

Contents

NOTE ON THE TEXT	x
INTRODUCTION	1
<p>The Introduction sets out the background to the Guide and considers the question of genre with reference to <i>Pericles</i>, <i>Cymbeline</i>, <i>The Winter's Tale</i> and <i>The Tempest</i>.</p>	
CHAPTER ONE	11
<p>The Late Plays: Critical Opinion in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries</p> <p>The first chapter discusses eighteenth and nineteenth century criticism of all four plays together, moving from the classically influenced eighteenth century through the Romantics to the Victorians and one or two very early twentieth century critics.</p>	
CHAPTER TWO	24
<p><i>Pericles</i></p> <p>The second chapter devotes its attention exclusively to <i>Pericles</i>, discussing the Arden editions of 2004 and 1963.</p>	
CHAPTER THREE	38
<p><i>Cymbeline</i> (1)</p> <p>This chapter is the first of two on <i>Cymbeline</i>. The chapter opens with a discussion of some comments by F R Leavis and then considers Martin Butler's 2005 Cambridge edition of the play.</p>	
CHAPTER FOUR	48
<p><i>Cymbeline</i> (2)</p> <p>This chapter continues the discussion of critical approaches to <i>Cymbeline</i>, opening with the Introduction to J M Nosworthy's 1955 Arden edition of the play. Jodi Mikalacki's essay on the</p>	

VIII CONTENTS

play is discussed and that is followed by a consideration of Coppélia Kahn's remarks on the play.

CHAPTER FIVE 59

The Winter's Tale: Early Moderns

The fifth chapter is the first of three chapters on *The Winter's Tale*. The chapter opens with a discussion of comments from *Shakespeare's Last Plays* by E M W Tillyard and moves on to discuss the views of S L Bethell, F R Leavis and G Wilson Knight on the play.

CHAPTER SIX 74

The Winter's Tale: Later Moderns

The sixth chapter opens with Ernest Schanzer's reply to E M W Tillyard and then moves on to discuss Inga-Stina Ewbank's views and those of Northrop Frye, Nevill Coghill and M M Mahood.

CHAPTER SEVEN 96

The Winter's Tale: Post-moderns

The last chapter to be concerned with *The Winter's Tale* opens with Stanley Cavell's treatment of the play and moves on to Valerie Traub's remarks. Finally an essay by Graham Holderness is discussed.

CHAPTER EIGHT 113

The Tempest: Moderns

The concluding two chapters on *The Tempest* contrast a range of 'traditional' and 'modernist' accounts of the play with distinctly 'postmodern' approaches. Chapter 8 returns to F R Leavis's comments on the late plays and then considers E M W Tillyard's treatment of the play before moving on to G Wilson Knight's vision of the play. The chapter concludes with Jan Kott's comments.

CHAPTER NINE 123

The Tempest: Post-moderns

The final chapter concentrates on the closer inspection of some critical accounts informed by 'critical theory'. The chapter opens with a discussion of the essay by Francis Barker and Peter Hulme and moves on to consider Paul Brown's comments, concluding with Meredith Skura's essay.

CONCLUSION: FUTURE DIRECTIONS 145

The Conclusion contrasts the more traditional critical approaches with the contemporary emphases and suggests some possible lines of development for future criticism.

NOTES 150**BIBLIOGRAPHY** 164**INDEX** 169

Introduction

When John Heminges (died 1630) and Henry Condell (died 1627) assembled the first Folio edition of Shakespeare's dramatic works for publication in 1623 they arranged them into three sections, Comedies, Histories and Tragedies, in that order, and they placed *The Tempest* in the first section. By doing so they made a contribution to a significant tendency that they may even have begun: the tendency, that is, to see this late play as the culmination of Shakespeare's life's work in the theatre. This tendency begets another (that may have started at the same time): the tendency to regard other plays, seen as similar, as precursor works. These plays together, *Pericles* (c. 1608), *Cymbeline* (c. 1610–11), *The Winter's Tale* (c. 1611) and *The Tempest* (1611), form a loose grouping because they are not like the great comedies of the middle period (*Much Ado About Nothing* (c. 1598–9), *Twelfth Night* (c. 1601), *As You Like It* (c. 1600)) nor are they quite like the 'problem plays' (*Troilus and Cressida* (c. 1601–2), *Measure for Measure* (1604), *The Merchant of Venice* (c. 1596–7)¹) and, though they have tragic trajectories to start with, they are unlike the great tragedies. Indeed *The Tempest* buries its tragic part entirely in a long retrospective narrative and is not properly speaking even a 'tragicomedy'.

Heminges and Condell were not particularly skilled in, or interested in, generic distinctions. Dr Samuel Johnson (1709–84) condescendingly remarks that the editors of the first Folio, who 'divided our author's works into comedies, histories and tragedies, seem not to have distinguished the three kinds by any exact or definite ideas'.² Later generations of editors and critics have been much more careful. The four plays addressed in this Guide are so often regarded together or in relation to one another that it is profitable to address them together and to see what such later generations of editors and critics have made of them.

THE QUESTION OF GENRE

If Heminges and Condell are to be taken to task at all, however, it is perhaps on the account that their distinctions were too few and too general. Their inclusion, for example, of *Measure for Measure* and *The Winter's Tale* in the same category, 'Comedies', as *A Midsummer Night's*

Dream and *Love's Labours Lost* seemed to later scholarship to be stretching the boundaries of the category to too great an extent, and to risk, thereby, losing its meaning. After all, a category so broad as to accept into itself all manner of things is of no use analytically. That perhaps is the point: to what use will these categories be put? Why need we know whether a play is a 'tragedy' or a 'comedy'?

