



Marlowe Society of America Newsletter

Vol. XV, No. 2, Fall 1995

MSA ANNUAL MEETINGS CHICAGO, 1995

Conceiving Woman: Marlowe and Shakespeare

Friday, December 29, 10:15-11:30 a.m. Gold Coast,
Hyatt Regency Chicago. Presiding: Constance B.
Kuriyama, Texas Tech University.

1. "En(G)endering Marlowe: Dido, Queen of Carthage
and Political Contexts," Mark Thornton Burnett,
Queen's University, Belfast.
2. "From The Massacre at Paris to La Reine Margot:
The 'Bloudie Marriage' of the French Wars of
Religion," Ellen C. Caldwell, Clarkson
University.
3. "Dido Mediated through Marlowe and Shakespeare,"
Maurice Charney, Rutgers University, New Brun-
swick.

Male-Male Desire in Marlowe: A Workshop

Saturday, December 30, 8:30-9:45 a.m. Suite 264,
Hyatt Regency, Chicago. Presiding: Sara M. Deats,
University of South Florida.

1. "Edward II, James I, and the Figure of the
Sodomite King," Curtis Perry, Arizona State
University.
2. "'Until our bodies turn to elements': The Uses of
Male-Male Desire in Marlowe's Plays," Roger E.
Moore, Vanderbilt University.
3. "'Here, take my picture, and let me wear thine':
Marlowe, Hillyard, and the Interpretation of
Homoerotic Desire in the Elizabethan Miniature
Tradition," Steadman C. Mays, Rutgers University,
New Brunswick.

CALL FOR PAPERS MARLOWE SOCIETY MLA SESSIONS WASHINGTON, DC, 1996

The Marlowe Society solicits papers for its December
1996 sessions at the MLA Convention in Washington, DC.
Send abstracts or papers of fifteen-minute length by
March 1 to Vice-President Sara M. Deats, 9049 Quail
Creek Drive, Tampa, Florida 33647.

MARLOWE SOCIETY ELECTION

Members will find a ballot to elect officers for 1996-
98 enclosed with this issue of the Newsletter. As the
ballot indicates, there were no nominations apart from
the slate of candidates prepared by the nominating
committee. Please return the ballot in the enclosed
envelope which is marked MSA Election. These will be
opened and tallied at the annual business meeting.
Even though these positions are not contested, your
support of the Marlowe Society by returning the ballot
is appreciated.

FROM THE EDITOR

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR *THE MARLOWE SOCIETY OF AMERICA NEWSLETTER*

MSAN has no backlog and depends upon the membership
for its contents. Materials for the next issue of
MSAN should be received by March 15, 1996. We welcome
reviews of films or productions relating to Renais-
sance and especially Marlovian drama, brief articles
and notes on Marlowe or matters related to Marlovian
studies, announcements and calls for papers, and ideas
or experiences relating to teaching Marlowe. Send
submissions to Bruce E. Brandt, Editor, MSAN, English
Department, Box 504, South Dakota State University,
Brookings, SD 57007.

MARLOWE SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Constance B. Kuriyama, President
Sara M. Deats, Vice President
Viviana Comensoli, Secretary
Robert A. Logan, Treasurer
Bruce E. Brandt, Membership Chairman and
MSA Newsletter Editor
Paul Whitfield White, MSA Book Reviews Editor

All business and organizational correspondence except for memberships should be addressed to the President:

Professor Constance B. Kuriyama, President
Marlowe Society of America
Department of English
Box 4530
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas 79409

New memberships and renewals should be sent to the Membership Chairman:

Professor Bruce E. Brandt
Membership Chairman
Marlowe Society of America
English Department, Box 504
South Dakota State University
Brookings, SD 57007

ALL MEMBERSHIP FEES SHOULD BE PAID IN U.S. DOLLARS

U.S. and Canada: 1 year = \$20, 3 years = \$50
Overseas members: 1 year = \$25, 3 years = \$65
Graduate students: U.S./Canada = \$10; Overseas = \$15

MSA Newsletter publishes reviews of Renaissance, and especially Marlovian, drama; notices of recent and forthcoming publications; announcements; and brief articles or notes of interest to Marlovian scholars. The opinions expressed are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect that of the MSA. The editor reserves the right to refuse items, to ask for revisions, and to make stylistic changes that he deems appropriate. Send inquiries, announcements, and submissions to Professor Brandt at the above address. The deadline for the spring issue is March 15, 1996.

