way not fundamentally construed as self-polluting, self-disfiguring, and ultimately self-destructive, their physical weakness relative to men would render such an expression, at best, a treasonous waste of time. That is, because men, for the “maintenance” (5.2.152) of women, can and do commit their bodies to the “painful labours” (5.2.153) of the harsh and threatening natural elements, they are, by natural, self-evident, physically demonstrated right, dominant, sovereign, princely, caring, and benevolent. Therefore, any opposition to such “honest will” (5.2.162) would be doomed to fail as the act of a “foul contending rebel” (5.2.163) or a “graceless traitor” (5.2.164). Indeed, as weaker vessels— as “unable worms” (5.2.173), Katherine advises the women to accept their subordinate position: to accept, in other words, “that [their] soft conditions and [their] hearts/Should well agree with [their] external parts” (5.2.171-172). In short, as dramatically represented by Katherine’s concluding hand-under-foot

58 Boose insightfully argues that “Having ‘fetched hither’ the emblematic pair of offstage wives who have declined to participate in this game of patriarchal legitimation, Kate shift into an address targeted at some presumptive Everywoman” (240).
gesture of submission, the might of male physical superiority makes right in every aspect and in every sphere of early modern life.

This difference also returns us to the bodily centered simplicity exemplified by Vives’s *Instruction*. That is, in the course of redefining male authority in terms of a superior capacity to endure physical deprivation, Shakespeare through Petruccio also redefines male authority in terms of sententious moral probity. While we have already explored his critique of Paduan speech, its Vivesian strain most clearly begins to emerge before the wedding, when he arrives late and “fantastically dressed.” After the other characters question whether he intends to marry Katherine in “these un reverence robes” (3.3. 105), as Tranio describes them, and insists that he change into something appropriate to the occasion, Petruccio refuses: “Good sooth, even thus. Therefore ha’ done with words./To me she’s married, not unto my clothes” (3.2. 109-110). Despite playfully continuing that she will wear him out sexually before he can wear out his wedding clothing, the seriousness of an implicit anti-materialism—that dietary excess and the resultant corrupt materialism threaten the marital union of dangerously and differently embodied souls—penetrates that bawdy festive surface nonetheless. In short, his fashion statement as well as its irreverent performative enactment during the wedding ceremony is as much a material critique of Paduan materialism as it is a source of festive laughter. The act-four fitting scene builds on this anti-materialistic critique. After the taming method has rendered Katherine “as cold as can be” (4.3. 37), she complains to Hortensio, Petruccio tests whether that coldness has extinguished her materialistic desires by teasing her with food, promises of fashionable luxury items, and a return to the corrupt and corrupting materialistic milieu of Paduan society:

Kate, eat apace, and now, my honey love,
Will we return unto thy father’s house,
And revel it as bravely as the best,
With silken coats, and caps, and golden rings,
With ruffs, and cuffs, and farthingales, and things,
With scarves, and fans, and double change of bravery,
With amber bracelets, beads, and all this knavery. (4.3. 52-58)
Before Katherine can finish eating, assuming that she has a chance to start, he invites the haberdasher and the tailor to present her with a cap and a gown as examples of their fashionable “knavery.” While “knavery” in this context most plausibly means “[t]ricks of dress or adornment” (OED), Petruccio’s anti-materialism as well as his other serious critiques of Paduan corruption also powerfully evokes its primary definition: “dishonest and crafty dealing; trickery, roguery” (OED). In other words, the point that Petruccio goes on to make in somewhat of a drawn out manner—a manner perhaps attempting to simultaneously evoke the quite different meanings of the word knavery—is that the technical trade skills feeding, as it were, Padua’s corrupt consumer culture is itself a reflection of that corruption. Indeed, his criticism of the fashionable workmanship of the Haberdasher’s cap and the Tailor’s gown represents an indirect way of criticizing that culture. Specifically, he criticizes the cap as appearing to have been “moulded on a porringer—/A velvet dish. Fie, fie, ’tis lewd and filthy/Why ’tis a cockle or a walnut-shell./A knack, a toy, a trick, a baby’s cap” (4.3. 64-67).

The analogies proliferate, as he goes on to describe it as “[a] custard coffin, a bauble, a silken pie” (4.3. 82). He likewise criticizes the sleeve-design of the gown: “What’s this—a sleeve?” he sarcastically asks, “‘Tis like a demi-cannon./ What, up and down carved like an apple-tart?/Here’s snip, and nip, and cut, and slish and slash./Like to a scissor in a barber’s shop” (4.3. 88-91). Although it may strike us as insensitive and even sadistic for Petruccio to discredit these examples of contemporary fashion in terms of various banqueting foods, his taming method, when compared to violent historical accounts of shrew taming or even the play’s sister play The Taming of a Shrew, is a relatively compassionate one based on linking, as Vives does, a corrupt taste for luxurious clothing to a corrupting diet of dangerously unhealthy food.

59 See Natasha Korda, Domestic Economies. In a related but different materialist argument, Korda argues that “in likening the commodities that are brought in after supper to banqueting conceits, commonly known as ‘voids’ or ‘empty dishes,’ Petruccio . . . emphasizes the commodity’s lack of substance or stuff” (69).
Indeed, Petruccio’s task is to starve Katherine and himself of these interconnected excesses for their own good. In that light, it is possible to understand Petruccio’s otherwise cryptic response to the final-scene banquet (“Nothing but sit, and sit, and eat, and eat” [5.2. 12]) as much more than an expression of boredom. It is, as I have been arguing, an educational critique that justifies the taming of both a shrew and her teacher-husband.

Eric L. De Barros is a Visiting Assistant Professor of English at the State University of New York at Oswego. A committed teacher-scholar, he has taught courses as varied as English composition, critical theory, epic poetry, Shakespeare, Renaissance literature and culture, and autobiographies of black masculinity at five institutions of higher learning over a fifteen-year period.
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*Petruccio and the Habadasher*
*From The Library Shakespeare*
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The Fünfbilderserie consists of anatomic schematics utilized in medical school dissections beginning in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Anatomists would create these mnemonics to help students envision the internal systems of the body. Besides the standard five male pictures, an additional image, the “Pregnant Disease Woman” acted as a means to understand the reproductive system and organs of the pregnant woman. This paper argues, however, that despite the empirical observation of the anatomy of the gravid woman, they continued to visualize and “imagine” it, largely due to the existing classical ideas these anatomist retained about women, their natures, and their bodies.

The pregnant female anatomy remained mysterious for much of the Middle Ages, forcing the male medical establishment to imagine its form and function. While anatomical investigation of male morphology began in earnest in the High Middle Ages, corresponding discoveries about females were delayed and imperfect. The lack of empirical knowledge and reliance on erroneous classical theories combined to make the gravid female a frightening and confusing “other.” The effect was a continued view of women as inferior, mysterious and imperfect. The pregnant woman was all of those things and, in addition, host to an alien, the stuff of modern day science fiction stories. The medieval mentality allowed male clinicians to view pregnancy as a disease, an acute condition with which one was afflicted. Despite the increased practice of dissection in medical schools, they were unable to reconcile Galenic theories with what they observed, especially in relation to women’s bodies. The disjuncture between what they “knew” and what they saw
illustrates the fact that the medieval mind was not trained to react to the visual but to the conceptual. What they could not make sense of they virtually ignored and failed to integrate, and thus the pregnant anatomy remained “imagined.”

One way in which historians can “dissect” the medieval vision of the pregnant woman is through medical illustrations, primarily the Fünfbilderserie. The Fünfbilderserie, or “five picture series,” representing the five principle systems of the Galenic body, is a group of stylized anatomic schematics used for instruction. The semi-squatting figures illustrate bones, nerves, muscles, veins and arteries. Occasionally an additional figure representing the generative organs was added. They were all male figures in a customary “frog” pose, except for the Gravida, or “Pregnant Disease Woman” that was sometimes included in the series, and occasionally alone. Obstetrics and gynecology had been considered part of the standard medical corpus from the time of the Greeks. It is notable, however, that these “Disease Women” were not an integral component of the male series, but rather an addendum. This was a consequence of the Aristotelian schema that men act as the standard and that women are thus “inverted” or “imperfect” males. Sally Kitch notes that “Aristotle’s judgment of women as a ‘monstrous error of nature’—worthy of study only in unflattering comparison to a male standard—would be inscribed in the natural sciences for centuries.”

In that light anatomists used the male body as a template, which was then altered to describe the female and gravid anatomy. In this way, they created a visual discourse on the parturient woman that was at best imperfect and at worst nearly wholly inaccurate. To the medieval mind, it was sufficient to “imagine” the mysterious pregnant female.

1 Karl Sudhoff points out that this is a misnomer as there are sometimes more or less than five pictures. Book One of Avicenna’s Canon contains an anatomical section on these systems, called “simple” members, used to formulate basic rules vs. Galenic empiricism. Siraisi, Renaissance Medicine, 85. In fact, Katherine Park argues that there are nine of these pictures. Park, Secrets of Women, 110.

2 Aristotle, Generation of Animals, I, 82f.

3 Kitch, Spector of Sex, 20.
By most accounts, the study of anatomy did not exist in Europe before the twelfth century. Galen of Pergamon’s and Soranus of Ephesus’ anatomical learning had been lost or possibly suppressed by Church authorities during the early Middle Ages. Although Galen never dissected human beings, most medieval readers assumed he had because of his avid recommendation to do so as well as the fact that he wrote about it so extensively. Galen’s second-century works were popular in the East but neglected in the West until the eleventh century. At that time his texts were united with those of Soranus. That, and the translation of several Arabic texts into Latin, brought Galenic anatomy to the West for the first time. After antiquity the dearth of anatomical manuscripts was broken by the arrival of Constantine the African, who translated the *Pantegni* of Persian Haly Abbas from the Arabic about 1080, beginning the “middle period” of Salernitan literature. Constantine the African brought several Arabic medical texts from North Africa to the south Italian monastery of Monte Cassino in the eleventh century and by the twelfth century Galen’s ideas began to overtake those of Soranus of Ephesus, especially at the medical school at Salerno. By the second half of the twelfth century, Galenic ideas as seen in the *Fünfbilderserie*, therefore, were superimposed on the ideas of Soranus already prevalent in medieval thought. By 1300 some of his physiological theories were being studied in Latin translation at Montpellier, Paris, and Bologna. Until the time of Leonardo Da Vinci anatomy was primarily pseudo-Galenic and offered what F. H. Garrison called “more a contribution to general morphology than to actual human anatomy.”


