INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

UMI®
800-521-0600

Shakespeare and the Public Sphere in Nineteenth Century America

Hilary Rowland,
Department of English,
Mcgill University, Montreal.

November 2, 1998.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and research in partial fulfilment of the requirement of the degree of Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been engaged in graduate studies for a scandalously long time. I'd like to thank the people who helped me through this process.

Professor Hugh Grady, the External Reviewer of this thesis, for elucidating the flaws and appreciating the merits.

Professors Michael Brian, Edward Pechter and Stanton Hoffman from Concordia University.

Val Free and Garry Elkin.

Staff at the Folger, H.H. Furness Memorial, Boston University, Boston Public and Houghton libraries and the staff at the New York Historical Society.

McLennan-Redpath library's smart and large-hearted staff, particularly:
Juliet Prashad, Franco Taddeo, Klaus Fiedler, Averill Hodge and the late Paul Thomas in Circulation.
Maria De Souza and Janice Simpkins in Inter-library Loans.
Digital/Reference Librarian David McNight.

Professors Robert Lecker, Leonore Lieblein, John Ripley and Denis Salter for project examination.

Professors Max Dorsinville and Sarah Westphal for project supervision.

Professors Maggie Kilgour, Trevor Ponech and Will Straw for participating in the thesis defense.

Professor Denis Salter for exceptional kindness and for support during that awful TA-ship.

Professor Paisley Livingston for his books, particularly Literary Knowledge.

Professor Mette Hjort for project supervision and examination, for intellectual generosity, and for The Strategy of Letters.

Professor Peter Gibian for participating in the thesis defense, and for astute, lifesaving comments on American cultural history.

Professor Michael Bristol for earlier project supervision and examination, for extraordinary tact while supervising this thesis, and for his books; but mainly for helping me to better appreciate the concept of intellectual sharing.

Paul Héroux for always having time and for sharing his library card.

For Paul, dearest

Abstract

The eighteenth century public sphere has been defined by Habermas in terms of its rational, critical style of debate and egalitarian ideals. In eighteenth century America the public sphere comprised mainly elite merchants. This group mediated between civil society and the state in order to influence government decisions. Motivated largely by commercial interests, they nevertheless claimed to represent the entire society. But around the mid-nineteenth century, the American public sphere began to expand, mainly due to the emergence of a middle class. Debate over Shakespearean drama had a profound effect on the ways in which 19th century civil society presented and considered arguments related to public issues. Increasingly, the credibility of an individual's public utterance, rather than his or her social or intellectual status, was of primary import in determining the merit of an argument. The discursive behaviour adopted in discussion of Shakespeare plays in numerous clubs and societies helped to form habits of rational critical debate which characterized public decision-making in the latter part of the century. Those largely excluded from public debate, such as blacks and women, began to publicly argue for rights previously extended only to white males. The major spread of mass entertainment and its perceived ills toward the end of the century, however, rendered Shakespeare the chief weapon in the resistance to modern vulgarity and commercialism. The wedge which developed in Shakespeare discussion between amateurs and academics at this time may be partly explained by a developing mass consumption mentality which Habermas contends segmented the public into protective, specialized minorities and an often uncritical mass of consumers.

Précis

Le plan du débat public au dix-huitième siècle a été défini par Habermas en termes de ses idéaux égalitaires et par son style de débat critique et rationnel. Dans l'Amérique du dix-huitième siècle, ce débat était mené principalement par une élite de marchands. Ce groupe intercédait entre la société civile et l'état afin d'influencer les décisions gouvernementales. Principalement motivés par des intérêts commerciaux, ceux-ci prétendaient néanmoins représenter la société toute entière. Mais vers le milieu du dix-neuvième siècle, le plan du débat public s'est étendu, principalement à cause de l'émergence de la classe moyenne. Le débat sur le drame Shakespearien a profondément influencé l'attitude de la société civile envers les arguments entourant les question publiques. De plus en plus, la crédibilité du discours de l'individu, plutôt que ses statuts sociaux ou intellectuels, déterminent le mérite de ses arguments. La dialectique adoptée par plusieurs clubs et salons dans la discussion du théâtre de Shakespeare a aidé à préciser des formes et des habitudes de critique rationnelle qui ont influencé l'allure des prises de décisions dans la seconde partie du siècle. Les exclus du débat, tels les noirs et les femmes, prirent d'assaut les privilèges réservés aux hommes de race blanche. La prolifération, vers la fin du siècle, des ingrédients de culture de masse et de ses problèmes associés, portèrent la culture Shakespearienne à devenir l'étendard de la résistance à la vulgarité moderne et au commercialisme. L'évolution divergente des discussions Shakespeariennes entre amateurs et spécialistes qui apparaît à ce moment peut s'expliquer en partie par le développement d'une mentalité de consommation de masse qu'Habermas prétend outil de segmentation du public en minorités spécialisées et protectionnistes, favorisant ainsi l'émergence d'une masse de consommateurs sans discernement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