MSA Book Reviews publishes reviews of books on Marlowe and his period. Reviews, suggestions for reviews, and inquiries should be sent to the Reviews Editor:

Professor Paul Whitfield White, Editor
MSA Book Reviews
Department of English
1358 Heavilon Hall
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1358

© MSA: All rights reserved to authors.

THE DEFENSE OF ACTING IN *TO BE OR NOT TO BE*

Directed by Ernst Lubitsch. Designed by Vincent Korda. Original story by Melchior Lengyel. Screenplay by Edwin Justus Mayer. Photography by Rudolph Mate. Edited by Dorothy Spenser. With Jack Benny, Carole Lombard, Robert Stack, Stanley Ridges, Felix Bressart, Sig Ruman and others. United Artists, 1942.

Ernst Lubitsch's *To Be or Not to Be* (1942), a black comedy about the involvement of a troupe of Polish actors in anti-Nazi espionage, was attacked for its flippant treatment of Nazi horrors. Critics concentrated particularly on Colonel Ehrhardt's (Sig Ruman) crack to the ham actor Josef Tura (Jack Benny) that "What he [Tura] did to Shakespeare, we are now doing to Poland." To many, this was an unfeeling comic line, equating the humorous putdown of a ham actor with the rape of a nation. Although Lubitsch, a Berlin-born Jew, was not insensitive to the charges, he refused to delete the line, asserting that the film does not make fun of Poles, but is a satire on Nazis and the inflated egos of actors who remain actors regardless of how dangerous the situations they encounter. As Robert Wilson has pointed out in a December 1976 Shakespeare on Film Newsletter article, Lubitsch uses Jack Benny as the epitome of an inflated theatrical ego who is more upset about Lt. Sobinski (Robert Stack) walking out during his soliloquy than the possibility that he may be having an affair with his wife Maria (Carole Lombard). The actors' vanities are mocked throughout the film, but at the same time they are shown to have larger, more important selves which they attain because of their ability to transcend their petty egos to emerge as actors in another sense—people who participate in, influence, and, in some measure, create reality. Like *Hamlet* and *The Spanish Tragedy*, *To Be or Not to Be* investigates the complex interrelationship between art and reality, acting in an existential sense and acting in a theatrical sense.

The metaphor of the world as a stage and people as actors has a long lineage stretching from Plato through early Christianity to the Renaissance when dramatists like Shakespeare and Thomas Kyd employed the play-within-the-play as the means of demonstrating the efficacy of art in the real world. In Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy*, the final play-within-the-play, ostensibly created by Hieronimo to celebrate the wedding of Bel-imperia and Balthazar, becomes the means of revenge against his son's murderers who "actually" are killed during the performance. Similarly, Hamlet arranges to have the "Murder of Gonzago" played with a few pertinent additions before the courtly audience, and the mousetrap works, as he observes the guilty reaction of Claudius to seeing his murder of his brother dramatized. Hamlet learns the truth and Claudius knows Hamlet knows through the performance of

a fiction as real as reality. Hence, we can see why it is appropriate that Tura play Hamlet in a movie dedicated to demonstrating the efficacy of art through plays-within-the-movie.

Both Hamlet, and the ongoing versions of the movie's Gestapo play, which can be classified as plays-within-the-movie, contain important parallels to the overall movie. In fact, it may be said that taken together, they constitute the movie itself. Hamlet furnishes plot and thematic similarities in its depiction of a country ruled by an usurper, its analysis of acting and being—Hamlet is an actor in as many senses as are the movie actors—and its use of a play-within-the-play to gain insights into reality. But it is Lubitsch's use of the opening words to Hamlet's most famous soliloquy as his title which epitomizes the Shakespearean overtones of the movie. Initially, the phrase is put into a humorous context when spoken by Tura as Hamlet and used by Maria and Sobinski as a cue for their rendezvous backstage, while her husband continues to play the melancholy and by now upstaged Dame. The phrase resurfaces when Siletski (Stanley Ridges) uses the code, which he got from the unsuspecting Sobinski in England, to summon Maria to his room where he attempts to seduce and make her a Nazi.

Finally, and most significantly, Hamlet's words capture the alternatives posed by the struggle against the Nazis: "To be or not to be" means either to remain alive through the acting out—in the dual sense of artistic and real action—of their opposition to Naziism or to succumb to its tyranny and be no more.

The Gestapo play is also used by Lubitsch as an ongoing play-within-the-movie which enables the actors to use their art to affect reality. Although the performance of the play is initially canceled because it might offend Hitler, the play is reenacted in reality when Tura, disguised as Colonel Ehrhardt, meets with the wily spy Professor Siletski, who sees through Tura's disguise but is killed onstage at the abandoned theater where the original Gestapo play was to be performed.