5 He also translated Galen’s commentary on the *Aphorisms* of Hippocrates as well as many other medical treatises. George W. Corner, *Anatomical Texts of the Earlier Middle Ages*, 15.

6 Monica H. Green, “The Transmission of Ancient Theories of Female Physiology and Disease”, 54, 85.

7 Garrison, “Early Mediaeval Anatomy”, 609.
Books Two and Three in Constantine’s encyclopedia, based on the Galenic tradition, constituted almost the sole source of anatomical knowledge at Salerno until the early twelfth century when three tracts on the dissection of the pig appeared, the Anatomia Cophonis porci, attributed to Copho, the Anatomia parva Galeni of Galen, and a third discussion of porcine anatomy known as the Anatomia Mauri. These Salernitan texts are practical anatomical manuals that allow us to glimpse dissection at Salerno and, as George Corner states, the “teaching from the specimen and not from books alone -- an unexpected thing in mediaeval anatomy, not to be seen again until the days of Mundinus.”

Three tracts on human anatomy followed. Mondino dei Luzzi, or Mundinus, of Bologna completed a dissection handbook called the Anothomia in 1316. He used a narrative of dissection within a Galenic framework, organizing his material according to Galen’s system, and analyzing each organ with respect to the position, connections, shape, parts and functions. This treatise marked the beginning of the shift from pig to human dissections. The development of anatomy as a scientific subject occurred because dissections, porcine and then human, became possible within the context of the university medical school. Clearly animal dissections continued to be used alongside human dissection for some time, explaining some of the inaccuracies in describing the morphology of organs. By the early fourteenth century anatomy became a recognized field of medicine studied at the University of Bologna, and at Montpellier. At the University of Padua students dissected one male and one female cadaver each year, but quickly and only in

9 Corner, Anatomical Texts of the Earlier Middle Ages, 30.
10 Wallis, Medieval Medicine, 231.
11 Guido de Vigevano states in his treatise that “it is prohibited by the Church to perform an anatomy upon a human body.” But of course the fact that he writes about performing a human dissection belies that statement. Guido of Vigevano, Anatomia Philippi septimi, trans. Faith Wallis, 72-77.
12 Hill, “Another Member”, 16.
the winter in order to minimize the unpleasant smell. In addition to Mundinus, Henri de Mondeville, born in the mid-thirteenth century and practicing medicine in Paris before becoming one of Philip IV’s royal surgeons, and another anatomist, Guido de Vigevano, who wrote in France around 1350, both used anatomical illustrations as their primary teaching tool. Vigevano said:

I demonstrate dissection . . . by figures accurately drawn . . . . The pictures show them better than in a human body, because when we make an anatomy on a man it is necessary to hasten on account of the stench.

He also argued that pictures are superior to actual dissections as they offered views that were otherwise impossible to see, saying that in the images the anatomy appears “rather better than it can be seen in the human body itself.”

The fünfbilderserie images are generally not based on empirical observation of corpses, but rather on traditional early anatomic illustration as they continued to be copied from manuscript to manuscript. This mimicry is indicated by the monotonous similarities in these drawings, common to Aztec, Tibetan, Persian, and European anatomic manuscripts. These pictures were not intended to be naturalistic, but rather designed to be schematic, a visual display of Galenic anatomy and were a “valuable adjunct to the experience of dissection”. Mondeville’s illustrations from 1304 show little to no improvement over the early anatomical illustrations, demonstrating imitation rather than innovation. Karl Sudhoff saw this lack of change over the centuries as indicative of the “almost stationary character of the medieval mind.”

13 Siraisi, Renaissance Medicine, 89.
15 Guido de Vigevano, Anatomia, 240.
16 Garrison, History of Medicine, 213.
17 Wallis, Medieval Medicine, 237.
19 Sudhoff, Archive, vol. i. 219, 351.
stylized anatomical depictions may represent the assimilation of Latin versions of Arabic texts and the summaries of Galenic medicine. The fact that dissection was taking place within a larger textual tradition meant that Galenic errors persisted, despite the opportunity to observe their inaccuracies. Nancy Siraisi points to this aspect: “Appearances in dissection were unlikely either to throw general doubt on or to greatly clarify preexisting physiological theories and anatomical descriptions.” By the fifteenth century the illustrations became more realistic, standing erect and not in the “frog” pose, indicating empiricism and dissection observation.

Obstetrics and childbirth were primarily relegated to midwives, who treated women pre-, post-, and perinatally. As empirics these midwives arguably became the experts on the gravid woman and learned through practice rather than through formal instruction. Midwifery manuals from this period primarily relied on classical knowledge transmitted and modified by midwives and thus were practical in nature. In his treatise Tractatus de Matricibus, Anthonius Gainerius acknowledged that he had learned from midwives and used them to carry out his own prescribed treatments. Male physicians and students matriculating through these universities were relatively unacquainted with the internal anatomy and physiology of pregnant females. They had to rely on their conjured concepts, akin to the fantastic view of an imagined mythical beast.

The first official dissection of a woman in the West took place around 1315 and Mondino mentions the dissection of women in January and March of 1316, indicating that special attention was paid to the anatomy of the uterus. His teacher, Taddeo Alderotti, expressed disappointment in not having had the opportunity to observe the pregnant female anatomy, indicating the rarity of

20 Frampton, Embodiments of Will, 263. He argues against Sudhoff, who finds a common classical Alexandrian source.

21 Siraisi, Renaissance Medicine, 89.

available female corpses. The practice of using executed foreign criminals for dissection, and the reticence of executing condemned pregnant females, were both obstacles to observing the pregnant female anatomy in the high and late Middle Ages. Because male physicians may have been relatively unacquainted with the female genitals, thirty people were able to witness the dissection of a female at the University of Bologna in the fourteenth century, while only twenty were allowed at the dissection of a male. While more students and physicians had direct access in this case, it also makes clear that female dissection was still seen as a novelty. In his study of thirteenth-century medical miniatures Charles Singer notes that within the group of medical drawings in MS Ashmole 399 there are several depictions of the dissection of a female body. These illustrations are of two types typical of anatomical representation: “full body” depictions and separate “organ” studies. The pregnant womb becomes emblematic of the “hidden” female internal anatomy in general, and is identified in the “Pregnant Disease Woman” as the organ that only dissection could reveal. Because the Ashmole drawings all contain recipes and remedies for female ailments and thus belong to the realm of gynecological manuals, Singer argues that the literature and illustrations were intended for midwives and not for male physicians. These recipes and herbal knowledge signify an area in which the midwife is arguably the more informed and the male physician relatively unenlightened, part of “women’s secrets.” This dichotomy illustrates comparable knowledges, “male” vs. “female.” While female empirical practitioners were limited by their comparative illiteracy, the anatomical field was a great equalizer of scientific data.

23 Park, Secrets of Women, 106, 109. She points out that the first anatomical illustration of a uterus “from nature” dates to woodcuts in Johannes de Ketham’s Fasciculo de medicina of 1494.


25 Mackinney, “Beginnings of Western Scientific Anatomy”, 235. They all depict, according to him, a reprobation of dissection.

26 Park, Secrets of Women, 27. She argues that the anatomists thought that if one could understand the complicated and mysterious uterus, they would be able to understand the rest of the woman.

27 Singer, “Thirteenth Century Miniatures”, 34, 35.

28 Park, Secrets of Women, 91.
The intended audience of the Fünfbilderserie illustrations was likely male medical students and physicians and the illustrations allowed them to visualize the internal structures in both an abstract and a practical way. In Paris, BN, MS 11229, the subject is in the characteristic “frog” pose with her arms raised and outstretched. We can see her very pregnant outline, illustrating that the anatomist recognized her advanced pregnancy and made a connection to her morphology. She is also uncharacteristically pregnant with twins, their faces peering out from her round uterus.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS lat. 11229 [15th Century]29

29 Because of copyright restrictions, this and subsequent illustrations are drawings from the originals created for this article by James Fagades.
This picture has extensive text surrounding the figure indicating its use for instructing male medical students. The text is surely secondary to the images, an explanation for the viewer about the images themselves. A practical factor, according to Peter Murray Jones, was “the need to describe the appearance of things so that the reader could visualize them for himself.”

In this way, anatomy might be taught from pictures in absence of a dissected corpse. Even Leonardo da Vinci’s drawings from the early sixteenth century are not based solely on observation, made obvious by his anatomical errors. His drawings too are “a form of visual thinking” made by observing, reading Mondino and Avicenna, and listening to his contemporaries describe anatomical structures through oral instruction.

However, in MS Bruges 411 from Thomas de Cantimpré’s *De Rerum Natura*, dating to about 1500, we can see the frog pose, the obviously pregnant belly and the *fetus-in-utero*, but we also see that the woman is holding an herbal sprig, which could be symbolic of analgesic or emmenagogues, or “menses provoking” medicines of varying efficacy, used by midwives during pregnancy and childbirth. This addition may indicate the audience’s pharmacological knowledge or interest. Another possibility remains that the herb is a reflection of the incorporation of the knowledge of herbal medicine taken from midwives.

It could also be attributed to a standard trope in medical illustrations, much like the *Fünfbilderserie* illustrations themselves. Wellcome MS 5000, c. 1420, contains the *Fünfbilderserie*, as well as other religious and medical information, including gynecological recipes, again representing female expertise. Despite the fact that these figures are more realistic than those included in previous manuscripts, the characteristic squatting pose roots them in the visual tradition and shows little in the way of empirical observation.

---

32 Green, *Making Women’s Medicine Masculine*, 164. She argues that there is no audience of female practitioners for these texts in the Middle Ages.
33 Hill, “Another Member”, 15.
Bruges, Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS 411, f. 259 [15th Century]

Illustration by James Fagades.
Erlangen MS 1492 from the thirteenth century contains the typical semi-squat position, although the picture is more natural and realistic than the *Fünfbilderserie* images. The woman’s stomach is cut away and her genitals covered by a cloth, an intriguing and somewhat odd addition, considering its probable use for instruction about the reproductive system. In these illustrations, of which there are several on a page, the fetus lies within the pregnant space, but not in a circumscribed, boundaried uterus, which is usually round or bell shaped, and often off to one side. These images depict the fetus in different positions, and act as a manual to assist practitioners in visualizing fetal presentation.

