

ABSTRACTS

Brent Dawson, 'Uncrowned Kings: Arcadian Lyric and the Discontentment with Power in *Henry VI Part 3*'

This paper compares the most well-known scene from *3 Henry VI*, Henry's soliloquy wishing for a bucolic life, with poems by Greene, Lodge, and others in a minor Elizabethan genre, the Arcadian pastoral. Likely drawing on Sidney's influence, this genre has rather less of the coded political commentary and foregrounded literary allusions of humanist pastoral like *The Shepheardes Calender*. Instead, it richly presents the utopian pleasures of pastoral, at times augmenting them with philosophical and ethical reflections. Like Shakespeare's play, the particular poems I am interested in describe the superiority of the shepherd's life to the king's, perhaps surprisingly, in terms of the mind and inner life. The paper addresses a few topics related to this genre and its influence on Shakespeare: 1) why this genre receives little literary criticism, despite being frequently anthologized both in the Renaissance and after, as though the genre resists the ways in which criticism attempts to give political weight to poetry; 2) why Shakespeare almost never draws directly on this genre in his several comedies and romances with pastoral settings; and 3) why Shakespeare's debt to the genre instead appears in his history plays, most prominently in *3 Henry VI* and continuing into the second tetralogy. While Arcadian lyric can seem apolitical, I argue Shakespeare rather uses it to describe the limits of the political and foster utopian longings for human community outside it.

Trina Hyun, 'Poetics of Futility: Golding's Ovidian Grace in *Antony and Cleopatra*'

Recognized as a translator more so than a lyricist, Arthur Golding wrote a poem that had no small impact on Shakespeare's dramatic corpus: an English-ed version of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Shakespeare's grafting of this particularly Christianized Ovid into his plays not only introduces clashes between two different literary traditions, but also draws on those traditions to warp the temporality of the plays by inviting anachronism and historical dissonance. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, Shakespeare conspicuously foregrounds the historical hinge of *Antony and Cleopatra* in Caesar's resounding declaration, "The time of universal peace is near," (4.6.4)—a phrase which signals both the Pax Romana and the advent of Christianity (Luke 2:14). This paper examines moments in the play when history is both out of sight and very much in the picture, as characters rehearse the anachronistic language of Christianity. Such ironic indications of the historical change about to occur—particularly in their acts and poetic contortions of the key Incarnational term, "grace,"—echo Golding's Ovidian articulations of a concept that bears no significance without the event of the Atonement. Throughout the play, Shakespeare creates a world in which this central tenet of Christianity, grace, is tragically futile, and culminates in Enobarbus's and Cleopatra's deaths. The toil of grace also fixes the characters within a historical frame before the Atonement, and thus complicates readings of the play that associate Cleopatra with an Eastern timelessness. By observing the incongruous logics of Western history and Eastern time, this paper reads "grace" as a poetic device of temporal distortion and *Antony and Cleopatra* as a play that both strives for redemptive change while thwarting its possibilities.

Ruth Kaplan, 'Blackness and Beauty in *Astrophil and Stella*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and Shakespeare's Sonnets'

Romeo and Juliet, with its caricature of Romeo as a would-be Petrarchan lover and its inclusion of multiple whole or partial sonnets, is widely acknowledged to be one of Shakespeare's plays most concerned with poetry, and with the sonnet craze of the 1590s specifically. Yet few scholars have considered Shakespeare to be engaging specifically with the sonnet sequence that set off that craze, and which became, for many, the paradigmatic sonnet sequence of the time, *Astrophil and Stella*. Perhaps we should. *Romeo and Juliet* refers directly to *Astrophil and Stella* in several lines. More importantly, the central romantic language of the play – the play of light and dark, and the figure of a night ablaze with stars – develops one of the main themes of Sidney's sonnet sequence, encapsulated in its title. Shakespeare uses these tropes differently in *Romeo and Juliet* from in his sonnets to the person conventionally known as the "dark lady" (though she in fact is much more frequently referred to as "black" than "dark"). My paper, tentatively titled "Blackness and Beauty in *Astrophil and Stella*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and Shakespeare's Sonnets" will explore the language of blackness in these three works, with a particular focus on demonstrating the relation of *Romeo and Juliet* to *Astrophil and Stella*, and to the significant research that has been done in the last fifty years on the construction of blackness in Renaissance English literature.