In the concluding version of the play-within-the-movie, the spear-carrier actor Greenberg (Felix Bressart) finally gets the opportunity to play his desired role of Shylock. The other actors use Greenberg to create a diversion, so that they can escape from Poland with the help of the real Gestapo. The anonymous Jew finally does act—in the dual sense—on the world stage as art and reality are deftly fused. Greenberg plays himself before an audience of Nazis and uses a Shakespearean speech—"Hath not a Jew"—as an announcement of Jewish identity and defiance. His climactic effect is achieved with the emergence of the line "And if you wrong us, shall we not revenge?", which Lubitsch had carefully omitted from Bressart's

earlier repetitions of Shylock's lament. Greenberg serves as an analogue to the director, who espouses Jewish resistance to persecution and an artistic credo which combines laughter and seriousness, art and reality.

Frank Ardolino

University of Hawaii at Manoa

MERCURY AND HELEN: LITERATURE, SOCIETY, AND EROS IN MARLOWE

An abstract of the paper presented at the MSA Annual Meeting, San Diego, 1994, by John Huntington, University of Illinois at Chicago.

A number of recent critics of Hero and Leander have found the digression on Mercury and the Fates at the end of the first Sestiad inept. W. L. Godshalk, for instance, makes it the ground for a reading of the poem's narrator as untrustworthy ("Hero and Leander: The Sense of an Ending," in A Poet and a filthy Playmaker, 308). I want to build on that perception of the section's anomaly to develop a case that, in fact, in a sense more profound than has been recognized, the passage is central to our understanding of Marlowe's social strategy. The passage brings together classical learning, utopian longings, a vision of the centrality of eros, and an angry (though still comic) outrage at the world's injustice, both to lovers and to scholars.

The first part of the paper examines in detail the complexities of the passage in Hero and Leander. I want to bring out the devious connections the passage achieves and to suggest a way of reading Marlowe that sees such outrageous narrative as both interesting and a way of saying serious things that do not have to be acknowledged. The passage poses a basic hermeneutic problem that is illuminated by looking both to other parts of Marlowe and to Chapman's continuation of the poem.

I then relate this passage to three passages from Doctor Faustus which develop this same union of the literary and the erotic. Early in the play Faustus is dissuaded from suicide because of a literary experience:

And long ere this I should have slaine my selfe,
Had not sweet pleasure conquerd deepe despair.
Have not I made blind Homer sing to me
Of Alexanders love and Enons death?
And hath not he that built the walles of Thebes,
With ravishing sound of his melodious harp
Made musicke with my Mephistophilis,
Why should I dye then, or basely despaire?

A 653-660

"Sweet pleasure" is explicitly literary. Homer is an

erotic poet, an Ovid in disguise, if you will. And it is this pleasure that overcomes the despair aroused by the fear of damnation.

It is not surprising, then, that at the end of the play *Faustus* should again invoke such a cluster when he addresses Helen. In those famous lines, which I won't bother to quote here, we hear again the mixture of Homeric and Ovidian allusion. One detail near the end, however, warrants further thought:

Brighter art thou then flaming Jupiter,
when he appeared to haplesse Semele.
A 1372-73

The self-destructive, ecstatic fantasy here (Helen's Jove to Faustus' Semele) recalls the story of Mercury and the "country maid." It is a remarkable gender inversion that deserves much thought, both for its construction of divine-human relations and for its vision of the nature of poetic inspiration.

One other moment in *Doctor Faustus* returns us to Hero and Leander. Early in the play Faustus boasts that his skill in "concise syllogisms" has

made the flowring pride of Wertenberge
Swarme to my Problems as the infernall spirits
On sweet Musaeus when he came to hell.
A 147-149

Editors of the play have been confused by the reference to Musaeus, as if Marlowe might not know who Musaeus was! I want to suggest that a powerful idea of culture is being invoked. The Vergilian allusion (Aeneid, VI, 667) is to the Musaeus whom Aeneas sees in the underworld as the foremost of those qui vitam excoluere ver artes [inventas] (663). A memory of this passage in the Aeneid may inspire Chapman in his praise of Marlowe in *Sestiad III*, 183-193. Though syllogisms and the magic of Agrippa are also a part of the vision in the Faustus passage, at its heart is the erotic literary tradition which is seen as both a redeeming source of pleasure and as the motive for civilization.