35 Illustration by James Fagades.
The twelfth-century Breslau Codex 3714 and Oxford Bodleian MS Laud, misc. 724, c. 1400, contains the traditional pictures of the fetus-in-utero from Mochion, the fifth-century Latin translator of Soranus of Ephesus from the original Greek. Soranus’s second-century treatise, *On Gynecology*, found widespread acceptance in numerous translations throughout Western Europe after the third century. Many other manuscripts contain fetus-in-utero images, such as Erlangen MS 1463. It was not until Ketham’s *Gravida* of 1491 that the parts of the pregnant maternal body and the fetus were labeled at all.

*Gravida, MS 1491 [15th Century]*

36 Garrison, *History of Medicine*, 211.

37 Illustration by James Fagades.
MS Ashmole 399’s thirteenth-century schema of the uterus and adnexa are particularly abstract. Accompanying diagrams of the \textit{fetus-in-utero} provide prescriptions for the pregnant woman.\textsuperscript{38} The image of the uterus seems to have been represented with a dark outline of two parts: one half pregnant and the other in the non-pregnant state. This schizoid representation illustrates the literal states of the woman’s anatomy, but also the figurative changing and mercurial nature of the female, the Galenic humoral fluctuations and character of the female personality.\textsuperscript{39} This bisected uterus could also be a result of Galen’s “bicorne”, or “bilobed” uterus, reflecting the two-lobed porcine uterus that he was accustomed to dissect.\textsuperscript{40} In the illustration the pregnant half of the uterus is filled by a fetus and its membranes. It also contains a description of the uterus from the text of Constantine the African.

\begin{center}
\textit{Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 399, f. 13v [14th Century]}\textsuperscript{41}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{38} Singer, “A Thirteenth Century Drawing”, 43.

\textsuperscript{39} Galen’s treatise \textit{De temperatmentis} takes the Hippocratic humoral theory and applies it to temperament, becoming the standard authority on the topic throughout the Middle Ages.

\textsuperscript{40} Galen, \textit{De usu partium}, IV, 4. Also, Singer, “Thirteenth Century Drawing”, 46.

\textsuperscript{41} Illustration by James Fagades.
The *Anatomia Ricardi*, an early thirteenth-century Salernitan anatomical text, is a systematic descriptive work that purports to describe the human, rather than porcine, anatomy and is derived from the *Pantegni*. Ricardus Anglicus describes the structures of the uterus in section 40, saying:

Some mistakenly say that there are five cells in the uterus and some say seven, because a corresponding number of fetuses can be carried in the uterus at once; but it must be said that even as many pears may be seen hanging from one tree, by which they are nourished, so many several fetuses adhere at once to one process in the uterus, from which they all take nutriment.\(^{42}\)

The “seven-celled” uterus was based upon an Aristotelian concept, and was widely accepted and transmitted through the Middle Ages. *De Spermate*, a twelfth-century pseudo-Galenic treatise asserted that parts of the body, including the uterus, were divided into sevens.\(^{43}\) *Anatomia Cophonis*, the porcine treatise, also says: “The uterus has seven cells, and if the animal is pregnant, you will find the fetuses in these chambers.”\(^{44}\) Mondino writes:

the uterus of a sow that I anatomized in the year 1316 was a hundred times greater than I ever saw in a human female. This could also have been because the sow was pregnant and had thirteen piglets in her uterus, and in it I demonstrated the anatomy of the fetus and of pregnancy.\(^{45}\)

Twelfth-century Salernitan anatomists presented this theory in texts again and again, illustrating that it is a concept not based on empirical observation but rather, like the *Fünfbilderserie* illustrations, a product of the “imagined” uterine anatomy. In this view the uterus is divided into two chambers with seven sections, three on the left, three on the right, and one in the center. The fetus that develops on

---


\(^{43}\) Reichman, “Seven-Chamber Uterus”, 249.

\(^{44}\) *Anatomia Caphonis*, in Corner, “Anatomical Texts”, 53. Soranus did not espouse the seven-chamber doctrine.

the left, which is cooler, will be male while the one that develops on the warmer right side will be female. The hermaphrodite will develop in the center. Later anatomists argued for five sections rather than seven because a woman could not possibly bear more than quintuplets.46 Because Mondino adopted the bipartite uterus its popularity actually *increased* during the time when humans were dissected more frequently.

The pregnant morphology created a new frontier of medical and anatomical knowledge for the student and gave male anatomists and physicians an inroad into the eventual “professionalization” and “paternalization” of the field of obstetrics. The overall effect was the claiming of the “syknessess of women” for the male medical field. The transition to human dissection was a momentous paradigm shift in the history of medicine. But in light of the fact that females were not dissected as often as males until the Early Modern period, “Pregnant Disease Woman” continued to be reproduced based on faulty classical ideas. The continued use of the *Fünfbilderserie* schematic model was especially true for female anatomy. The fact that male medical authorities continued to conceptualize the gravid female as “diseased” is also notable. They saw the pregnant woman as having an acute condition that had to be “cured” one way or another: through the birth of the child or the death of the mother. It was approached as potentially harmful, even fatal. The maternal mortality rate seems to have been at least 20% at this time, so that was a very real concern.47 But midwifery manuals treat the pregnant patient in a very different way, perhaps in a more “empirical” manner. This is the result of a gendered approach to obstetrics specifically, and medicine generally that arguably continues to this day. Monica Green argues that the “same gender system that kept men at a distance from the bodies of their female patients was equally

---

46 Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Differences*, 198.

47 Hanawalt, *Growing Up in Medieval London*, 43 and 234. The author cites 14.4 maternal deaths for every 1,000 births in fifteenth-century Florence. This figure rises to approximately 20% when deaths resulting from complications of pregnancy or some condition related to child-bearing, rather than the birth process itself, are added.
powerful in keeping women away from the traditions of education and philosophical discourse that might have generated a women’s medicine that was both empirically and rationally informed.”

“Pregnant Disease Woman” offers us a fruitful means of exploring the transformations in perceptions of the pregnant anatomy and childbirth. This perception is based, like the Fünfbilderserie itself, not on reality but rather on the imagination of medieval physicians, most of whom were male, until the Renaissance and the Early Modern period. The issue here is not when the understandings of the female anatomy changed, but rather why there was a disconnect between what people saw and what they imagined. These pictures therefore allow us to see the “male” and “medicalized” perception of something at once familiar and foreign: the pregnant woman.

\[\text{Ginger L. Smoak is an Assistant Professor Lecturer of History at the University of Utah. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Colorado at Boulder and is interested in the history of medicine, especially midwifery and obstetrics.}\]

\[\text{James Fagedes, illustrator, is a graduate of the University of Utah Fine Arts Program. He works as a designer and enjoys photography and letterboxing.}\]

\[\text{48 Green, Making Women’s Medicine Masculine, 68.}\]
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Notes

Shylock and Joachim Gaunse: and a Real Jew

Michael T. Walton
Independent Scholar

Joachim Gaunse, a Bohemian metallurgist, was brought to England to help evaluate the resources of the New World. During a visit to Bristol in 1589, he defended his Jewish rejection of Jesus. The reaction of those who heard this real Jew gives some indication of how theater audiences may have responded to Shakespeare’s Shylock.

The use of a Jew as the vindictive miser in the comedy Merchant of Venice was undoubtedly effective as a dramatic device until the relatively recent recognition of Jews as something other than theological-economic stereotypes. Certainly Shakespeare exploited both the stereotypes of miser and Jew effectively in the play, combining Shylock’s comic, theological, and pathetic value. As an historian who has been studying real Jews in sixteenth-century Europe, I find that the character of Shakespeare’s Shylock raises an interesting question. Given the dearth of identifiable Jews in Shakespeare’s England, how would Shakespeare’s audience have responded to Shylock?

A partial answer to this question can be inferred from the recorded reaction of Elizabethans to a real Jew, the Bohemian metallurgist, Joachim Gaunse. Although there were some Marranos living in London, Gaunse was not a Marrano. Nor was he a convicted public enemy, as later (1594) was the putative Jew, Dr. Rodrigo [Roger] Lopez. Therefore, the limited record of reactions

1 James H. Forse, Art Imitates Business, discusses Lopez extensively in Chapter 6 with references to the important studies.
to this unconverted Jew, who presented no political threat to the realm, probably gives a fairly good picture of the attitude toward Jews as Jews in Shakespeare’s audience.  

I

The records dealing with Gaunse, or as he would have been called in Yiddish “Gans,” entered Shakespearean studies at the end of the nineteenth century by way of Sidney L. Lee’s “Elizabethan England and the Jews.”3 James Shapiro is also referred to Gaunse in the recent (1996) study, Shakespeare and the Jews. In neither work, however, is the reaction to Gaunse’s Jewishness linked to the text of The Merchant of Venice nor to audience reaction. There is good reason, I believe, to see in the records about Gaunse not only Elizabethan attitudes toward Jews, but also foreshadowing of the very words in Shakespeare’s play. I am not suggesting that Shakespeare copied from the public records concerning Gaunse, only that Elizabethans had an understanding about Jews that Shakespeare used in creating the character of Shylock. He also put words into the mouths of other characters that are consistent with Elizabethan attitudes we find in the public records.