Categories are constructed on the basis of similarities and dissimilarities between things such that things that are similar are gathered together under the rubric of a summary of, or a definition of, their similarities, and their dissimilarities are set aside as of little or no significance. Once the balance of similarity and dissimilarity starts to tip in favour of dissimilarity then a new category is required. Such is the case with those 'Comedies' (as Heminges and Condell styled them) *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*: there are simply too many aspects of those plays that set them apart from plays such as *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, or *Love's Labours Lost* to allow readers, audiences and scholars to continue to regard them as comedies. The case of *Cymbeline* is even more curious: Heminges and Condell set that play amongst the 'Tragedies' and *Pericles* is in no case at all as Heminges and Condell did not include it in their First Folio edition of the plays.

In what do the significant differences consist? First it may be said that the tragic part of three of the plays is much more extended than is usual in comedies. That there is a tragic part is not unusual: the plight of the lovers in *A Midsummer's Night's Dream* could easily be drawn out to a tragic conclusion. However, the tragic part in, say, *The Winter's Tale* is drawn out throughout the first part of the play to the end of Act 3 scene 2; the tragic part in *Cymbeline* is so extended that Heminges and Condell's decision to place it amongst the Tragedies may almost be defended. Pericles's sufferings are egregiously extended and Prospero's narrative is of similarly extended suffering. Nor is it only a matter of extension: the intensity of the first part of *The Winter's Tale*, or the intensity of Pericles's suffering, raise serious questions concerning whether any restoration of equilibrium would be sufficient to offset them; to convince an audience that order and well-being had been restored.

A second significant feature of these plays is a much greater dependence on unlikely incident than is usual in plays with a serious intent, such as these plays have for much of the time been taken to be. Comedy may trifle with magic and outrageous coincidence without upsetting their balance but the closer a play approaches to 'real life' the more the illusion it is trying to sustain is endangered by the unlikely. These four plays revel in the unlikely and they do so in the thick of seriousness. Their willingness to exploit the unlikely has led to comparisons with those works usually called 'Romances' in which the magical and the unlikely abound and, indeed, the sources from

which it seems Shakespeare is likely to have drawn are themselves, frequently, Romances. Finally, the plays belong to the final period of Shakespeare's creative life. The great tragedies and the great middle period comedies had been written: *Pericles* seems to come just after *Antony and Cleopatra* (1608?); it is followed by *Coriolanus* (1608?) and then by *The Winter's Tale* (1609–10?), *Cymbeline* (1610–11?) and *The Tempest* (1610–11?). After that come *Cardenio*, *All Is True* (*Henry VIII*), and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. These belong to 1613 and were co-written with John Fletcher (1579–1625); Shakespeare's contribution to the two that have survived has never excited much critical interest. He died, according to his monument, on 23 April 1616 and was buried on 25 April 1616. It is inevitable perhaps that the plays that have excited critical interest, especially *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* should be regarded as 'last' or 'late' plays.

J M Nosworthy's Arden edition of *Cymbeline* takes this idea to a logical conclusion and compares that play with Beethoven's famous 'late' string quartets and piano sonatas. The idea of 'late' works, in which an accomplished and celebrated artist turns in upon himself and reflects upon his art and his success in a mood of introverted self-absorption is a popular notion with Romantic writers and artists, and the figure of Prospero, turning his back on his art having completed a work from which he will personally benefit directly very little, easily becomes a figure of this kind of artistic self-abnegation. We cannot know what Shakespeare would have made of this characterization of his own position, but we can speculate that he found the figure an attractive one as he dramatizes it so effectively. Of course so he does *Othello* and *Macbeth* and we are not led to make such speculations in that direction so readily.

A final introductory word must be said in respect of the differences of the plays from one another. Distinguishing each play from the categories into which earlier editors thrust them is only part of the task to be completed: if there are no really significant similarities between them, or if the differences between them outweigh any similarities there may be, then there is no group; only four plays as distinct from each other as they are from other plays that can be grouped together in spite of their differences.

For they really are different, at least on a superficial view. *Pericles* is set in the Ancient world and appears to be an episodic tale of the wanderings of an unlucky man and of members of his family, which, after much anxiety, ends happily. *Cymbeline* is set in Ancient Britain and may, on that account, be compared with *King Lear* (1608?), but any such comparison ends immediately with the recognition that the king in the one has almost no part to play while the king in the other has all to play. *Cymbeline* sets a personal domestic drama against a backdrop of historical political conflict: the course of the relationship, which does

not run smooth, between Posthumus and Imogen runs through two countries (three, counting Wales), and, abstracted from the Romano-British conflict against which it is set, could have been set in the same countries as those in which some of the middle comedies are set, say, Illyria or Messina. *The Winter's Tale* is set in Sicily but is so far removed in what may be called its moral world from those plays, that it bears really very little resemblance to any of them, though perhaps a comparison with *The Merchant of Venice* may be sustained for a while, as the theme of vindictiveness is shared by them both. Finally, *The Tempest*, if it is close to any play, reminds one of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in some respects but not in others, and few plays have such a central figure as Prospero that are not tragedies, commanding, as he does, the whole of the action, quite literally.