Andrew Mattison, 'The Ethics of Authorship in Daniel and Shakespeare'

Shakespearean authorship is most often conceived of in one of two ways: either through Shakespeare's reputation as a singular genius, or through documentary evidence of the dynamics of the Renaissance theater. This paper will offer a third way, by considering associations with authorship that are specific to lyric and discussing how they apply both to Shakespeare's poetry and to his plays. Shakespearean authorship is sometimes contrasted with the way it is conceived by Ben Jonson, and I will discuss this relationship and the critical history that has followed from work by Joseph Loewenstein, Lynn Meskill, and others. But my primary model will be Samuel Daniel, who writes frequently about authorship in prefaces, commendatory poems, and lyrics. Shakespeare doesn't, which is one of several differences that might make this an unlikely pairing: Shakespeare tells us little about himself in his printed works, at least explicitly, whereas Daniel makes himself so central to his poetic output that the pseudonym he gives to the beloved in his sonnet sequence is Delia, practically an anagram of his own name. Nevertheless, I suggest that Shakespeare and Daniel surprisingly share what I will call an apologetic model of authorship: one based in the acceptance of responsibility, positively or negatively, of the authorial product.

Anne-Marie Miller-Blaise, 'Dead Shepherds and Living Birds: Shakespeare's "Poetic Essays" within European Context'

In this paper, I propose to look at Shakespeare's conception of collaborative rivalry as expressed in both his *Sonnets* and "The Phoenix and the Turtle", in light of Du Bellay and Ronsard's earlier attempts to collectively define and defend their own status as rising French vernacular poets, in relation to the Ancients, foreign Italian poets, and former French poets. From the *Passionate Pilgrim* to the *Sonnets* and to *Love's Martyr*, Shakespeare's various

“essays” at short lyric forms are all enmeshed, whether willfully or unwittingly, in ideas of collaborative authorship. If Shakespeare seems not to have complained about Jaggard’s strange patching together of a Shakespeare-the-poet figure through a hodge-podge of poems by other pens mixed in with a few authentic pieces, it is probably because he was well aware that earning the status of a “poet” (and/or of an “author”) was itself a communal task. As suggested by the “rival poet” sonnets and more clearly yet by his “Poetical Essay,” published alongside those of Chapman, Marston and Jonson in *Love’s Martyr*, Shakespeare knew full well this could not be achieved without engaging in a self-conscious poetic community, itself based on rivalry, on publicized peer recognition amongst living poets, and, most importantly perhaps, on the shaping of a common poetic language – one that needed to be continually renewed. The creation of such a lively language was inevitably predicated upon the imitation and transformation of former models, both Ancient and English (such as Chaucer, Marlowe or Sidney), but it also drew on borrowings from and translation of other vernacular poetries. Whereas Spenser (who had recently died, becoming part of the community of “dead shepherds”) had explicitly translated Du Bellay, this paper seeks to demonstrate how Shakespeare may have found in the first and second editions of *L’Olive* by Du Bellay (1549, 1551) and the *Odes* by Ronsard (1550) – which speak the same aviary language of swans, phoenixes and crows inspired from the Ancients as “The Poetical Essays” – models for reimagining poetic commonality but also for redefining and refining the legitimizing process of imitation, ushering in new ways of being an English poet among the poets.

Steven Monte, ‘Shakespeare and Daniel’s Complementary Complaints’

Among scholars who study Shakespeare and Samuel Daniel, at least one instance of their influence on each other is well known: Daniel’s closet drama *Cleopatra* (first published in 1594) informs *Antony and Cleopatra* (first performed in 1606–7), and Shakespeare’s tragedy informs a later version of *Cleopatra*. Other examples of mutual influence include Daniel’s *The Civil Wars* and Shakespeare’s English history plays, and the two poets’ sonnet sequences —Daniel’s *Delia* and Shakespeare’s *Sonnets*. My essay focuses on the sequences, and particularly on their concluding narrative poems, “The Complaint of Rosamond” and “A Lover’s Complaint.”