Apparently Gaunse was brought to England with other German mining and metallurgical technicians around 1581 in an attempt to improve English metallurgy. In 1585, he was sent to the Roanoke colony to inventory the mineral resources in the New World. His role in the expedition was described by Ralph Lane, original

---

2 Gaunse has long been known to historians and Shakespearean scholars. The first article devoted to him seems to be Israel Abrahams, “Joachim Gaunse: a Mining Incident in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth,” 92-101. He is recently mentioned in James Shapiro, Shakespeare and the Jews, 74 & 180. As Shapiro concentrates on the status and presence of Jews in England, he does not compare reaction to Gaunse and statements by and about Shylock as I attempt to do here. The presence of Jews at various places and of different statuses in Elizabethan England is well-documented by Shapiro and his predecessors, Sidney L. Lee, “Elizabethan England and the Jews,” 141-163; C. J. Sisson, “A Colony of Jews in Shakespeare’s London,” 38-51; and Cecil Roth, History of the Jews in England. Gaunse may have been related to the famous Gans family of Prague, see André Neher, Jewish Thought and the Scientific Revolution of the Sixteenth Century.

governor of Roanoke colony, in his account of the expedition.\textsuperscript{4} Gaunse’s Jewishness does not seem to have occasioned any written reaction among his London and expedition associates, many of whom, such as Raleigh and Walsingham, were well-educated and connected at court.

Gaunse, as a Jew, made a splash into the public records only during his visit to Bristol in 1589.\textsuperscript{5} At the house of Mr. Richard Mayes, inholder (taverner) Gaunse and his companions were visited by the Rev. Richard Curteys on September 15th. Curteys spoke to Gaunse, whom he may have believed to be a convert to Christianity, in Hebrew. When told by another guest that Gaunse was an “infidel,” Curteys bore witness in Hebrew that Jesus of Nazareth, whom the Jews had crucified, was the Son of God. Gaunse disagreed in words that so upset Curteys that, as he later informed the Mayor and the Justices of the City of Bristol under oath, he “spake in the englishe tonge, to the ende that others beinge there present might heare it and witnes his speeche, what do you denie Jesus Christ to be the sonne of God, at whiche tyme he awnswered what needeth the almightie God to have a sonne, is he not almyghtie:”\textsuperscript{6}

As a result of forcefully expressing his Jewish views, Gaunse was brought before the mayor and aldermen of Bristol the next day. There his denial of Jesus was confirmed by a witness to another incident three days earlier.

Jeremye Pierce of the Cytie of London, Joyner, . . . Informeth the saide Mayor and Aldermen . . . that he beinge in Companye with Jeochim Gauzn at the Cytie of Bristol on fryday last beinge the xii\textsuperscript{th} of this instante monethe, fallinge into Comunicac’on of the oulde testam and the newe, This exam' demaunded of the said Jeochim whether he did not beleve in Jesus Christe the Sonne of God. Whereunto the saide Jeochim aunswered there was noe suche name, and that there was but one God, whoe had noe wife nor chielde.\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{4} Ralph Lane, “Narrative of the Settlement of Roanoke Island, 1585-1586.”

\textsuperscript{5} Abrahams, “Joachim Gaunse,” 92-101 reproduced the records.

\textsuperscript{6} Abrahams, “Joachim Gaunse,” 100.

\textsuperscript{7} Abrahams, “Joachim Gaunse,” 101. Jews traditionally avoided using the name “Jesus.” Instead they used a similar sounding but meaningless word, see Michael T. Walton, \textit{Antho-nius Margarita and the Jewish Faith}, 65.
Gaunse affirmed before the court that he was a Jew born in the City of Prage in Bohemia, and that he was Circumcised and hath bin alwayes instructed and broughte uppe in the Talmud of the Jewys and was never Baptized, neyther dothe he beleue any Article of our Christyan faithe for that he was not brought uppe therein.

As a Jew, Gaunse could not be charged with heresy. Barring special permission, however, Gaunse was in England illegally—Jews being banned from the country since 1290. The mayor and aldermen sent him to the Privy Council with the official finding:

Whereas one Jeochim Gaunz beinge (as he saithe) a Jewe born in the Cytie of Prage in Bohœmia, and nowe Inhabitinge in the blacke Fryers in London was latelye apprehended and broughte before us, for that beinge in this Cytie he used verye blasphemous Speaches againste our Savyour Jesus Christe, denyenge him to be the Sonne of God, a matter ministringe noe small offence to her Maies people heere, and beinge thereupon examyned before us declarethe him selfe to be a moste wicked Infidell, as by his examynac'on maye appeere, We have therefore thoughte yt our dewtyes to sende him unto your honors, as alsoe to Signifye unto you his ungodlye and moste heathenishe opinyons and demeasnor not meete to be suffered amonge Christyans . . . .

Thereafter Gaunse drops from the historical record. It is probable that he returned to Europe. The language of the reaction to him in Bristol, not his continued life’s journey, is central to this paper. For Shylock, like Gaunse, appears to the leading citizens of Venice as a wicked infidel, ungodly, heathenish, and not meet to be suffered among Christians.

II

Londoners who attended the first performances of The Merchant of Venice around 1597 would surely have viewed Jews in much the same manner as did Curteys and the other citizens of Bristol. Indeed, Shakespeare probably had only to look to his own expectations and those of his friends for the creation of certain aspects of Shylock’s character.

8 Abrahams, “Joachim Gaunse,” 100.
Shylock is, of course, an amalgam of stereotypes. He is a miser who will be taught a lesson during the course of the play. He is also a moneylender, and although there were no Jewish moneylenders in England during this period, the Jewish connection to moneylending was well-known. Moneylenders and misers shared the trait of loving money above all else, and thus were fit game for comic retribution.

As a Jew, Shylock was also stereotyped as a man obsessed with the Law and a stranger to mercy. St. Paul had stated the basic difference between Jews and Christians: “But now we are delivered from the Law, being dead unto it, wherein we were holden; that we shulde serve in newnes of Spirit, and not in the oldenes of the letter.” (Rom. 7:6 Geneva Bible).

Beyond the stereotypes are Christian feelings and impressions about non-Christians. The non-Christian is a different kind of being. If he is not, in the words of Gratiano, a human with the soul of an animal (4.1.130-134), he is still a being whose soul is lacking. Thus, he can be a miser seeking revenge or an unnatural father--indeed, a person committed to justice and not to mercy. It is in the Christian perception of the non-Christian that Shylock is described.

Shylock, like Gaunse, knows religion, but only from a “Jewish” perspective, as that perspective was understood by Shakespeare. He cites the example of Jacob’s breeding cattle to his own benefit and against the interests of Laban, to justify his business practices (1.3). Antonio says, “Mark you this Bassanio, the devil can cite Scripture for his purpose.” (1.3.98-99). In his conversation with the joiner Jeremy Pierce, Gaunse refutes the idea that Jesus is the Son of God, for “there was but one God, whoe had noe wife nor chielde;” moreover, as he rhetorically asks Minister Curteys, what need has the “Almighty” God of a son? Such a statement is clever, but to the Christian irrelevant. Neither Shylock nor Gaunse can see theological truth, the truth of Jesus’s mercy, because they are caught in the legalistic Jewish view of scripture. As Antonio says,

9 All textual references to Shakespeare’s The Merchant of Venice are from The Riverside Shakespeare, 1249-1305.
You may as well go stand upon the beach
And bid the main flood bate his usual height;
You may as well use question with the wolf
Why he hath made the ewe bleak for the lamb;
You may as well forbid the mountain pines
To wag their high tops, and to make no noise
When they are fretten with the gusts of heaven;
You may as well do any thing most hard
As seek to soften that—than which what’s harder?—
His Jewish heart! (4.1.71-80)

Shylock’s and Gaunse’s resistance to truth is most apparent in their mocking, or apparent mocking, of Jesus. Gaunse disputes Jesus’s status as the Son of God and Shylock belittles the miracles of Jesus, specifically his casting evil spirits into swine. Responding to an invitation to dine with Antonio and Bassanio, he says that if he comes, it will be

to smell pork, to eat of the habitation which your prophet the Nazarite conjur’d the devil into. I will buy with you, sell with you, talk with you, walk with you, and so following; but I will not eat with you, drink with you, nor pray with you. (1.3.33-38).

(Swine is referred to again by Launcelot upon hearing of Jessica’s conversion, “This making of Christians will raise the price of hogs. If we grow all to be pork-eaters, we shall not shortly have a rasher on the coals for money.” (3.5.24-26)).

The most striking similarities in the description of Gaunse and Shylock turn on words like faithless, infidel and alien. The Mayor and Aldermen find Gaunse “a moste wicked Infidell,” for denied “neyther dothe he beeleeve any Article of our Christyan faithe,” and Shylock’s daughter Jessica is called “issue to a faithless Jew.” (2.4.37). Gratiano says to Shylock, “Now infidel I have you on the hip.” (4.1.334). Launcelot addresses Jessica as “most beautiful pagan, most sweet Jew!” (2.3.10-11); Gaunse holds ungodly and heathenish opinions.10

10 John W. Hales, “Shakespeare and the Jews,” 652-661 on p. 655, after quoting Lucien Wolf’s account of Gaunse’s inquisition, argues that the audience viewing Macbeth at the Globe would connect the third witch’s “blaspheming Jew” to Gaunse. This seems unlikely as Gaunse was not a public figure.
Although strictly speaking, a Jew was neither a heathen nor a pagan, and the terms faithless and infidel are more epithetical than descriptive, both Gaunse and Shylock were, by their very non-Christianness, aliens. By statute, Gaunse was an alien who, because of his religion, could never be denizened. In Venice, Shylock is a tolerated alien, for, as Antonio states:

The Duke cannot deny the course of law;  
For the commodity that strangers have  
With us in Venice, if it be denied,  
Will much impeach the justice of the state,  
Since that the trade and profit of the city  
Consisteth of all nations. (3.3.26-31)

But it is, however, Shylock’s alien status that puts him in jeopardy for seeking Antonio’s life.

If it be proved against an alien,  
That by direct or indirect attempts  
He seek the life of any citizen,  
The party ‘gainst the which he doth contrive  
Shall seize one half his goods; the other half  
Comes to the privy coffer of the state,  
And the offender’s life lies in the mercy  
Of the Duke only, ‘gainst all other voice[.] (4.1.348-357)

Remember the reaction of the mayor and aldermen of Bristol to Gaunse and to his apparent intransigence. Shylock also is intransigent in the face of all pleas for mercy for Antonio, even those of the Duke. The authorities in Bristol solved their problem by sending Gaunse to London, getting him out of town. Certainly there is no reason to think that the London audience would react to the character of Shylock any differently than the citizens of Bristol reacted to the real Jew Joachim Gaunse. We do not know the ending of Gaunse’s story, but the playwright is able to make a “neat” resolution. The miser, moneylender, and infidel Shylock is a fit object of comic retribution, but he is actually saved. Mercy triumphs. Shylock, willing to die rather than live a pauper, in the end retains part of his wealth and his life by agreeing to convert to Christianity. The comedy has a happy ending.
The modern difficulties we have today with *The Merchant of Venice*, especially post-Holocaust, diminish some when we understand that in the light of history, Shylock, the Jew, was viewed as the citizens of Bristol viewed Joachim Gaunse—as a wicked infidel in need of Christian knowledge, in need of the mercy Christ offered all men.