What the plays do share is a mood. When Edward Bond (born 1934) wrote that his play *Saved* was 'almost irresponsibly optimistic' he surely knew that eyebrows would be raised.³ Causing scandal on account of the scene in which a baby in a pram is stoned to death by a group of youths, the play seemed to many to be a picture of a hopeless and degenerate form of human existence. Yet the play's central character, Len, is seen at the end of the play, preoccupied, trying to mend a broken chair. The plays discussed in this Guide share a mood I shall call 'almost irresponsibly optimistic'.

Each play is realistic about sexual desire, realistic to the point of affronting audiences in later times, especially in Victorian times; each play is realistic about politics as well. Each play deals realistically with the terrible disappointment that attends upon our not being able to have what we want or, more dreadfully still, not wanting what we can have. Each play deliberately and extravagantly flaunts the unlikelihood of the events it narrates. In this respect the comparison with *The Merchant of Venice* really is appropriate. At the end of that play, when Antonio has been saved from his fate by the intervention of Portia, the fate that he incurred by making a foolish bargain with Shylock, insuring his ships against a pound of his own flesh, losing the ships one by one and facing his death at last, Portia, when all is at last well, turns to him to give him a letter, in which, she tells him, that he will find that the three ships that he and everyone else had thought lost are in fact now come safely to port:

■ *Portia*: You shall not know by what strange accident
I chancèd on this letter.

Antonio: I am dumb! □

(5.1.278–9)

It is not at all necessary that we should have, in addition to the substantial gift of the salvation of Antonio, this additional bonus. The play

has already ended very well. Moreover, such an additional bonus runs the risk of stretching the audience's credibility, for all art exists on a cusp between wish-fulfilment and reality and to stray too far towards either end of this continuum is to risk disaster for we do not want an art that merely recapitulates reality and we are too wise not to know wish-fulfilment dreams for what they are and what they do. This, however, is exactly the mood of the plays considered in this Guide. They are realistic to the point of arousing disgust (Leontes's jealousy; the brothel in *Pericles*; Posthumus's infantile maunderings about Imogen; Caliban's enthusiastic endorsement of the charge that he tried to rape Miranda: 'O ho, O ho! Would't had been done! / Thou didst prevent me; I had peopled else / This isle with Calibans.' (1.2.351–3)), and they unashamedly reach out to meet and to embrace our deepest wishes that all would end well after all. If the very greatest art helps us to reconcile ourselves to the way things are, once we have accepted that we cannot change that, this art seems designed to provoke everything we have trained ourselves to put behind us as we grew up and to tell us that we can have what we want.

ART AND CRITICISM

Here we focus on the deepest problem of any literary-historical discussion. It may be clearly stated: what is Art? What is Criticism?

There are many answers and rehearsing them all serves no useful purpose: one has to pick one and take one's stand. This Guide is influenced by the careful remarks of Dr Johnson in his *Preface to The Works of William Shakespeare* (1765):

■ To works, however, of which the excellence is not absolute and definite, but gradual and comparative; to works not raised upon principles demonstrative and scientific, but appealing wholly to observation and experience, no other test can be applied than length of duration and continuance of esteem. What mankind have long possessed they have often examined and compared, and if they persist to value the possession, it is because frequent comparisons have confirmed opinion in its favour.⁴ □

Criticism, in such a view, is not the application of a theory derived from some other discipline or even from the study of critical activity itself but the observation of what 'mankind have long possessed', and the possession of which 'they persist to value', and the conduct of 'frequent comparisons' through which this valuation persists. Criticism, then, is the conduct of comparison. Hence the remarks above in respect of genre will apply to a discussion of criticism: if criticism is comparison

then it is the identification of similarities and dissimilarities and the judgement on the ground of these whether a work should be highly regarded or not and to which rank precisely it belongs.

Another view entirely holds that the persistence of the valuation of a work is a phenomenon to be observed and analysed from the vantage point of a theory derived from some other discipline – say, anthropology, sociology or psychology – as though one were observing the doings of men and women in quite another society than one's own. Both of these views will be encountered in the course of an examination of the critical history of these plays.

The question, what is Art, is equally discussed differently from these different positions. The first position is concerned to discover in what the excellence of an excellent work consists: the second is concerned to uncover what underlies the ascription of the value to the work, what are the consequences of the ascription for the arrangements of society, and are they beneficial to some, many or all, or contrary to the interests and aspirations of some, or of many. The first position will hold that this set of accounts will not be criticism at all: the second position will hold that accounts given from the first position are complicit with the consequences of the valuation. As is the case with any hard and fast distinction the reader will find that this useful guidance will hold in some cases and not in others: it is the fate of theories to be true in general and unprovable in particular.