After a brief review of the textual exchanges between Shakespeare and Daniel, my essay presents the poets in the context of late Elizabethan and early Jacobean artistic culture, in which a new generation of non-aristocratic poets were competing intensely in the literary marketplace. One locus of competition was the sonnet sequence, which in some respects had replaced the pastoral collection (exemplified by Spenser’s *Shepherd’s Calendar*) as the gateway genre for the aspiring poet. Daniel’s sonnet “Let other sing of knights and paladins,” for example, targets epic-romance in general and Spenser’s *Faerie Queene* in particular, and Shakespeare’s Sonnet 106 (“When in the chronicle of wasted time”) responds to both Daniel and Spenser.

My discussion of “The Complaint of Rosamund” and “A Lover’s Complaint” foregrounds narrative strategy. Beyond the textual exchanges, each poet is trying to “outframe” the other. Both complaints present stories within stories within stories. To make a long story short, Daniel closes his poem outside the frame of Rosamund’s story, in an autobiographical present, and

Shakespeare leaves his narrative frame open, concluding with the female lover's words. My essay explores the implications of these poetic moves, and what they reveal about literary competition.

Joseph M. Ortiz, "'Not fit for music': Shakespeare, Scott, and the Sound of English Poetry'

Recent scholarship has suggested that Shakespeare was more interested in the English Renaissance debates over prosody than previously assumed. For Shakespeare, the idea of reviving classical quantitative meters in English was not a technical matter; it spoke directly to the translatability of classical texts and the relationship between poetic sound and meaning. This paper reads Shakespeare's early experiments with quantitative verse in light of their reception by William Scott in his treatise *The Model of Poesy* (1599). As Gavin Alexander has shown, Scott was an accomplished classicist whose theory of poetics was deeply influenced by Sidney's *Defence of Poesy*. Yet, Scott adamantly rejected Sidney's experiments with quantitative verse, arguing that such attempts constituted a kind of poetic servility. I suggest that Scott's prosodic theory was itself shaped by his response to Shakespeare's *Rape of Lucrece* and *Richard II*, whose verse he alternately critiques and praises. For both Shakespeare and Scott, at the heart of the matter was the ability of English verse to preserve and inscribe a measure of time.

Johann Paccou, 'The "Member" and the "Prick": Fashioning the Beloved in Barnfield's Sonnets IX and X and in Shakespeare's Sonnet 20'

It has almost become a consensus among critics who have worked on Richard Barnfield that his homoerotic poetry must have influenced William Shakespeare's sonnets (see for instance Hammond 2002, p.72). The issue with existing criticism on the matter is that it tends to give in to qualitative assessments of both poets when it argues that, to put it bluntly, Shakespeare did it better. Even though we lack irrefutable proof that Barnfield was a direct source of inspiration for Shakespeare, the two poets do seem to have written their sonnets roughly at the same time: Barnfield's twenty sonnets to Ganymede were published in 1595 as part of *Cynthia: With Certain Sonnets, and the Legend of Cassandra*, and, though *Shakespeare's Sonnets* were not published until 1609, we know that at least some were already in circulation in the 1590s. It is also unclear whether their paths crossed in late Elizabethan London, but we can at least argue that the two poets wrote alongside each other in the sense that they shared the same poetic culture, influenced as they were by classical literature, early Renaissance Italian poetry, and Elizabethan pastoral literature.

The fact that both Barnfield and Shakespeare dedicate a sonnet collection to a fair young man is, of course, a compelling starting point of comparison. Even more interesting is the fact that both poets give their beloved youths pseudo-mythical origin stories. In this paper, I want to compare these origin stories through a thorough analysis of Shakespeare's "Sonnet 20," where the persona elaborates on the genesis of the "fair youth," and of Barnfield's "Sonnet IX" and "Sonnet X," in which we hear of Ganymede's divine origin. Shakespeare delineates what Colby Gordon has recently described as "trans technogenesis" since he "revisits Genesis 1.27 to offer