*Michael T. Walton (Salt Lake City, Utah) wrote frequently on the history of chemistry and medicine. He co-edited Reading the Book of Nature: The Other Side of the Scientific Revolution with Allen G. Debus. He recently published *Genesis and the Chemical Philosophy* and *Anthonius Margaritha and the Jewish Faith*. His interests included alchemy and creation accounts, Paracelsianism, and Hebrew studies and the hermetic tradition. Michael passed away 23 August 2013. Michael was an enthusiastic and active member of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association. He will be missed.*
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This essay focuses on Julian’s intended audience, claiming that it is more limited than one might at first assume. This leads to a discussion of Julian’s use of paradox, her abrupt changes in modes of discourse, and the conclusion that unless her work is read according to the Augustinian rubric of love, it will be misunderstood.

Readers will recall that Julian of Norwich was an anchorite in the English city of Norwich in the late 14th and early 15th century. During her enclosure, she wrote two texts about visions she experienced in 1373, at the age of thirty, while lying on what she (and others) thought was her deathbed. Julian’s first, generally called the Short Text, is thought by many to have been written soon after her visions occurred. The text called the Long Text, written twenty years after the visionary experience, refines and augments the Short Text. Both texts, but especially the Long Text, showcase Julian’s remarkably inquisitive, poetic, and analytic spirit, and contain doctrines—such as the “grand deed” that God will perform at the end of time to “make all things well”—that have proved provocative and fruitful to academic and religious readers (often these groups coincide) of the past century.

Consequently, Julian, virtually unknown until the beginning of the twentieth century, has experienced a great surge in popularity in recent years. Moreover, Julian’s sympathetic nature, her theolog-

1 Thanks to Charlotte Gross for reading and commenting on this essay as well as continuing to challenge me to think more closely and carefully about Julian’s work. Thanks also to Gina Bellissai Mills, Robert Erle Barham, and the anonymous readers at Quidditas for their helpful and insightful commentary.

2 All quotations from the Short and the Long Text are from Watson and Jenkins, eds., The Writings of Julian of Norwich.
ical concerns, and her obvious intellectual powers have found correspondence and admiration in many religious and academic circles, and her unique historical position as the first known English woman writer has been of particular interest to literary critics. As a result, the importance of her work has been elevated, and the work itself also has been appropriated often by certain groups; for many, Julian has become “one of us;” for others, a fit antagonist to Church authorities; and in both groups, the historical framework of her Showings has been somewhat neglected.

One could reasonably object that she claims to write “a revelation of love” that should be applied “generally,” and, more, that her intellect, which we witness in active engagement with perennially difficult theological problems, is a match for any theologian’s. In what follows, I attempt to deal with these objections, though not by attempting to refute them outright by claiming that Julian meant something quite different from what she said, nor that she is inferior to any male theological writer, but rather by seeing whether her terminology, her expectations regarding audience, and her place in intellectual history need some qualification. More specifically, I am interested in understanding what bearing Julian’s historically-conditioned Christian community and traditional Christian ideas of truth and interpretation should have on our reading of the Showings. My purpose in all this is to counteract those mis-readings just mentioned and to show that a proper reading of Julian involves understanding her ultimate goal for writing—the manifestation of God’s love.

We can begin to understand Julian’s historical community by first of all considering late medieval Norwich, which was, after London, one of the most (if not the most) populated and wealthy cities in England. The city had a cathedral which housed a Benedictine priory and “one of the finest libraries in England;”

---

3 Colledge and Walsh, eds., A Book of Showings, 39. Though Showings refers to both the Short and Long Texts, I use it here and throughout to refer to the Long Text, the focus of most critical commentary.

4 Tanner, Church in Late Medieval Norwich, 35.
religious houses, and probably over forty parish churches, including St. Julian’s, where “Julian” herself resided. And though she was bodily confined to a cell, Julian was not necessarily as isolated as one might think; for one, she had at least two serving maids, as we learn from the 1415 will of John Plumpton, a citizen of Norwich (who leaves each maid twelve pence).

These maids probably came into contact with Julian by providing her with food and other necessities by means of one of three windows typically built into an anchoritic cell. The other two windows offered her further interaction: one may have faced the altar and allowed Julian to observe services, and another opened outward, perhaps toward the road. It was through this third window that Julian was able to communicate with any visitors and thereby inject herself into the broader community of Norwich. But assuming that Julian was literate (and she almost certainly was), there also existed for her the broader community of past and present Christian writers. Although parish churches apparently had little beyond “service-books and a few standard works of Canon Law,” a parish-specific scarcity of books does not mean that Julian was not able to gain access to them by other means. If nothing else, she may have received works aurally, as did Margery Kempe by the generosity of her spiritual director. But it is probable that she may have owned a few books herself or been allowed to borrow some from, say, her priest or other professional religious in Norwich.

So, potentially at least, Julian had the religious, literate element of Norwich as an audience, and even though some estimate

5 Tanner, *Church in Late Medieval Norwich*, 35.
6 Colledge and Walsh, eds., *A Book of Showings*, 34.
7 Cannon, “Enclosure,” 109-123.
8 The extent of this community largely depends on Julian’s knowledge of Latin.
9 Tanner, *Church in Late Medieval Norwich*, 35.
literacy as low as 5% at this time, there are obviously difficulties in coming to any solid conclusions about the actual rates, including the fact that the 14th-century idea of literacy was often based only on an ability to read and write in Latin. Whatever the literacy rate may have been, it was rapidly increasing, especially in the vernacular. Grammar schools accessible to the middle, and sometimes lower, classes were first established in the 14th century, and students there were at least exposed to Latin grammar and literature and certainly learned to read and write in English. The French romances and Latin texts, including mystical writings, were also being translated for the first time and, of course, the Wycliffite Bible was produced in 1380. There is, further, the popularity of Chaucer’s and Langland’s vernacular work(s) and the establishment of the book trade in London during the 1390s. Probably never before was there the possibility of a text being as widely disseminated as it could have been then.

Julian’s audience was, then, potentially much larger than Norwich, and she may have intended it to be so. Fourteenth-century mystics Richard Rolle and Walter Hilton almost certainly anticipated (and, indeed, found) an audience beyond their immediate area. But, as far as Julian is concerned, this is all circumstantial evidence. What do we know of Julian’s own intentions concerning her audience? We can discover some of these by looking first at the changes she made from the Short to the Long Text. In the Short Text, she seems to consider her audience as fellow contemplatives. Thus, in the Short Text, during her discussion of the vision of the “hazlenut,” Julian says that “every man and woman who desires to live contem-

11 Coleman, Medieval Readers and Writers, 24.
12 Coleman, Medieval Readers and Writers, 41.
13 Robert G. Babcock (professor of Classics, UNC-Chapel Hill), in discussion with the author, January 2011.
platively needs to have some understanding of this [revelation],”¹⁵ in the Long Text, Julian generalizes the application: “We need to have understanding of this.”¹⁶ Again, in the Short Text, she writes, “in this I learned that every contemplative soul that is inclined to behold and seek God will see [Mary] and pass [beyond her], by contemplation, to God;”¹⁷ whereas she reduces this in the Long Text to “by which I learned that our soul will not ever have rest until it comes to him.”¹⁸ Throughout the Long Text, we see this desire on Julian’s part to address her “evyn [fellow] Christen” rather than just other contemplatives. In XIII, she is amused by the ultimate impotence of the devil and wishes for her “fellow Christians” to laugh along with her; elsewhere, she declares that she is filled with compassion for “all [her] fellow Christians;”¹⁹ in VIII.22-24, she says that her love is aroused toward her “fellow Christians, that they might see and know the same things that I saw, for I wish it to be a comfort to them. For all of this vision was intended generally.”²⁰ These are just a few of several examples of Julian calling “all” to participate in her visions. We could therefore reasonably claim that Julian’s intended and potential audience was by no means limited to her fellow contemplatives or even to the city of Norwich. Rather, her work seems to be intended for any “fellow Christian” literate in English.²¹

15 “Of this nedes ilke man and woman to hafe knawyng as desires to lyeve contem- platyfelye” (IV.38)
16 “Of this nedeth us to have knowinge, . . .” (V.20).
17 “And in this was I lerede that ilke saule contemplatif e to whilke es giffen to luke and seke god shalle se hire and passe unto God by contemplation” (XIII.23-24).
18 “Wherin I was lerned that oure soule shalle never have reste tille it come into him, . . .” (XXVI.2-3). Both of these examples are provided by Windeatt, Julian of Norwich and Her Audience.
19 “alle my evencristen” (XXVIII.3).
20 “In alle this I was mekille sterede in cherite to mine evencristen, that they might alle see and know the same that I sawe, for I wolde that it were comfort to them. For alle this sight was shewde generalle.”
21 And there’s the possibility of her work being translated into another language, as Hilton, for example, was translated into French.
“Fellow Christian,” “all,” and “generally” are, admittedly, pretty broad categories, but are they as broad as we are initially tempted to think? Does Julian try to limit her audience in any way? I think so. First, I think it is important to understand that although Julian desires ostensibly a large, heterogeneous audience, she nevertheless exerts great control over the interpretation of her text. For, as Nicholas Watson points out, it is impossible to disentangle Julian’s revelations from her interpretation of them. She “sees” her insights into her revelations often in the same way that she sees the revelations themselves. Obviously, this means that the interpretation of the visions is as divinely inspired as the visions themselves, and that as a result, the reader is not free to come to his or her own interpretation of them, even if they are shown “generally.”