SUBSEQUENT CRITICAL HISTORY

Just as literature has its history so does literary criticism: criticism has its fashions and its changes. We may reasonably say that 'Shakespeare' is always '*our* Shakespeare', or 'Shakespeare for us'. This has become even clearer as the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have seen the difference increase between the critical traditions of the preceding centuries and the critical traditions developing within these later centuries. At the same time, 'Eng. Lit.' has developed further from being 'the literature *of the English*' to becoming 'the literature *in English*'. This 'globalization' has been accompanied by 'decentralization'. Central authorities and over-arching narratives have lost their power to influence. The successes of feminism in challenging patriarchal authority are to be credited amongst several developments that have undermined these central authorities and discredited the larger narratives on which they have depended, as are the later developments such as postcolonialist theoretical positions. The American philosopher Stanley Cavell (born 1926) has identified 'scepticism' as a central theme (associated with the French philosopher René Descartes (1596–1650) especially, but, in

Cavell's analysis, a part of Shakespeare's work) and his discussion of *The Winter's Tale* is duly given prominence in this Guide. Other themes to be noted are the development of critical interest in and, sometimes, respect for plays largely ignored by the eighteenth century (*Pericles* and *Cymbeline*) and the importance of the performance tradition in respect of this development. Indeed, the changing critical appreciation of the performance tradition, moving towards acceptance and, more recently, towards significant respect, is to be noted.

The quality and the quantity of critical attention devoted to each play varies very widely and there is no reason to believe that the play to which most, and the most careful, critical attention has been devoted so far, *The Winter's Tale*, will remain in this prominent position. As scholar-critics devise ever more subtle positions they are able to discover aspects of the plays hitherto unsuspected of existence.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE GUIDE

Chapter 1 discusses eighteenth and nineteenth century criticism of all four plays together while the remainder of the Guide devotes chapters specifically to each play. This is because the significant development in the critical industry is very much a twentieth and twenty-first century phenomenon but also because these centuries have seen the most significant and extended critical attention paid to these plays. The eighteenth century did not think that these plays asked for much in the way of comment compared to the great tragedies, for example. Comments by Dr Johnson, whose opinion of *Cymbeline* in particular was not high but whose estimate of *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* was not very much higher, are included, and the much more favourable views of William Hazlitt (1778–1830) and Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772–1834). It is too sweeping a generalization to say that the Augustan Dr Johnson disapproves while the Romantics, Hazlitt and Coleridge, approve, but there is some truth in the view. Even so, the level of the comments devoted even by so discerning and imaginative a critic as Coleridge do not reach the heights he reached when considering the tragedies and even some of the lesser plays. The chapter concludes with two Victorians and a Modern: Edward Dowden (1843–1913) whose *Shakspeare: His Mind and Art* (1875) was a bestseller in its day and Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch (1863–1944: he wrote popular fiction as 'Q') are the Victorians, and Giles Lytton Strachey (1880–1932: famous for his *Eminent Victorians* (1918), a series of unflattering portraits of such key figures as Florence Nightingale (1820–1910) and General Gordon (1833–85: 'Gordon of Khartoum') in which Strachey shows the feet of clay of which each

was possessed) the Modern. Strachey was a founder member of the 'Bloomsbury Group', associated with Leonard Woolf (1880–1969) and Virginia Woolf (1879–1970) and E M Forster (1879–1970) and, therefore, part of the embryonic 'Modernist' movement in the UK at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Chapter 2 devotes its attention exclusively to *Pericles*, a play almost universally believed to be a collaboration in which Shakespeare participated (perhaps the reason Heminges and Condell did not include the play in their 1623 Folio), beginning with Suzanne Gossett's 2004 Arden edition of the play and then considering the 1965 Arden edition of F D Hoeniger (born 1921). Chapters 3 and 4 discuss *Cymbeline*, focusing on Martin Butler's 2005 Cambridge edition of that play and contrasting this edition with J M Nosworthy's 1955 Arden edition. Increasingly, editions of the plays have become important starting points for any critical examination of the reception history of the plays as a review of that history has become a standard feature of the introductions to these editions and those editions have been growing in both length and in the comprehensiveness of their coverage. Neither play has provoked anything significant in critical discussion, though two essays on *Cymbeline* gave rise to some interesting comment by F R Leavis (1895–1978) on the Late Plays, which is introduced in Chapter 4 though that comment primarily concerns *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* and is dealt with at greater length in Chapter 5 and again in Chapter 8. Chapter 4 addresses the Introduction to J M Nosworthy's 1955 Arden edition of *Cymbeline*, and concludes with a discussion of Jodi Mikalachki's essay on 'The Masculine Romance of Roman Britain: *Cymbeline* and Early Modern English Nationalism (1995)' and Coppélia Kahn's remarks on the play in her *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds and Women* (1997). Mikalachki and Kahn are 'historicist' critics, interested in exploring the relationship between the works and their context in early modern England, with particular reference to the construction of gender identities.

Chapter 5 considers some early twentieth century critical accounts of *The Winter's Tale*, starting with discussion from *Shakespeare's Last Plays* by E M W Tillyard (1889–1962) and moving on to S L Bethell's ingenious argument that the apparent clumsiness of the dramatic technique of the play is in fact deliberate. G Wilson Knight (1897–1985) offers a highly theorized approach, claiming that 'Shakespeare offers nothing greater in tragic psychology, humour, pastoral, romance'. If anything unites these critics it is an unspoken shared set of assumptions about critical practice: that it depends upon interpretations that the critic can, or at least does, assume will be available to the reader. They do not defend their views as much as present them. Chapter 6 opens with a

discussion of Ernest Schanzer's reply to E M W Tillyard and takes into account the interesting discussion by Inga-Stina Ewbank (1932–2004) of the figure of Time in the play and the attempt of Northrop Frye (1912–91) to place the work in a context of Graeco-Roman mythology. Nevill Coghill (1899–1980) draws attention to points of stagecraft and M M Mahood traces some of the key words in the play. In the work of these critics it is already becoming clear that some promotion, if not defence, of one's views, in terms of historical scholarship or theoretical ingenuity, is becoming necessary and the appeal to common 'feeling' is less marked if it is there at all. Indeed, Coghill, to take his essay as an instance, seems at times to be arguing against common assumptions and for common sense. At the same time the ideal reader, the 'common playgoer', as it might be, or the 'common reader', is being displaced by a more erudite figure altogether. The earlier chapters of this Guide have already acknowledged the degree of scholarship that is now displayed in the best editions of the plays: the development visible in this chapter has come to fruition.