a transfeminine version of the creation myth” where the body is technically constructed, and, as such, central to human experience (Gordon 2020, p.273). Barnfield’s Ganymede is magically created by Venus out of snow and a drop of Diana’s blood, thus making him the fruit of what I would describe as divine lesbian parthenogenesis, or virgin birth. Being part of the same literary network, Barnfield and Shakespeare offer similarly fabulous origin stories which both draw attention to matters of corporeality and embodiment as they discuss the creation of the beloved’s body. In this regard, they share the same half-veiled focus on genitalia, indicated by the attention given to the “prick” in Shakespeare’s poem (l.13), which I propose to read as an echo to the “member” mentioned by Barnfield (“Sonnet X,” l.6). Analogous as these two creation stories might be, they reveal different strategies in the poetic fashioning of the beloved: while Barnfield’s is made otherworldly through a process of deification, the “master-mistress” of the persona’s passion in Shakespeare’s sonnets is very much of this world.

Giulio Pertile, ‘Shakespeare and Donne: The Poem as Event?’

At least since the early nineteenth century, lyric poetry has been understood primarily as private first-person meditation—speech, in John Stuart Mill’s famous formulation, that is ‘overheard’ rather than heard. Against this model Jonathan Culler has recently proposed that lyric should be understood not as representing a pre-existing speaker but rather as an event of speech unto itself, a linguistic ‘happening’, an ‘iterable’ moment of present-tense utterance. Culler’s vision of lyric poetry purports to be more transhistorical than the conventional idea of lyric as private meditation: his account ranges from Horace and Pindar to Baudelaire, Neruda, and Koch. Early modern lyric has, however, proven to be something of a sticking point. Culler himself draws sparingly on early modern examples and his notion of the poem as event has been challenged, in relation to early modern texts, by Paul Alpers and Colin Burrow. The dominant lyric form in this period, after all, is the sonnet—seemingly the archetype of the lyric as a private meditation standing outside time and presupposing a speaker whose thoughts the poem relates to us in turn.

In my paper I will approach this question by juxtaposing Shakespeare’s Sonnets with the more obviously ‘eventful’ lyrics of John Donne. Usually spoken in the present tense and clearly directed to an addressee, Donne’s Songs and Sonnets would seem much closer to the idea of the poem as event than Shakespeare’s apparently more ‘private’ poems (as already characterized by Francis Meres in 1598). Yet the seventeen sonnets which open Shakespeare’s sequence are mostly acts of address (if less ostentatiously so than Donne’s lyrics) seeking to impress a sense of urgency, of the ‘now’, upon their addressee. And on the other hand Donne’s lyrics, for all of their immediacy, often end by imagining a future audience more frequently associated with the poems of Shakespeare. In the paper, then, I will be juxtaposing these two poets with an eye to establishing both common ground as well as a sharper sense of their differences. I will also be reflecting more broadly on the ‘metaphysics’ of early modern lyric, in particular in relation to temporality and the question of ‘lyric ontology’. And finally I will use the comparison as a means of evaluating the theory of the poem as event: to what extent is this model applicable to early modern lyric? And might early modern lyric prompt any revision or sharpening of the theory itself?

Tracey Sedinger, 'The unexemplary content of poetic form: *Richard II* as unusable past'

"I am Richard II. Know ye not that?" Queen Elizabeth's remark to William Lambarde in August 1601 concluded over a decade's worth of historical parallels between the Lancastrian revolution of 1399 and the succession crisis of the 1590s. In the wake of the February 8 Essex uprising, and the subsequent execution of the earl on February 25, such deployments of the rhetoric of exemplarity seemed altogether dangerous. But censorship of late Elizabethan accounts of the Lancastrian revolution was seemingly inconsistent. For example, the 1587 edition of *Holinshed's Chronicles* removed the 1577 edition's thorough account of Richard's deposition. Rowland White wrote that the mere possession of R. Doleman's 1595 *A Conference About the Next Succession to the Crowne of England* was thought treasonous. Famously, the first three quartos of Shakespeare's *Richard II* (1597, 1598) omitted the deposition scene, which was first printed in 1608. Richard Bancroft, bishop of London, burned the second edition of Sir John Hayward's *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII* in 1599 – though, perhaps contrary to Sir Francis Bacon's 1604 account, not because the Queen had already noted its allegedly treasonous proclivities. However, in 1600, in the wake of Essex's sudden return to court from Ireland, Bacon used Hayward's history as evidence for the earl's seditious behavior, resulting in the lawyer's being sent to the Tower in July, from which he emerged only after James' accession.