Julian limits interpretation more overtly by constantly reminding the reader that her work is subordinated to “Holy Church.” In the first place, she says, it is by the teaching of the Church that she desires to have an experience of Christ’s passion; moreover, in everything she believes “as Holy Church believes, preaches, and teaches. For the faith of Holy Church . . . stood continually in my sight, willing and intending never to receive anything that might be contrary to that faith;” Christ himself tells her that he is “that which Holy Church preaches and teaches,” and in spite of the seeming dissonance created by the juxtaposition of her visions and Church teaching, she claims that she “was not drawn away by that from any point of the faith that Holy Church teaches [one] to believe.”

22 Watson, “The Trinitarian Hermeneutic.”

23 Lewis, “Directing Reader Response.”

24 II.66.

25 “But in all thing I beleve as holy church preacheth and techeth. For the faith of holy church, which I had beforehand understonde—and, as I hope, by the grace of God willefully kept in use and custome—stode continually in my sighte, willing and meaning never to receive anything that might be contrary thereto” (IX.18-21).

26 XXVI.6-7.

27 “. . . yet I was not drawen therby from any point of the faith that holy church techeth me to beleve” (XXXIII.13).
The textual history of Julian’s work is also worth considering. The only two extant manuscripts of the Long Text are both 17th-century products. One likely originated in a religious community in northern France, and the other was owned by a private citizen in Rouen, and may have originated in the conventual library of Cambrai or Paris. The Short Text survives in one 15th-century manuscript, is of English origin, and ended up in the library of an English Catholic family.28

This paucity of manuscripts and, until recently, a virtually non-existent audience indicate that Julian’s actual, immediate audience was very small and monastic. Whether Julian ever intended this is, of course, another question. What is more apparent, however, is that Julian’s first readers most likely tried to control access to her works. I make this claim based not only on the limited dissemination of the full-text manuscripts mentioned above but also on the evidence of another 15th-century manuscript that contains an edited version of the Long Text. This edited version, one part of the Westminster text, which also includes two (English) commentaries on the psalms and an extract from Walter Hilton’s Scale of Perfection,29 was evidently intended for a “mixed” audience—that is, those who, according to Hilton’s advice, “mix the works of an active life with the spiritual works of a contemplative life.”30 In it, Julian’s text has been edited so that most of her theological speculation—and in particular, her unorthodox desire to have a “bodily sight” of Mary—is removed.

The intentions of Julian’s earliest readers are obviously no substitute for those of Julian herself. But they seem somewhat suggestive, for both Julian and her immediate audience share similar backgrounds, contexts, and religious beliefs; that is, there is much more resemblance between Julian and a 15th-century recluse or nun

28 Colledge and Walsh, eds., A Book of Showings.
29 Kempster, “A Question of Audience.”
30 Quoted in Kempster.
than there is between her and any modern reader. Now one could very reasonably call this claim into question—perhaps by asserting that Julian has finally found her ideal in today’s audience, who can receive her work without the unnecessary encumbrance of Church dogma. Indeed, Julian is writing at a time when the Church authorities in England have begun to make their presence known: among other displays of power, there is a push for the right to execute heretics. So of course Julian is going to go through the requisite political dance-steps in order to align herself with Church authorities. Though this is probably somewhat true, insofar as Julian probably realized that theology could have political consequences, it is not entirely accurate to think that what she really wanted was to jettison received doctrine altogether, that she envisioned some ideal world in which the “higher judgment” of the Showings would substitute for Church teaching. Probably none of us thinks that of her.

And yet, many of Julian’s readers continue to believe that she is either disingenuous or at least ill-at-ease in the Church of her day. Thus, Denise Baker is moved to argue that Julian “rejects the anthropomorphic characterization of a punitive God,” and “interrogates the retributive premises of orthodox theodicy,” while David Aers points out that her doctrines have heretical implications. What these critics may overlook is a deliberate and fruitful tension between Julian’s work and Church teaching. The intentional use of such tension may strike us, the inheritors of the Reformation, as odd. We are much more likely to consider it as a sign of the coming storm. But Julian’s immediate audience was, of course, in a very different place, though many of them certainly perceived trouble in the Church and were anxious about controversies over Scripture and the Church’s authority. Julian, however, is no John Wyclif. Nor-

31 McKisack, The Fourteenth Century.
32 Baker, Julian of Norwich’s Showings, 106.
33 Aers, “Sin, Reconciliation, and Redemption.” See also Nicholas Watson’s review of Aers (Speculum 86[2011]: 151-153) which agrees on many points with the present assessment.
wich is not Oxford, and the *Showings* is not the *Trialogus*. Julian’s immediate audience would have easily perceived such a difference and likely have noticed (or unconsciously benefited from) the tension in her work—a kind of tension that we also see used in the Scriptures and Christian tradition.

To be more specific, I am referring to the use of paradox, by which I mean “an absurd or self-contradictory statement or proposition . . . which investigation, analysis, or explanation may nevertheless prove to be well-founded or true.”

Nicholas Watson mentions that Julian likes to create “gaps” in her work that are “brimful of meaning,” and that one of these gaps is found “between her visionary experience and Christian orthodoxy.” That is, rather than positioning her work over against Church teaching, Julian is trying to counterbalance received doctrine, to point, as paradox often does, to some higher truth. It is, after all, one of the Christian tradition’s foundational beliefs that truth cannot be fully expressed or grasped in the temporal world. As Paul says in 1 Corinthians 13:12, “We see now through a glass in a dark manner.” Paradox is one of the ways in which the Bible and tradition proclaim and embrace this belief. Jesus’s use of paradox is especially noteworthy: “He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that shall lose his life for me shall find it;” “So shall the last be called first and the first last;” in the gospel of John, Jesus, who identifies himself as the disciples’ “Lord and Master,” performs the servant’s task of washing their feet and tells them to do the same.

The New Testament contains the apparently contradictory idea that both faith and works are necessary for salvation: “For by grace you are saved through faith: and that not of yourselves, for it

---

34 “Paradox.” *Oxford English Dictionary.*
35 Watson, “Julian of Norwich.”
36 Matt. 10:39 (Douay-Rheims).
37 Matt. 20:16.
38 John 13.
is the gift of God. Not of works, that no man may glory”\textsuperscript{39} in contrast to “faith also, if it have not works, is dead in itself.”\textsuperscript{40} At the beginning of his \textit{Confessions}, St. Augustine delightedly muses on the paradox of God’s omnipresence: “. . . are You not in every place at once in the totality of Your being, while yet nothing contains You wholly?”\textsuperscript{41} And again, he characterizes God as “suffering no change and changing all things . . . ever in action, ever at rest . . . angry yet unperturbed by anger.”\textsuperscript{42}

Julian is certainly writing within such a tradition and its influence on her way of perceiving God and truth is evident on even a local level. In X.62-63, she claims that “seeking [God] is as good as beholding [him]”\textsuperscript{43} and meditates upon the paradoxes of the divine-human relationship: “And thus I saw [Christ] and I sought Him, and I had Him and I lacked Him.”\textsuperscript{44} And as I mentioned earlier, tension is created by Julian’s unorthodox desire to have a “bodily” vision of Mary, which Jesus himself initially appears to offer her before giving her a “gostly” vision instead. Such tension, Kempster points out, “could easily be misinterpreted by a lay audience untrained in theological debate, but for Julian it is one of the tools of the trade.”\textsuperscript{45} She “embraces the tension between mystical experience and traditional orthodoxy, and a deeper theological understanding is born as a result.”\textsuperscript{46} It will be seen that the fruits of this tension are dependent upon a firm commitment to and knowledge of both the “lower judgment”( as Julian puts it) of the church and the “higher judgment” of her vision.

\textsuperscript{39} Eph. 2:8.  
\textsuperscript{40} James 2:17.  
\textsuperscript{41} I. III.  
\textsuperscript{42} I. IV.  
\textsuperscript{43} “seeking is as good as beholding”  
\textsuperscript{44} “And thus I saw him and sought him, and I had him and wanted him” (X.14).  
\textsuperscript{45} Kempster, “A Question of Audience,” 276.  
\textsuperscript{46} Kempster, “A Question of Audience,” 278.
Julian, contrary to what some might think, is not a system builder; she is not interested in “interrogating” or “rejecting” traditional orthodoxy—which implies some antagonistic, history-of-ideas role—but rather with moving the affections of her audience. The Showings is a “revelation of love” and is, when all is said and done, organized to effect a spiritual response from her readers. This explains, of course, why Julian’s work is so difficult to analyze: she is not striving for the coherence necessary for the establishment of a school of theology or philosophy. She is interested, ultimately, in love. Love, she says in the Short Text, is the “meaning” of her revelations. The meaning of this, of love as the hermeneutic by which to interpret the divine, originates with St. Augustine in On Christian Doctrine, wherein he says that the “fulfillment and end of Scripture” is the love of God and our neighbor and love itself he defines by “the Lord’s cross.” Julian assumes for her audience not only a Christological idea of love but also a desire to practice it through the reading of her work.

As I see it, there are a couple of conclusions that follow from all of this. First, that Julian’s intended audience is perhaps smaller than we might at first suppose. Although the external evidence is admittedly inconclusive, at the very least, it does not seem to imply that Julian desired a universal audience even in late medieval England. The internal evidence implies that Julian sought a certain kind of reader: someone who was committed to the Church’s authority, familiar with the Scriptures and Augustinian theology, accustomed to the tensions within Christian orthodoxy, and extremely conscious of personal sin—someone, in short, similar to a priest or a member of a religious order.

47 my emphasis.

48 St. Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, I.35: “Omnium igitur quae dicta sunt ex quo de rebus tractamus haec summa est, ut intellegatur legis et omnium divinarum scripturarum plenitudo et finis esse dilectio rei qua fruendum est et rei quae nobiscum ea re frui potest, . . .”

49 St. Augustine, On Christian Doctrine, II. 41: “. . . ut in caritate radicati et fundati possimus comprehendere cum omnibus sanctis quae sit latitude et longitude et altitudo et profundum, id est crucem domini.”
Second, it follows that we, as 21st-century readers of Julian, must consider her within her historical context and the Christian tradition if we are to avoid misinterpreting her. Further, according to Julian, if we want to fully understand and benefit from the Showings, we have to interpret it under the auspices of love. Though we as scholars are not used to reading this way, in order to understand Julian aright, we must constantly remind ourselves that her primary concern is moving the affections of her readers toward God, and that she will use any tool to hand to achieve this goal. In her famous Parable of the Lord and Servant, for example, one sees her move blithely from the logical to the allegorical, not because of confusion, incompetence, or whatever else, but because of her desire for readers to know love in the fullest sense, with both the heart and the mind.