Chapter 7 brings the discussion of *The Winter's Tale* up to the end of the twentieth century, looking at Graham Holderness's essay and Stanley Cavell's treatment of the play and finally at Valerie Traub's remarks in her *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Drama* (1992). Chapter 8 returns to F R Leavis's comments on the late plays to bring together the key early twentieth century responses to *The Tempest*: Tillyard's and G Wilson Knight's. Jan Kott (1914–2001) in *Shakespeare: Our Contemporary* (1965) offers a nightmare vision of the play that acts as a transition between the early twentieth century and the later twentieth century. Giles Lytton Strachey's comments on the violence and cruelty that can be seen alongside the pastoral tranquillity of the late plays come to mind as Kott lays bare the infrastructure, as he sees it, of these romances. It is not fanciful to say that the development of the twentieth century has been away from visions of tranquillity and towards visions of violence and cruelty. Cavell's identification of scepticism is relevant: it may be that the century has taken its revenge on the confidence in knowledge (especially in scientific and technological developments) that so marks the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries.

Lastly, Chapter 9 concentrates on the closer inspection of some critical accounts informed by 'critical theory'. Francis Barker (1952–99) and Peter Hulme deconstruct *The Tempest* with the aid of advanced theoretical positions and Paul Brown explores the historical context in detail, again with the aid of some of the theories that have emerged in the last half of the twentieth century, while Meredith Skura's essay rounds off the discussion by taking on both Barker and Hulme and

Paul Brown to offer a psychoanalytical perspective where they have offered a more politically oriented perspective. The Guide concludes with a hope that the ingenuity displayed by critics of various persuasions will not tire and that these plays, that have provoked so much interesting discussion so far, will continue to do so.

Index

- Aaron (*Titus Andronicus*), 142–3
 Adelman, Janet, 28, 45, 99, 148
 Age of Reason, 92
 Alexander, Bill, 48
 Alighieri, Dante, 18, 31, 74
The Allegory of Love (Lewis), 68
 all-male family, 57
 Althusser, Louis, 136, 138
 Antigonus (*Winter's Tale*), 85
Antony and Cleopatra, 3
 anxiety, 132
 Apollo, 81, 104
 Archer, William, 38
 archetypes, 117–18
 Ariel (*Tempest*), 14–15, 17, 117, 118
 Aristotle, 36, 60
 Arnold, Matthew, 96
 art, 5–6
 Arthos, J., 34
As You Like It, 1, 111, 121, 141, 146
 Auden, W. H., 124
 authority, 92
 Autolycus (*Winter's Tale*), 62, 71, 95
 autotelic text, 125, 128
- Barker, Francis, 9, 69, 124–35, 146
 Barton, Anne, 42
 Bate, Jonathan, 28
 Beaumont, Francis, 78
 Belsey, Catherine, 44
 Bender, John B., 143–4
 Bergeron, David, 29, 148
 Bethell, S. L., 8, 62–4, 71, 77, 147
 Bicks, Caroline, 28
 Blackfriars Theatre, 42
 Blake, William, 112
 Bloomsbury Group, 8
 Bond, Edward, 4
 Bosch, Hieronymus, 121–2
 Bradley, A. C., 38, 70, 93, 99
 Bradley-Archer assumption, 38–9
 Bradley-Archer thesis, 99
 British colonialism, 132, 135–7,
 140–1
 British nationalism, 52–5, 56
- Brown, Paul, 9, 135–9
 Butler, Martin, 8, 41–7, 52
- Caliban (*Tempest*), 14–15, 118, 134, 137,
 141–3
 Capell, Edward, 34
 categorization, 1–5
 causation, 101
 Cavell, Stanley, 6–7, 9, 99–107
 Césaire, Aimé, 124
 Chorus (*Winter's Tale*), 71
 Christianity, 72, 95, 105
 Christian view, of *Pericles*, 27–8
 Clubb, Louise G., 86
 Coghill, Nevill, 9, 75, 84–8
 Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 7, 16–19, 44
 Collier, J. P., 17
 colonialism, 132, 135–7, 140–1
 comedies, 1–2, 22
 Condell, Henry, 1
 consciousness, 98
 conscious reflexivity, 123
 Cook, Carol, 109
 Coriolanus, 3
 cosmology, 83–4
 creative activity, 118–19
 critical history, 6–7
 critical theory, 9–10, 129
 critical tradition, 11–12
 criticism *see* literary criticism
The Crown of Life (Wilson Knight), 66–7
 culture, 97–8, 133–4
Cymbeline, 1, 3, 8, 48–9
 adaptations, 48
 Arden edition, 3, 8
 Butler on, 41–7
 Cambridge edition, 8
 Coleridge on, 16
 family relationships in, 51
 Hazlitt on, 13–14
 historical context, 45, 52–5
 imagery in, 50–1
 Johnson on, 12–13, 41
 Kahn on, 55–8
 Leavis on, 38–41