On the other hand, Samuel Daniel's 1595 *Civil Wars* seemingly experienced no challenges (though Daniel or his printer removed an extensive encomium to Essex in the 1601 edition). Shakespeare scholars remain undecided as to whether the removal of the deposition scene in the printed quartos evidences the company's refusal or inability to perform it. Some of Essex's followers attended a play (about Richard II and/or Henry IV) at the Globe; most scholars conclude that it was Shakespeare's *Richard II*. Later efforts to relate the performance to the treasons of Essex and his followers remain inconclusive; though Augustine Phillips was examined on February 18, and Sir Edward Coke made much of the performance during Sir Gelly Meyrick's trial, the Lord Chamberlain's Men apparently suffered no penalty. Why? And why did Elizabeth and the Privy Council make so much of Hayward's 1599 text, while ignoring Daniel's poem?

As various scholars have argued, late Elizabethan magistrates may have assumed that watching an ephemeral performance of Richard's fall (especially when it was likely that the highly charismatic Richard Burbage played the king) was considerably less threatening than a private – and therefore potentially subversive – act of reading. But I would also like to consider what Hayden White has called the content of the form – here, the perhaps prophylactic use of verse, including a variety of tropes and figures, to avoid a more prosaic, and ostensibly more "objective," historical account that rendered the past as a real (i.e., implementable), as opposed to a notional (thinkable but impossible), option for the present. I have argued elsewhere that Daniel deployed a number of tropes and figures to negate the Lancastrian revolution as a "usable past." I would like to follow the consequences of that argument in terms of Shakespeare's play, especially insofar as it was received as poetry – in opposition to the prose of Hayward's *The First Part of the Life and Raigne of King Henrie IIII*.

Goran Stanivukovic, 'The Narrative Poems and Erotic Description: Rethinking Early Shakespeare'

My paper focuses on *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, examining the erotic and emotional rhetoric of Shakespeare's early literary style as a means of depicting embodiment. I argue that the primary characteristic distinguishing Shakespeare's epyllia from their classical models, particularly Ovid, is an elaborate description of the body. I analyze erotic description as a critical device that prompts us to consider why it appears at specific points in the poem and what it achieves. Descriptions of the gendered body are central to cultural ideas of its signification, as well as to the readers' sensuous and moral response to that body. Late Elizabethan poetry often conveyed moral messages, and it is reasonable to assume that Shakespeare's erotic descriptions similarly invited early modern readers to ponder the subversiveness of these descriptions or to contemplate the tension between identification and deidentification with the content of these depictions. I conclude by rethinking the notion of 'early Shakespeare.' The fact that Shakespeare began his writing career fascinated by the male and female body has seldom been emphasized in criticism as a defining feature of 'earliness' in his writing. If 'early' as a concept in describing a literary career is both related to the text and shaped by extra-textual factors (e.g., biography), my focus on textual elements only reveals the complex interplay between various classical and early modern influences in his erotic descriptions.

Eric Vivier, 'Shakespeare Among the Satirists'

I am working on a book chapter about the quarrel—if you can call it that—between John Marston and Joseph Hall, which I think, has something to do with the relationship poetry and pleasure. I would like to use this seminar as an opportunity to write about the first part of this: Joseph Hall's attitude towards Ovidian poetry. In *Virgidemiarum* (1597-98), Hall was interested in producing his reader's displeasure by attacking poetry that offered its readers pornographic pleasure—especially Thomas Nashe's *Choice of Valentines* (1592), but perhaps also including Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* (1593). For Hall, satire was the only truly moral poetic undertaking. Ironically, however, the pleasure of Ovidian epyllions like Nashe's *Choice of Valentines* and Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* was wrapped up in its satirical response to Petrarchanism. What's more, Hall's opposition to pornographic pleasure becomes (at least for Hall, but also, probably, for us) a distinctly pleasurable undertaking. I don't know what any of this means yet, or that Shakespeare is actually involved in any meaningful way, but I'm going to do my best to figure it out over the next two months.