Marlowe's erotic intensity (in Faustus, Hero and Leander, and also the Elegies) is often acknowledged, but its social implications are seldom worked out beyond a kind of atheism of the physical (for instance, see Emily Bartels, Spectacles of Strangeness, 136). The Mercury episode becomes central for the way it justifies not just love or even eros but learning and art and sees the failure of the world to recognize such learning as injustice. The passage would be read by Chapman as an argument for the value of an inspired and uncourtly art which dignifies the scholar-poet. At this point, space permitting, I would sketch how Chapman develops some of these issues in his part of Hero and Leander.

I am interested in seeing how, in the formulation of Pierre Bourdieu, struggling poets redefine the concept of poetry itself in order to reshape the cultural space and thereby create a living. They are less interested in changing society than in establishing the worth of their own accomplishments and thereby accumulating cultural capital. By asserting the power (one is tempted to say the divine power) of erotic poetry, Marlowe, abetted by Chapman, is urging the value of culture and poetry's centrality to pleasure and to life, in the face of the "Midas brood" (Hero and Leander, I, 475) and the "lofty servile clown" who "keeps learning down" (I, 481-82). At its core this is a radical social assertion, new to English culture.

"UNHAPPY DIDO": MARLOWE'S LYRIC STRAINS

An abstract of the paper presented at the MSA Annual Meeting, San Diego, 1994, by Diana E. Henderson, Middlebury College.

Unlike so many of his contemporaries, Christopher Marlowe does not seem to have penned a sonnet (much less a sequence), instead turning his attention as a lyricist to a translation of Ovid's urbane and disturbingly erotic Amores (the Elegies), and the production of one exquisite pastoral piece, "Come live with me and be my love." Both eschew the purportedly edifying metaphysical overtones of much Petrarchism. In his single lyric, Marlowe develops a voice of future conditional desire which not only implies its own limits, but in its emphasis on temporal deferral provides a rhetoric transposable to the tragic stage—a transfer most evident in his courtly play, Dido, Queen of Carthage. By looking at Marlowe's similar lyricism in "The Passionate Shepherd" and in Dido, I call attention to its status as temporal and metaphorical fantasy; the differences in rhetorical positioning between Marlowe and his Ovidian and Virgilian sources reinforce such a reading. Rather than viewing Marlowe as a satirist of lyricism (as several recent readings have implied), I argue that the playwright encourages mixed emotions from an audience placed in the position of empathizing and enjoying desires it knows are doomed to failure over time.

In the drama, Marlowe employs various rhetorics and theatrical resources to strengthen his commentary on erotic desire already implicit in the lyric. His criticisms of courtly lyricism are made not on moral or personal grounds, but for the reason that such poetry is ultimately ineffectual as social praxis in a destructive universe. Lyrical rhetoric creates a seductive dream, but fails its earthbound speakers.

After analyzing the temporal deferral of Marlowe's future conditional offerings in "The Passionate

Shepherd," I turn to Dido's comparable seduction speech ("Aeneas, I'll repair thy Trojan ships, / Conditionally that thou wilt stay with me. . ." 3.1.112ff.). I contrast this court-ship fantasy with the comically present gifts offered by Polyphemus in Ovid's Metamorphoses, Book 13, finding more apt grounds for comparison with Heroides 7, in its representation of the appeal of unattainable desire, not acquisitiveness. Marlowe takes the ambiguity of the future, as psychologically alluring but unreal, and molds it into a source of dramatic conflict. Thus the rhetoric of his sensual appeals to love in Dido lends itself to tragic "testing" overtime, during the inexorable sequence of stage events and the imagined passage of time in Carthage. This latter is made more stark and poignant through juxtaposition with the timeless world of Olympus at the play's beginning; whereas Jupiter appears for his lyric moment and has the power to control temporality, Dido and Aeneas are both trapped within the temporal logic of a dramatized narrative. Marlowe makes the cost of that narrative especially apparent by erasing the appeal of epic futurity, and creating in Aeneas an early version of something akin to male subjectivity at the margins. Marlowe's variations from tradition encourage a reading that discounts gender differentiation in the realm of eros, but remains more obscure in its messages as a boys' performance before the elusively gendered Queen.

THE A.R.T. HENRY V: 1995.

One of the tenets of post-modernism is "multiple signification." Spectators of a production may legitimately disagree about what it signifies. Is Kenneth Branagh's 1989 film of Henry V anti-war, pro-war, a blend of attitudes that amounts to neutrality? The film arranges the inherited script so that it does not make a univocal point. Post-modernism is not to be confused with incoherence, however. What was the point of Ron Daniels's Henry V for the American Repertory Theatre in Cambridge, Massachusetts in early 1995? The answer would be irrelevant were it not that this production was highly praised, was sold-out night after night, and received standing ovations.