The reader, then, must always keep Julian’s goal of divine love in mind when reading her work, knowing that in an instant, her mode of discourse will dart in another direction in order to keep its quarry in sight. In short, to approach the Showings with the merely acquisitive intellect is to misunderstand it. Julian, though possessing logical and analytical gifts in abundance, is more than these—just as divine love, which also encompasses reason, is necessarily more than reason.

Luke William Mills is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill completing a dissertation on religious language in the Chaucerian fabliaux and their sources and analogues.
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Perhaps nothing is more valued in the modern classroom than student engagement. Pedagogical strategies and exercises for encouraging active learning are both wide-ranging and plentiful. Among the most popular at present is Barnard College’s Reacting to the Past (RTTP) role-playing games: “Reacting to the Past (RTTP) consists of elaborate games, set in the past, in which students are assigned roles informed by classic texts in the history of ideas. Class sessions are run entirely by students; instructors advise and guide students and grade their oral and written work. It seeks to draw students into the past, promote engagement with big ideas, and improve intellectual and academic skills.”² RTTP’s presence in a growing number of college curricula and positive responses in the Chronicle of Higher Education and in sessions at professional conferences, including the most recent meeting of the American Historical Association, point to its significant impact.

Research on the benefits of the series for students points to increased self-esteem and openness to diversity of opinions as well

1. See Barnard’s “Reacting to the Past” website for an introduction to the RTTP project, information on published titles and games under development, and RTTP conferences and workshops: http://reacting.barnard.edu/ (accessed October 5, 2013).

as improved rhetorical skills. The use of elaborate role-playing games is not without its critics, however, some of whom charge that such exercises absorb valuable class time spent more profitably in other tasks and that students frequently have difficulty distinguishing between fact and opinion during the games themselves.

It was not the popularity or the controversy of RTTP that inspired me to create a course exercise I dubbed “Virtual Village: Witch-Hunt,” although I knew about the series when I began development of an Honors colloquium on witchcraft in early modern England for students of the Centennial Honors College at Western Illinois University. When I first considering proposing an Honors course, I wanted a topic studied by scholars in a variety of disciplines to draw students pursuing diverse degree programs, and early modern witchcraft came immediately to mind. The status of witchcraft as a topic of perennial student interest and the robust and relatively accessible historiographical debates in witchcraft studies had already allowed me to offer several undergraduate and graduate seminars on the subject, to make the study of witchcraft a component of the final unit of my British survey course, and to supervise both an M.A. thesis analyzing English demonologies and an Honors thesis focused on artistic representations of early modern witches.

A variety of texts exists to support student investigations of early modern witchcraft, and I have employed several with success. For my undergraduate research seminars in witchcraft, I paired Alan Steven J. Stroessner, Laurie Susser Beckerman, and Alexis Whittaker, “All the World’s a Stage? Consequences of a Role-Playing Pedagogy on Psychological Factors and Writing and Rhetorical Skill in College Undergraduates.” *Journal of Educational Psychology* 101, no. 3 (2009): 605-20.

See Berrett, “Mob Rule.”

Charles Kors and Edward Peters’s robust 400-page primary source witchcraft reader, *Witchcraft in Europe, 400-1700: a Documentary History*, with a collection of scholarly essays: *Witchcraft in Early Modern Europe: Studies in Culture and Belief*, edited by Jonathan Barry, Marianne Hester, and Gareth Roberts. At the graduate level, I assigned *Witchcraft Historiography* from the Palgrave Advances series and P. G. Maxwell-Stuart’s translation of *The Malleus Maleficarum* to provide students with an understanding of the field of witchcraft studies in preparation to select a topic of interest for their seminar papers. All four books were suitable as common readings for History majors and graduate students in courses emphasizing the study of historiography and historical methods.

Unlike my research-oriented courses on witchcraft, however, my Honors course was not intended for an audience with prior training in historical thinking and writing. Because I wanted to engage academically talented non-majors in the study of a complex topic far outside students’ areas of academic expertise as well as to create a popular course that could compete successfully with well-established Honors offerings from other departments on campus, I decided to create a mock witchcraft trial exercise. I believed it would offer the Honors students an opportunity to apply in an experiential fashion something of what they had learned during the colloquium. I developed the one-credit course to be taught face-to-face as a seminar for the first half of a traditional 16-week semester and made the “Virtual Village” game the class’s culminating experience.

The course design emphasized student engagement and participation. For the first five weeks, the students and I read and

---


talked our way through a brief text combining a secondary narrative with short excerpts of a range of primary sources: James Sharpe’s *Witchcraft in Early Modern England*. Then each student selected an academic journal article available through JSTOR to review and present to the class. I created a list of articles for students to choose from with their diverse fields of study in mind: for Law Enforcement and Justice Administration majors, I incorporated articles emphasizing law and trial procedures, for example; for Theatre and English majors, I selected pieces discussing witchcraft on the early modern stage; and for Religious Studies majors, I included pieces focusing on demonologies authored by clergymen.

The final class session was reserved for the mock trials, although foundations for the exercise had been established much earlier in the semester: I presented the game’s framework several weeks before the final session and used the Discussion board feature of our course page at the university’s distance learning platform (Desire2Learn) to help students to get into character in preparation for the day of the trials. I assigned each student a personality from the sixteenth-century village of Middlewich in Cheshire, based loosely on records I had studied for my dissertation, and each character was part of a team of villagers of similar status: village leaders, church leaders, merchants and artisans, laborers, tenant farmers, and landlords. I created various guides to explain the socioeconomic, religious, and political history of the village as well as its hierarchy. Fresh from their readings of Sharpe and their selected scholarly journal articles, students quickly gained a solid sense of village structures without too much prompting from me. To personalize the

---


10 My thanks to Desire2Learn for permission to reproduce screen captures from my course page in this article and to Roger Runquist in the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Research at Western Illinois University who helped me edit the images.

game further, I developed modest character biographies and a “Relationship Guide” to allow students to think more concretely about the interdependence of early modern villagers as well as potential points of tension among the village’s residents (see Image 1 below for a student’s visual rendering of connections within the village). On trial day in class, a role of the die gave power to one of the teams to accuse a fellow villager of witchcraft, and the trials began. A representative from each group served as a trial witness, offering evidence contesting or supporting allegations of the use of harmful magic. I acted as a visiting assize justice and rendered final verdicts based on each team’s vote to convict or acquit the accused (see Image 2 below).
After repeated offerings that earned enthusiastic reviews from students, my own appointment as the Associate Director of Western’s Centennial Honors College, and the university’s encouragement of new online course offerings, I volunteered to teach the course as a four-week online summer section in July 2013. I promoted with great vigor and packed the class with 22 students. Then came the task of figuring out how to convert a successful real-time exercise involving direct student interaction into one that would need to play out asynchronously in a distance-learning format and absent students’ ability to respond to one another with the immediacy afforded by the physical classroom environment. This turned out to be far more challenging than I had anticipated.

Without the opportunity to offer students an opening lecture presentation on the subject that was responsive to their questions, I quickly realized the importance of selecting a text that was both
accessible to students and capable of introducing various scholarly interpretations of the topic. Further, I wanted to provide students access to primary sources so they could get a taste of the kinds of evidence scholars draw upon to inform their conclusions. In this way I hoped to provide sufficient information to curb the most egregious ahistorical errors in the role-playing game at the course’s end.

I thought about replacing the course text with a book that delivered additional information (Sharpe’s book is a brisk 100 pages of narrative and 30 of source excerpts) but ultimately decided that its relatively unique combination of accessibility, brevity, and sources of multiple types would work best for the four-week summer section. Particularly attractive to me was Sharpe’s “Documents” section, which opens with the Elizabethan witchcraft statute of 1563 and moves through selections from demonologists, witchcraft trial accounts, defamation records, and Quarter Sessions petitions and examinations dating from the Elizabethan period to the early eighteenth century. The book supplements the documentary record with visual evidence in the form of plates from witchcraft pamphlets and other published literature of the period. I uploaded an introductory PowerPoint to introduce students to active debates in the field and to define and address key terms with which non-majors might be unfamiliar, Reformation, assizes, and defamation among them. I also provided a guide for reading and interpreting primary sources, as that task was new to many of them, and hoped for the best.

In face-to-face offerings of the class, I am able to address misconceptions about early modern witchcraft at the point they first creep into class discussions. Students come to the study of the subject with many preconceived notions, in part as the result of memories of high school coverage of the Salem trials and in part because of contemporary popular culture images and stereotypes. In the online environment, staying ahead of misinterpretations proved a more difficult task. I structured a series of timed discussion exercises that
required students to respond to selected questions I posted about each week’s assigned readings. In order to earn participation credit, students had to post according to certain guidelines: an original post answering one question about Sharpe’s chapters and another about corresponding primary sources by Fridays at midnight and then a follow-up post responding to another student by Sundays at midnight (see Image 3 below).

The challenge came in the form of monitoring student work, as the accessibility of the distance learning platform turned out to be both a blessing and a curse. Daytime posts offered an opportunity for me to correct problematic analyses and offer remarks synthesizing multiple responses to point out common themes; nighttime posts, however—and they were plentiful—allowed for the demons of misinterpretation to roam. A few mornings I awoke to the unwelcome discovery of an erroneous interpretation or explanation subsequently endorsed by a handful of other late night posts. Rather than respond to each student who contributed to the wayward discussion individually, I instead replied to the initial post to point out the need for modification or correction and addressed my remarks to the class at large. I did so in what I hope was a rather cheerful “this is a teachable moment” fashion, so as not to embarrass anyone but also to be mindful of the fact that most students in the class would have at least skimmed all posts in searching for another message to respond to, which meant misinformation was not in fact confined to the thread’s participants. In general these problems were few and far between, and I was able to let students communicate with one another, agreeing and disagreeing with interpretations of the primary source documents and assessing the theories of witchcraft Sharpe discusses in his text. In order to wrap up each week’s discussion, I did author a final post, drawing attention to distinct issues and points of debate raised in student responses and clearing up any lingering points of uncertainty or confusions that I could readily identify (I also created a Questions thread and encouraged students to post concerns there or contact me by email).
A more daunting task came in the form of structuring the “Virtual Village” exercise, which has now become a significant part of the course’s draw for students. The act of transforming the class into a sixteenth-century village sounded simple in my advertisements of the course but required a rather Herculean effort, as every aspect of the elaborate trial process had to be explicitly and thoroughly described in written form rather than explained and clarified in the classroom. Early in the month-long course it became apparent that the kind of synchronous mock trial experience I used for face-to-face courses would not work well in the distance learning platform. I had students who worked full time, others in different time zones, and some taking other face-to-face courses in the same summer session. I realized I would never be able to get everyone together for the 150-minute block of time I would need to run the trials as I did in the classroom. What emerged to take the place of that old format was a considerably different structure: a three-day
visit by a visiting assize justice to hear evidence concerning a series of accusations of witchcraft.