- Cymbeline* – continued
 Mikalachki on, 52–5
 nationalism and, 49–50, 52–5
 Nosworthy on, 49–52
 organization of, 52
 Q on, 23
 as romance, 57
 as Roman play, 55–8
 setting for, 3–4
 Strachey on, 20–1
 symbolism in, 45–6
Tempest and, 115
 as tragedy, 2
 as tragicomedy, 42–3
 tragic part of, 2
Winter's Tale and, 39
see also specific characters
- Daniels, Ron, 24–5
 D'Avenant, William, 124
 decentralization, 6
 deconstruction, 100
 Derrida, Jacques, 147
 Descartes, René, 6–7, 100–1, 104, 105
 Desdemona (*Othello*), 94, 105
 Diana, 28
 Dionyza (*Pericles*), 31
 discourse, 130–1, 132, 135
Disowning Knowledge (Cavell), 99
Divine Comedy (Dante), 74
double entendre, 46, 89
 Dowden, Edward, 7, 19, 148
 dreams, 16
 dreamwork, 138
 Dryden, John, 13, 124
 D'Urfey, Thomas, 48
 Dymock, Edward, 42
- Edwards, Philip, 30
 ego, 91, 92
 Elizabethan-Jacobean age, 68–9
 Eliot, T. S., 38
 Elizabeth (princess), 145–6
 Elizabeth (queen), 43, 53–4, 136
 Elizabethan manners, 67
 Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 100, 101
The Enchanted Island (Dryden), 124
 enchantment, 12
 Engels, Friedrich, 55
 English literature, 6–7
 Enlightenment, 92
epitasis, 129
 erudite terminology, 127
- events, unlikely, 2–3, 4–5
 Ewbank, Inga-Stina, 9, 77–80
- fairy tale narratives, 41–2
The Faithful Shepherd (Dymock), 42, 43
 Falstaff, 71–2, 141
 family relationships, 31–2, 35, 51, 57
 Faucit, Helen, 48
 female body, 108
 female sexuality, 101
 femininity, 55
 feminism, 6, 92
 feminist critique, of *Winter's Tale*, 107–12
 Ferdinand (*Tempest*), 118
 Fletcher, John, 3, 78
 Florizel (*Winter's Tale*), 79–80
 Foakes, R. A., 42
 Folio edition, 1, 2
 Forster, E. M., 8
 Foucault, Michael, 101, 130, 136, 138
 fraternity, 53
 Frederic (prince), 124, 145–6
 Freud, Sigmund, 91, 101–2, 138, 141
 Frye, Northrop, 9, 27, 80–4
- Garrick, 48
 Gaskill, William, 48
 Geertz, Clifford, 98
 gender identities, 8
 genre, question of, 1–5
 Girard, René, 98
 globalization, of English literature, 6
 Gonzalo (*Tempest*), 17
 Gordon, General, 7
 Gossett, Suzanne, 8, 24–33, 52, 93, 99,
 147, 148
 grammar, 130
 Greece, 61
 Greek drama, 59
 Green, Robert, 77
 Green, Roger L., 51
 Greenaway, Peter, 124
 Greene, Alexis, 26–7
 grotesque, 122
 Guarini, Giambattista, 42
- Hall, Peter, 48
 Halpern, Richard, 27, 29, 30
 Hamlet (character), 142
 Hands, Terry, 24
 Hart, F. Elizabeth, 28
 Hazlitt, William, 7, 13–16
 Hegel, G. W. F., 55

- Heidegger, Martin, 101
 Heminges, John, 1
 Henry VIII, 31, 53
 Hermione (*Winter's Tale*), 60, 81–2, 87–8,
 90, 93–4, 95, 101, 109–10, 111–12
 historical context: of *Cymbeline*, 45, 52–5
 of *Pericles*, 29–30
 Histories, 1
 Hoeniger, F. D., 8, 33–7
 Holderness, Graham, 9, 97, 98, 99,
 110–12
 Hulme, Peter, 9, 69, 124–35, 146
 Hunt, Maurice, 27–8

 Iachimo (*Cymbeline*), 44
 idealised rusticity, 116
 ideology, 97, 129, 136
 imagery, in *Cymbeline*, 50–1
 Imogen (*Cymbeline*), 13–14, 42, 44,
 47, 57
 imperfect narrator, 69
 incest, 28, 30, 31
 infidelity, 57
The Injured Princess (D'Urfe), 48
 intertextuality, 126

 Jacobean manners, 67
 James (king), 29–30, 43, 45
 Jameson, Anna, 48
 Jarman, Derek, 124
 Johnson, Samuel, 1, 5, 7, 11–13, 41, 42, 96
 Jonson, Ben, 141
 Jordan, Constance, 29–30

 Kahn, Coppélia, 8, 44, 45, 55–8
 Kemble, John Philip, 48
 Kermode, Frank, 124, 126, 128–9, 131,
 134, 146
 key words, 9
King John, 53
King Lear, 116
 Knights, L. C., 93, 99
 Kott, Jan, 9, 119–22
 Kuhn, Thomas, 147
 Kulick, Brian, 26–7