The incoherence was intentional. Set designer John Conklin says that "In Henry V we did the most extreme distance chronologically between the French Court and England. [The French] are foolish in that history has passed them by; they're no longer able to survive in the world of Marines and modern technology. It's historically true they could not cope with technology. The English had longbows, which were like machine guns. They're like the Poles in World War II, charging Panzer tanks on horseback" (Cooper). The French and English, then, inhabited different times, and the French—five unarmed men on horseback—were no match for three times as many English armed with automatic weapons. But this is to do violence to

locus--the inherited script and what is incontrovertible in it--and to render some of the lines about fearful odds that the production retained into nonsense. It is true that the French misread the lesson of Crecy, failed to attribute the English victory there to the longbow, and so set themselves up for Agincourt. It is also true that Ethiopian tribesmen attacked the armored columns of Granziani and Badoglio with spears in late 1935. It is true about the Polish ulhans of September, 1939, and true that an army without an air force could defeat the United States in Southeast Asia. But the historical battles between anachronistic armies occurred at the same time and sometimes within the same culture. The French may have relied on the old-fashioned method of a charge of armored horsemen and the English may have been similarly stupid at Balaclava, but neither army was the product of a lost tribe discovered on a remote archipelago and thus immune to western concepts of change. Daniels gave us a number of choices for when Agincourt occurred--at some moment corresponding to wherever the French may have been, WW I, WW II, Vietnam, Desert Storm. The answer he gave is that it did not occur. Not only are the odds gone of which the inherited script makes so much, but so is any sense that the play's defining moment could have happened. Daniels created a non-world which did not ask us to suspend our disbelief but which forced us to disbelieve. The experience was like watching a dull variety show. But that sub-genre has its disconnectedness built-in. Here the director and designers had to work to "unlink" and render inarticulate the script of Henry V, but they did so with stunning completeness. Pistol's "songs," for example ("Bear him to the burial ground"), were extra-textual, emerged from yet another time and place (the Negro New Orleans jazz tradition?) than the several apparently depicted in the play, and slowed an already slow production. But it wasn't Pistol's fault. The project was deeply flawed at its conceptual heart, yet emerged, as I shall suggest, with remarkably self-congratulatory tones and with a built-in defense against anyone--like me--who found the production just plain stinko.

The ending of Daniels's II Henry IV had seemed to promise a powerful Henry V. The new King, splendid in royal garments, rejected Falstaff with a brutal coldness that told us what Hal had been doing all along. He had been hiding out as a punk rocker, learning "how to handle" (I Henry IV 2.4.309) people from Falstaff. The King showed how well he had mastered his lessons in dealing with his former adversary, the Chief Justice, and then in denying Falstaff his primary weapon, words ("Reply not to me with a fool-born jest"). I was absolutely convinced that Henry V would prove a powerful leader and that Camp's study of kingship would be eminently worth observing and evaluating. What we got was a crew-cut, chubby young man who, apparently, had been that punk-rocker, not paying

attention to the mastery he had been achieving through Falstaff, not aware, it seems, of the devastating impact of his transformation. Daniels cut the churchmen's lines that describe the instant coming of "consideration like an angel" and the "wonder" of the change (I.1.24-69). It seemed that Henry had been thrust suddenly and unexpectedly into a position he had never wanted, as opposed to the prince we have watched in training for this kind of improvisational kingship from the first. What do I do now? Henry seemed to be asking himself as he stared down at the huge map of the Channel and France. He had made up his mind, of course—the Salique Law exposition was a joke. The options he had at the outset—the establishment of a huge feudal system with him as liegeland (I.1.11-14) and "a thousand pounds by the year" (I.1.19)—were cut, so that the production went immediately for the simplistic version of events that the Chorus offers. Thus Camp was robbed of his own background as prince and of the complexities of decision-making that go into that opening sequence with Chichele. I felt that Camp would hit his stride at some point, but he never did. His hoarse voice lacked range, his chief mannerism was an exhausted, rubbing of his brow, and his speeches made little sense. Since he was costumed as either a full general or a soldier in fatigues, his speech on "ceremony" was incomprehensible. There had been no ceremony. The production did reflect what the program notes called "The unwavering focus of Henry V on war" and provided no other point of view. Thus, when we got to the wooing scene, we took Henry at his own valuation, as opposed to recognizing that he was turning disadvantage—his poor French, his soldiery—into advantage. That ability to translate shortcoming into strength is one of his primary traits. We watch him acquire the technique from Falstaff. Knowledge of his character's ability and where it comes from gives an actor something to work with behind the lines.