The first step involved introducing students to their characters and explaining the group structure of our virtual village. The documents I produced to explain the village for older, face-to-face sections of the course worked fairly well here; indeed, for a group of students used to communicating with me and with their classmates through Discussion posts and emails alone, the game’s first requirement, that each student should post an introduction in character, was a simple task to complete. One thing I was not prepared for in the first round of posts was the students’ creation of rather elaborate backstories to explain their relationships with others in the village. I provided a few basic details, but the students moved far beyond them to tell stories of long-ago slights, former friendships and romantic relationships that had soured, and personal tragedies and economic losses. In so doing they were clearly drawing from sources we had examined that emphasized the long history of conflict that often culminated in accusations of witchcraft. One of Sharpe’s excerpts, a church court defamation case from 1617 contained in the Cause Papers at York, recounted Thomas Brooke saying of Isabel Beamond, “she is a wich & hath done me harme in my goods these xiiiij yeares last past,” for example. The students thus created a far more elaborate early modern social network than I had anticipated, and the depth of these constructed personas made the subsequent phases of the game considerably more satisfying.

I had been worried that it would be difficult to “become” the village without face-to-face contact, but in fact, the online environment allowed students to mimic an early modern community more successfully than the once-a-week classroom exchanges offered by the traditional course delivery method. Social networking through the distance learning platform permits and in some ways encourages the kind of immediacy and relentlessness involved in contesting

12 Sharpe, Witchcraft in Early Modern England, 112.
reputations experienced by early modern men and women. Confining the village exercise to class sessions meant that time spent in character is relatively limited; using Discussion boards, in contrast, opens the possibility of making the contestation constant, and a number of the students embraced that possibility with enthusiasm (I dare say a few were glued to their computers, as gauged by the speed and frequency of their posts and replies). I raised the stakes frequently by posting as a notorious gossip, priming the pump with tales of woe: I related sightings of strange animals likely to be familiars, rumors of disputes, and reports of sick children. Each new report heightened tensions, as students began, hesitantly at first and then more confidently, to point fingers at those they believed to be responsible (see Image 4 below).

![Image 4. The online “Virtual Village” headquarters.](image-url)
To encourage students to develop skills in teamwork, I required each of the six socioeconomic groups to formulate and submit a Team Strategy Paper. This document required students to discuss the goals and values of their group, to identify the other groups they believed to share those goals and values, and to distinguish the groups they believed to threaten the order and safety of the village. Teams were required to collaborate by email or chat to write the Strategy Paper, which concluded with a list of their top three suspects—those individuals the teams would accuse if given the opportunity—and explanations for why those three were most likely the cause of the village’s recent troubles.

This final piece in place, the trials began (see Image 5 below). Each team had to have a member to act as a Witness, to give testimony against the accused (following the parameters set by their own Strategy Paper), and another to serve as Spokesperson, who would privately email me the team’s vote to convict or acquit and then publicly post the team’s vote and its rationale on the Discussion board. Obviously, accusations of witchcraft in England were judged by visiting assize justices rather than villagers, and so I built into the game a clear violation of historical accuracy. My motives, however, were based on a desire to distribute the workload fairly among the students: since one team member compiled the Strategy Paper, and another member or two served as a trial Witness, I wanted to create a third role so that all members of the teams had to participate and to practice articulating why their group would have felt about the accused the way they did. By this point in the game, most students were identifying exclusively with their characters in their course communications. I often received emails signed by sixteenth-century residents of Middlewich, something that was a rather encouraging sign of their engagement, as I did not require the practice (see Image 6 below).
Trial #1 ELEANOR KINSEY Tuesday-Wednesday, July 23-24.

This Discussion thread will contain two different sets of posts:

1. The first set of posts consists of Witness testimony from Witnesses from all 6 teams (posted before 5:00 am Central Time Wednesday, July 24).

Witnesses will respond briefly to the following questions:

1. How well do you know the accused?
2. What is your opinion of the reputation of the accused? What have you heard about the accused, and do you believe those reports?
3. Do you believe the accused is likely to have committed acts of harmful magic? Why or why not?

2. The second set of posts consists of Spokesperson public rationales of team votes to convict or acquit the accused, following the private vote emailed previously to Justice McNabb (posted by 9:00 am Central Time on Saturday, July 27).

This post, 3-4 sentences in length, will explain what verdict the Team reached and why (why the accused guilty or not guilty), according to the determination of that team's members. Those rationale posts must be posted before 9:00 am Central Time on Saturday.

ELEANOR KINSEY IS THE ACCUSED FOR THIS TRIAL. SEE THE ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR EACH DAY'S TRIAL HERE.

Available after Tuesday, July 23, 2013 8:00 PM CDT
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Trial #2 HIGH WRIGHT Wednesday-Thursday, July 24-25.

This Discussion thread will contain two different sets of posts:

1. The first set of posts consists of Witness testimony from Witnesses from all 6 teams (posted before 5:00 am Central Time Thursday, July 25).

Witnesses will respond briefly to the following questions:

1. How well do you know the accused?
2. What is your opinion of the reputation of the accused? What have you heard about the accused, and do you believe those reports?
3. Do you believe the accused is likely to have committed acts of harmful magic? Why or why not?

2. The second set of posts consists of Spokesperson public rationales of team votes to convict or acquit the accused, following the private vote emailed previously to Justice McNabb (posted by 9:00 am Central Time on Thursday, July 25).

This post, 3-4 sentences in length, will explain what verdict the Team reached and why (why the accused guilty or not guilty), according to the determination of that team's members. Those rationale posts must be posted before 9:00 am Central Time on Thursday.

HIGH WRIGHT IS THE ACCUSED FOR THIS TRIAL. SEE THE ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR EACH DAY'S TRIAL HERE.

Available after Wednesday, July 24, 2013 7:25 PM CDT
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Trial #3 AGNES CALTER Thursday-Friday, July 25-26.

This Discussion thread will contain two different sets of posts:

1. The first set of posts consists of Witness testimony from Witnesses from all 6 teams (posted before 5:00 am Central Time Friday, July 26).

Witnesses will respond briefly to the following questions:

1. How well do you know the accused?
2. What is your opinion of the reputation of the accused? What have you heard about the accused, and do you believe those reports?
3. Do you believe the accused is likely to have committed acts of harmful magic? Why or why not?

2. The second set of posts consists of Spokesperson public rationales of team votes to convict or acquit the accused, following the private vote emailed previously to Justice McNabb (posted by 9:00 am Central Time on Friday, July 27).

This post, 3-4 sentences in length, will explain what verdict the Team reached and why (why the accused guilty or not guilty), according to the determination of that team's members. Those rationale posts must be posted before 9:00 am Central Time on Friday.

Image 5. The trial threads at the course Discussion board.

To: "Jennifer L. McNabb" <jlmcnabb@uw.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 3:10:23 PM
Subject: With Trial 1

Justice McNabb,

Thomas Cranage and Humphrey Vernor, lend Eleanor Kinsey not guilty. Mistress Kinsey is a dear friend of ours and we know her well. We believe her to be wrongly accused. She is a devoted Christian and a very hard worker. She owns the pub in town now that her husband has passed away. She is at times hard handed, but being an owner of a pub she has to be able to control her unruly patrons. Mr. Kinsey is grateful to have had a caring husband who has taken care of her before he died, and even now that he is gone is still taking care of her.

Thank you,

Humphrey Vernor and Thomas Cranage

Image 6. An email vote from the first trial.
Of course, things did not always run according to plan, as confusion developed in some groups about which students were taking on which roles (a communication problem I required them to work out among themselves), and some students gently abused the timed elements of the trials. Timing was key to the exercise: I revealed the name of the accused each night at 9:00 p.m., and then before 5:00 p.m. the following day, Witnesses had to testify, and Spokespersons had to email me an official vote for each group; by 9:00 p.m., Spokespersons had to reveal their vote publicly (the need for a private email vote that preceded the public declaration stemmed from desire to avoid a domino conviction/acquittal effect). At that point I would post the official verdict based on all of the votes, and the next accusation would be revealed. The hiccups concerning timing were minor inconveniences, and something that was not entirely unexpected. What did surprise me was the vigorous defense the first of the accused posted in response to the charges against her, something that had never happened before in face-to-face classes (see Image 7 below). She actively refuted the charges against her and promoted her good name and fame with an energy that helped set the tone for the first trial and the rest of the game as well. In the end two of the accused were convicted (one male character and one female character) while another was acquitted (one female character), and student reviews of the project were glowing.

Despite the challenges and occasional hitches, I was pleased with the exercise. In many ways it was more satisfying than its in-class counterpart; the necessity of conducting all of the processes in written form in an asynchronous online environment allowed students to consult the course text and its primary sources in shaping their testimony or rationales and to be more thoughtful and careful in their responses to the game’s prompts. Studies have noted that while role-playing exercises improve oral communication skills, they have little identifiable effect on students’ writing skills; perhaps using available technology for a portion of the games’ activities could address that gap. I think it did for my students in our virtual village.
Jennifer McNabb is the Associate Director of the Centennial Honors College at Western Illinois University and an Associate Professor in the Department of History, specializing in early modern Europe and the history of England. Her emphasis is social history, and current research interests include defamation, courtship, marriage, and the family in early modern England.
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