 Lacan, Jacques, 109–10
 language, 130
 late plays, 3
 18th and 19 century critical opinion on,
 11–12
 as humanist, 22
The Lays of Ancient Rome (Macaulay), 57

 Leavis, F. R., 8, 9, 38–41, 42, 52, 64–6,
 96, 99, 113–14, 126, 148
 Leninism, 130
 Leonatus (*Cymbeline*), 16
 Leontes (*Winter's Tale*), 15, 16, 20, 59, 60,
 75, 77–8, 81–2, 84–5, 89–91, 93–5,
 97, 102–7, 112
 Lewis, C. S., 68
 literary criticism, 5–6
 in 18th and 19th centuries, 11–23
 contemporary, 99
 history of, 6–7
 revolution in, 52
 Locke, John, 92
 love, 111
Love's Labours Lost, 2
 Lyotard, Francois, 26

 Macaulay, Thomas Babington, 57
 Macbeth (character), 3, 75
 Mahood, M. M., 9, 69, 88–95, 97
 Malone, Edmond, 12, 13, 34
 Mamillius (*Winter's Tale*), 67–8, 95, 102
 Maoism, 130
 Marina (*Pericles*), 31–2
 marriage, 43–4, 68
 Marx, Karl, 97–8, 129–30
 masculine knowing, 101
 masculinity, 55
 masques, 78–9, 131, 134, 136
 McJannet, Linda, 30
 McManaway, J. G., 34
 Measure for Measure, 1, 22
The Merchant of Venice, 1, 4, 146
 as romantic comedy, 35
 unlikely events in, 4–5
 metanarrative, 26
 metaphor, 137–8
 Midlands Uprising, 29
A Midsummer Night's Dream, 1–2, 4
 Mikalachki, Jodi, 8, 52–5
 Milton, John, 18
 Miola, Robert, 27, 55
 Miranda (*Tempest*), 17, 18, 115, 118
 Modernist movement, 8
 Monck, Nugent, 24
 mood, 4
 moral intransigence, 94
 morality play, *Winter's Tale* as, 90
 Morse, William, 96
 Mousley, Andy, 148
Much Ado About Nothing, 1, 107–8, 110–11
 Muir, Kenneth, 36

- Mullaney, Steven, 29
 Murry, Middleton, 115
 music, 14
- nationalism, 49–50, 52–5, 56
 Nature, 65, 76, 81–2, 116, 120
 Nevo, Ruth, 30, 31
 New Criticism, 100
 Nightingale, Florence, 7
 Nosworthy, J. M., 3, 8, 49–52
 novels, 64
- occlusion, 127, 128
 oppression, 125, 138
 Orgel, Stephen, 43, 48, 49, 66, 71
 Orlin, Lena Cowen, 52
Othello, 42, 64, 101, 105, 107, 111
 Othello (character), 3, 16, 44, 101, 105
 Oxford Standard Authors, 96
- Palfrey, Simon, 29–30, 96, 148
Pandosto (Greene), 77
 pantomime, 62
 parallelism, in *Winter's Tale*, 76–7
 Parker, M. D. H., 34
 Parker, Patricia, 44, 56
 particularization, 68
 pastoral scenes, 65, 72, 79–80
 patriarchal authority, 6
 Perdita (*Winter's Tale*), 61, 79–80, 90–1, 95, 105
 performance tradition, 7
Pericles, 1, 2, 3, 8, 12, 24–37
 Arden edition, 8
 biographical approach to, 33
 Christian view of, 27–8
 Coleridge on, 16
 exclusion of, from canon, 34
 family relationships in, 31–2, 35
 Gossett on, 24–33
 Hazlitt on, 13
 historical context, 29–30
 Hoeniger on, 33–7
 paradox in, 28–9
 production of, 24–5
 psychological readings, 30–1
 Q on, 23
 as romantic comedy, 35–6
 setting for, 3
 Winter's Tale and, 74
 see also specific characters
 Phelps, Samuel, 24, 48
 picture, creating a, 18–19
The Plays of Shakespeare, Johnson's *Preface* to, 11–12
 Pocahontas, 135
 poetic drama, 38
 poetry, 65, 88, 148
 political alliances, 29
 politics, 4
 Polixenes (*Winter's Tale*), 84–5, 93
 Polonius (*Hamlet*), 142
 Pope, Alexander, 15
 post-Freud epoch, 91
 Posthumus (*Cymbeline*), 46–7, 51, 57
 postmodernism, 25–6, 69, 92, 146, 147
 postmodernist critiques: of *Tempest*, 123–44
 of *Winter's Tale*, 96–112
 post-structuralist criticism, 125–6
 power-knowledge-pleasure concept, 136
 private theatres, 78–9
 problem plays, 1, 19, 22, 146
 Prospect Theatre, 26
 Prospero, 3
 Prospero (*Tempest*), 63–4, 114, 116–18, 121, 131–6, 141–3
 Proudfoot, Richard, 97
 psychoanalysis, 101, 103, 130, 134
 psychological readings: of *Pericles*, 30–1
 of *The Tempest*, 139
 of *Winter's Tale*, 88–95
 Queen (*Cymbeline*), 53–4
 Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur (Q), 7, 21–3, 38, 42, 59, 71, 126, 145, 146, 148
- Rabelais, François, 120
 Raleigh, Sir Walter, 34, 126
 realism, 65, 82, 86
 Relihan, Constance, 30
 Renaissance cosmology, 83–4
 Renaissance Italy, 49–50
 revisionists, 139
 Richard II, 53
 Richards, I. A., 137–8
 Richardson, Tony, 24, 26
 Rolfe, John, 135
 Romances, 2–3
 Romano, Giulio, 82, 87
 Roman plays, 55–8
 romantic comedies, 35–6
 romantic criticism, 146
 Roman virtue, 55