The deepest problem, however, was the treatment of the French. "Whereas the English are very much these mud creatures," said Daniels, "the French are sky creatures" (Graham B30). This is as if Daniels—or Tolkien or Herbert—were making a fiction, not Shakespeare, as if the contrast between the English and the French, a "given" in the script, must be driven to a reductio ad absurdum. "We're looking at these French creatures as very beautiful creatures," says Daniels, "very wondrous creatures. They walk on shoes that are 1 foot high, they ride these beautiful horses" (Graham B30). The French did walk around on high shoes and later were pushed around on wheeled platforms, from which they played chess or rolled dice on trays held high by servants. Later they pranced inside toy horses from Equus. The "ideas" go back at least to Barton's Richard II (1972), where Bolingbroke and Mowbray appeared inside horses for the trial by combat and where Northumberland (the "ladder") grew into an eight-foot upstage

crow. The contrasting English, muddy, fatigued, and in fatigues, of course, came straight from Michael Bogdanov's Henry V and Macbeth. Yet, to one critic, the "staging . . . was strikingly fresh" (Lehman 15).

But it was not the staleness of the concepts that made me angry. It was the deeper incoherency of the entire enterprise. Suffice it that the French and their fillies sank out of sight to loud sounds (music, one supposes). But what was sinking them? Were they melting into puddles of hubris? Sinners in the hands of an angry Saint Denis? It may go without saying that Grandpre's wonderful speech—in which he almost defines the indefinable quality of that English army—was cut down to just another of the overconfident lines that the French shouted at us from their various perches. Bogdanov had his Grandpre rip his dispatch from his typewriter, recognizing that "Description cannot suit itself in words / To demonstrate the life of such a battle / In life so lifeless as it shows itself" (4.2.51-3). Daniels's French should have been asking what those funny looking tubes were in the English hands. As Rambures should have noted, they did not look like crossbows. The Allies were asking a similar question in France in late 1944 when the Me 262—the first operational combat jet—was introduced. But that was in late 1944, when suddenly a fighter that flew a hundred miles faster than the 51 or 47 was in the air, not in the non-time or anti-time in which this production took place, where M-16s went up against a liberated merry-go-round.

The exception to this mishmash was a moment almost worth the expense of spirit and waste of time that the rest of the production entailed. Henry read his threat to Harfleur through a tannoy. The loudspeaker amplified the threat and made a metaphor with "hostage situations." What was he doing? Reminding his men about what war is really like, thus getting them ready for Agincourt? Warning them not to become outlaws, like those he must hang for not being "gentle gamesters"—thus anticipating Burgundy's "savages / That nothing do but meditate on blood" (V.2.59-60)? Getting rid of some of his own frustrations in an sour, self-condemning speech? Distancing himself from his men at a time when he looked and acted like little more than an NCO? Trying to bluff Harfleur into surrendering to an exhausted army (as Branagh seemed to be doing)? It was a moment full of possible meanings, about which reasonable people could disagree. His army, insulted, glared at him angrily. His brother Gloucester refused to salute him after the speech. I neither represent nor condone that kind of talk, Gloucester seemed to be saying.

A tiny moment that also worked was a version of "Te Deum Laudamus" in cadence count (e.g., "Sound Off, One, Two . . ."). This was a brief commentary on how religion subserves national policy, as the Archbishop had done earlier.

Yet a third instant that worked was Katherine's listening to Henry's Harfleur speech in translation on her Atwater Kent. Her crash course in English was motivated—by fear? Fascination? Awareness that she was one of the prizes that this irresistible conqueror would gain? We could not be sure, nor could she, until time revealed her motive to her in the wooing scene. There, she leaned in for another kiss and Camp drew back on "Here comes your father." This borrowing from Branagh got the evening's biggest laugh.

Daniels claims that Henry "learns . . . the terrible cost" (Graham B30) of his policies. To try to make that point Daniels left in much of Exeter's mawkish speech about the deaths of York and Suffolk. The speech balances chivalric values against the slaughter that Agincourt really was, but that contrast had already been made here, however awkwardly and stupidly. The speech here was meant to tell us how much the English had lost, as was Henry's bursting into tears when he read the tag on Davy Gam's body bag. The "terrible cost" has been on the French side of the equation, a fact the script makes clear but that Daniels attempted to avoid by cutting "None else of name; and of all other men / But five and twenty" (4.8.104-05) and the subsequent attribution of this miracle to God (4.8.105-11).