- Rome, 45, 49–50, 54, 61
 Romeo and Juliet, 117
 Ryan, Kiernan, 148
 Rymer, Thomas, 86
- Saussure, Ferdinand de, 130
Saved (Bond), 4
 scepticism, 6–7, 9, 100–1, 104, 107
 Schanzer, Ernest, 9, 73, 74–7
 Scheie, Danny, 48
 Schlegel, August von, 13
The Second Part of King Henry the Fourth, 72
 self-consciousness, 123
 sexual desire, 4, 28
 sexuality, 30, 101
 Shakespeare, William: approaches used
 by, 64
 death of, 3
 reinterpretations of, 6–7
 Shakespearean world, 116, 117
 Shylock, 141
 Siemon, James R., 44, 97
 Skura, Meredith, 9, 56, 139–44, 147
 social anthropology, 98
Songs of Experience (Blake), 112
Songs of Innocence (Blake), 112
 stagecraft, 9
 in *Winter's Tale*, 84–8
 Stalinism, 129–30
 Steevens, George, 34
 Stephenson, A. A., 50
 Stewart, J. I. M., 91
 Strachey, Giles Lytton, 7–8, 9, 19–21, 38
 structuralism, 130
 structuralist criticism, 125–6
Suffocating Mothers (Adelman), 148
 supernatural, 113–14
 superstructure, 97–8
 Swinburne, Algernon Charles, 38
- The Tempest*, 1, 3
 Barker on, 124–35
 Brown on, 135–9
 Coleridge on, 16–19
 colonialist discourse in, 132, 135–7, 140–1
 as comedy, 2
 as culmination of life's work, 1
 Cymbeline and, 115
 de-historicization of, 128
 Hazlitt on, 14–15
 Hulme on, 124–35
 Johnson on, 12
 Kott on, 119–22
 Leavis on, 113–14
 Midsummer Night's Dream and, 4, 15
 modern views on, 113–22
 postmodernist view of, 123–44
 psychological readings, 139
 Q on, 145, 146
 Skura on, 139–44
 structure of, 115, 119–20
 Tillyard on, 114–15
 variations of, 124
 Wilson Knight on, 116–19
 Winter's Tale and, 115
 see also specific characters
- textuality, 126
 Thacker, David, 24–5
 theatrical illusionism, 113–14
 theatrical tradition, 11–12
 themes, 22
 theory, 129
 Tillyard, E. M. W., 8, 49, 59–62, 63, 74, 114–15
 Time (*Winter's Tale*), 71, 76, 77–8, 86
 time, unity of, 60
 time scale, 62
Timon of Athens, 116, 118
 Tinkler, F. C., 50
 Tippett, Michael, 124
Titus Andronicus, 13, 142–3
 Tomkins, J. M. S., 34
 tragedies, 1, 22, 36, 60
 tragicomedy, 42, 43
 Traub, Valerie, 9, 107–10
Troilus and Cressida, 1, 22
Twelfth Night, 1, 72
The Two Noble Kinsmen, 3
- unity, 51, 60, 115
 unlikely incidents, 2–3, 4–5
- Vaughan, Alden T., 123, 124, 140
 Vaughan, Virginia Mason, 123, 124
 violence, 20
 Viswanathan, S., 96–7
- Wayne, Valerie, 25
 Wells, H. G., 148
 Welsford, Enid, 129
 Wilcox, Fred M., 124, 148
 Wilkins, George, 24, 25

- Wilson Knight, G., 8, 27, 36, 49, 53–4,
66–73, 75, 83, 95, 96, 116–19
- The Winter's Tale*, 1, 3, 9
- art in, 82
- Bethell on, 62–4
- Cavell on, 99–107
- Coghill on, 84–8
- as comedy, 2
- critical attention given to, 7
- Cymbeline* and, 39
- early modern views on, 59–73
- Ewbank on, 77–80
- feminist critique of, 107–12
- Frye on, 80–4
- Hazlitt on, 15–16
- historical context, 135–6
- imagery in, 97
- Johnson on, 12
- Leavis on, 64–6
- modern views on, 74–95
- as morality play, 90
- Much Ado About Nothing* and, 107–8,
110–11
- organization of, 64, 74–6, 77–8
- parallelism in, 76–7
- pastoralism in, 65, 72, 79–80
- Pericles* and, 74
- postmodernist view of, 96–112
- psychology of, 88–95
- realism in, 82, 86
- recognition in, 80–1
- Schanzer on, 74–7
- setting for, 4, 67, 68–9, 70–1
- stage-craft in, 84–8
- statue-scene in, 82, 87–8
- structure of, 81, 83
- supernatural in, 113–14
- Tempest* and, 115
- Tillyard on, 59–62
- time in, 77–80
- tragic part of, 2
- Wilson Knight on, 66–73, 75, 96
see also specific characters
- wish fulfilment, 5
- Woolf, Leonard, 8
- Woolf, Virginia, 8
- Wordsworth, William, 101,
147–8
- Yates, Francis, 56