Another distressing and untenable resonance here was Daniels's insistence that "part of the process Shakespeare is investigating [is] the demonization of the enemy" (Graham B30). The play cannot be made to reflect "demonization." The English don't demonize the enemy—Exeter makes that clear in singling out the Dauphin for particular rebuke (2.4.117-26). The French insult the English, but with the grudging sense that their women prefer the lusty English (cf. 3.5.27-31 and 4.5.12-16)—as Katherine seems to. The French know that the English have "mettle" (2.5.15) and will "fight like devils" (2.7.147). The latter simile does not represent demonization, however, any more than Henry's "imitate the action of the tiger" (2.1.6). Indeed, the French view the English in the context that Daniels applies to the French, that is, that the English rush into danger heedlessly, not like "a hawk" (2.7.15), admittedly, but like "Foolish curs that run winking into the mouth of a Russian bear, and have their heads crushed like rotten apples" (2.7.139-41). One might argue that Henry demonizes Scroop, comparing his treason to "Another fall of man" (2.2.142), but that is because Scroop seemed so full of "The sweetness of affiance" (2.2.127), not because Scroop was an enemy demanding demonization. Daniels got hold of an idea and applied to a play where it does not work. Does Hamlet denigrate Claudius, describing his uncle in terms which the play itself will not support? Yes, and the contrast between Hamlet's point-of-view and the Claudius we experience was one of the strengths of Daniels's late 1980s production for the Royal Shakespeare Company. Do Malcolm's forces demonize

Macbeth? Indeed—and not without cause. It did seem at times that Daniels's French were a fantasy invented by the English because they needed an enemy—as we are currently inventing Islam and our own poor as enemies, with enough terrorist bombings and drug-related murders to feed the process. But the French here, if a fantasy enemy, were composed of the easy-pickings of daydreams.

In the great RSC production of Henry V in the 1970s, Terry Hands and Alan Howard broke the play down into performance units. Howard could not remember Grey's name in the line "And you... my gentle knight" (2.2.14), but came up with it on "though Cambridge, Scroop, and . . . Grey" (2.2.58). The soldier Henry "enlarged" was right there on stage and became the MP who arrested the explicitly sober Scroop. Even Iain Glen, in the overwrought RSC production at Stratford in 1994, made a point when he said, "God acquit you in his mercy" (2.2.166) to a Scroop, who appealed with a gesture to Henry. That meant I do not forgive you. Here, the Constable's "whore's manship" (3.7.53), was one of the few instances of an emphasis that illuminated what was meant. Hands doubled Scroop and Williams, Grey and Bates. Daniels doubled Grey and Williams, Cambridge and Bates. Hands's doubling subtly raised the question of treason versus loyalty, as I have argued elsewhere (144-45). Daniels's doubling did not link 2.2 with 4.1 ff. The blocking of the scenes was somewhat similar—each developing on the narrow edge of the front stage area, Henry down front center for the first and down right for the second. Each scene, however, got a very perfunctory reading. Neither scene in this "post-modernist" production was meant to remind us of the other. The doubling, then, was merely a matter of convenience, not a technique. That Daniels's Williams was a first lieutenant, a platoon leader, and thus an inhabitant of the social plane on which Henry lives further confused things. The Boy at one point was an Air Force Staff Sergeant, a fact that, again, pointed at the production's intentional effort to refuse to tell us who was who, what was what, and when any of this was happening. The more we noticed the more confused we were meant to be.

What does "Convey [him] with safe conduct" (1.2.298) mean if the French ambassador then walks off alone? What does it mean to us when we hear that the King has ordered "every soldier to cut his prisoner's throat" (4.7.9-10), when we have seen the prisoners shot down in a spatter of automatic weapons fire? Why upstage the Chorus at the beginning—Henry appeared as the Chorus says "Suppose" (19)—and at the end, when the cast slithered in for its curtain call behind the final words? In the latter case the obliteration of the words may have made us believe that the bright young couple down-center was destined for all good things. Suffice it that no one concerned with the production has ever sat in a theater and thus experienced the ways in which movement behind a speaker

erases what is being said.

"Shakespeare is not owned by the critics or the intellectuals or the academics, but by the man on the street," says Daniels (Graham B30). That is more or less what Bogdanov says to rationalize his ownership and to make certain in advance that any criticism can be dismissed as "elitist." The man on the street will not have seen other productions, of course, so he is likely to accept Daniels's staging as "fresh," when it is really a collection of bad ideas culled from other directors. The man on the street, however, is not going to pay \$45 a ticket for ART productions, and, if he did, he would learn that all the bad things that are said about Shakespeare are true. We are told that "Through his challenging, contemporary productions, Daniels hopes to return Shakespeare, and the theatre in general, to those for whom it was originally intended—regular folks" (Graham B30). That is self-serving nonsense. He wants no such thing. I would advise Daniels to have a look at what companies like Shenandoah Shakespeare Express and ACTER are doing. They, without the pompous clichés, are putting exciting and coherent versions of the plays in front of students. Daniels is serving a more obscure, personal cause: ego, perhaps, perhaps megalomania.

If, as one critic of this production argued, "stage directors supply concepts and images to make up for [the public's inability to] follow Shakespeare's language," then, indeed "acting becomes almost irrelevant" (Dyer 75). If language and acting are irrelevant, so is Shakespeare. Let Daniels call his play "Having Fun with Anachronisms: A Perverse Reading of *Henry V*." Whatever Shakespeare's script still may have within it to communicate was distorted and unintelligible in this version.

H. R. Coursen

Globe Centre

Works Cited:

- Cooper, Jeanne. "ART Makes War by Playing with Time." Boston Globe (10 March 1995).
- Coursen, H. R. Shakespearean Performance as Interpretation. Newark: U of Delaware Press, 1992.
- Dyer, Richard. "Henry V at War with Words." Boston Globe (24 February 1995): 67, 75.
- Graham, Renee. "Another View of Henry V's Triumph." Boston Globe (19 February 1995): B25, B30.
- Lehman, Jon L. "Superb Henry V Triumphantly Concludes A.R.T. Trilogy." Patriot Ledger (24 February 1995): 15.
- Lindsay, Heather. "The King Is But a Man: The Personal Epic of Henry V." Henry V Program. American Repertory Theatre, 1995.

RECENT STUDIES IN MARLOWE

Abiteboul, Maurice. "Du Bon Usage des religions dans The Jew of Malta de Christopher Marlowe."

Chouleur Jacques (fwd.). Mythes, croyances et religions dans le monde anglo-saxon. Avignon: Université d'Avignon, 1985. 9-22.

- Anderson, Kathleen. "'Stab as Occasion Serves': The Real Isabella in Marlowe's Edward II." Renaissance Papers (1992): 29-39.
- Bartlett, Sally A. "Fantasy and Mimesis in Doctor Faustus." Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts 5.3 [19] (1993): 18-27.
- Cerasano, S. P. "Tamburlaine and Edward Alleyn's Ring." Shakespeare Survey 47 (1995): 171-179.
- Cole, Douglas. Christopher Marlowe and the Renaissance of Tragedy. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995.
- Fleissner, Robert F. "'Wittenberg,' not 'Wertenberg': A Nominal Discrepancy in the A-text of Doctor Faustus." Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America 89 (1995): 189-192.
- Guy-Bray, Stephen. "The Civilization of Eros: A Study of Christopher Marlowe." Dissertation Abstracts International 54 (1993): 1810A-1811A.
- Heaney, Seamus. The Redress of Poetry. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1995.
- Jack, Alex. "Christopher Marlowe: The True Shakespeare." Profiles in Oriental Diagnosis. Vol. 1. Becket, MA: One Peaceful World Press, 1995.
- Kermode, Lloyd Edward. "'Marlowe's Second City': The Jew as Critic at the Rose in 1592." Studies in English Literature 35 (1995): 215-229.
- Kirk, Andrew M. "Marlowe and the Disordered Face of French History." Studies in English Literature 35 (1995): 193-213.
- Levine, Laura. Men in Women's Clothing: Anti-Theatricality and Effeminization, 1579-1642. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Maus, Katharine Eisaman. Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- McAdam, Ian. "Edward II and the Illusion of Integrity." Studies in Philology 92 (1995): 203-229.
- McAlindon, T. "Doctor Faustus: The Predestination Theory." English Studies 76 (1995): 215-220.
- Saenger, Michael Baird. "Shakespeare's Macbeth." Explicator 53 (1995): 133-135.
- Sheppard, Sallye. "Faustus and the Fall of Troy." Conference of College Teachers of English Studies 59 (1994): 68-74.
- Shurbanov, Alexander. Mezhdru patosa i ironiyata: Christopher Marlowe i zarazhdaneto na Renesansovata drama [Between Pathos and Irony: Christopher Marlowe and the Genesis of Renaissance Drama]. Sofia: Climent Ohridsky University Press, 1992.
- Tolman, Linda Clare. "Audience Response to Discontinuities in Marlowe's The Jew of Malta and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida." Dissertation Abstracts International 54 (1994): 4106A-7A.
- von Koppenfels, Werner. "Dis-covering the Female Body Erotic Exploration in Elizabethan poetry." Shakespeare Survey 47 (1995): 127-137.