A few years ago Scientific American ran an article devoted in large part to the Droeshout engraving of Shakespeare. The article details the work of American computer artist Lillian Schwartz, who in 1990 began digitally comparing Shakespeare portraits to those of his contemporaries. Her goal was "establishing the bard's identity." Invited to England to continue her work, she compared the face in the Droeshout engraving with portraits of the Earl of Oxford and others but was unable to find a match. While scrutinizing a painting of Elizabeth I however, she noticed the eyes appeared identical to those in the well known First Folio engraving. Detailed computer work on both images matched eyes, noses and facial curves perfectly. Schwartz suggests that, in having to invent a face for Shakespeare, Droeshout based his engraving on a cartoon of the queen's face, and notes that vigorous discussion continues over the authorship of the works.

Schwartz's work continues a debate that began in the mid-nineteenth century United States and was, "without any exaggeration, one of the main topics of discussion among the cultured men and women of the day" according to one historian (Wadsworth 65). Although the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy comprises only a small portion of my thesis, it does highlight several important elements of 19th century American Shakespeare reception that are central to my argument: Debate over Shakespearean drama had a profound effect on the ways in which civil society presented and considered arguments related to public issues. Because ideals of self-determination and democracy have played such a large role in American culture, it seems important to establish how and why a cultural icon such as Shakespeare might have related to, and even helped develop, some practices supporting these concepts.

At first glance suggestions that anyone from Bacon to Elizabeth I secretly authored the plays appear bizarre. But basic components of 19th century American Shakespeare discussion, in terms of democratic access to public debate and use of evidence to support claims, were highlighted in this controversy. The debate sometimes included attempts to use science in the same spirit as Schwarz did. The drive to establish Shakespeare's identity by means that could be duplicated by others began in earnest after the Civil War--although admittedly using considerably cruder technology than Schwarz's

software. The discussion was often conducted through public media in law-like terms which stressed reasoned arguments and presentation of acceptable evidence in support of a position. Those without access to machinery or mathematical theories presented their evidence somewhat less dramatically in Shakespeare clubs, literary journals, newspapers and books. Seriously questioning the sacred "Shakespeare myth"—of the untutored Stratford genius single-handedly writing extraordinary plays—in a prolonged, often witty public debate in which anyone could participate was itself extraordinary. And because the popular belief in Shakespeare's innate genius had become self-evident for many, a deep commitment to presenting convincing arguments was essential to both sides. But further, some Shakespeare skeptics posed questions about the nature of authorship. These queries underscored the collaborative effort which ideally characterizes all social relations.

The Bacon-Shakespeare controversy was just one topic which intrigued Shakespeare clubs and other literary groups. After the mid 1800s discussion of the plays, particularly as literary texts, had become a wide-spread means of education and self-definition for an emerging, American, middle class. In this dissertation, I will examine the amateur, middle class reception of Shakespeare in great part with reference to Habermas' concept of the structural transformation of the public sphere. I consider the ways in which textual Shakespeare study exhibited blatant race, class, and gender biases; but it also extended participation in public debate, confined in the eighteenth century to an elite group. I want to contend that this nation-wide discussion was based on an egalitarian, democratic ideal by which the credibility of an individual's public utterance, rather than his or her social or intellectual status, was of primary import in determining the merit of an argument. I particularly wish to show that the discursive behaviour adopted in literary discussion helped to form habits of rational critical debate which characterized public decision-making in the latter part of the century.

The work of John Rawls might seem the most appropriate theoretical base for this thesis. Rawls is a widely respected American intellectual with a focus on developing the deliberative practices and ethical behaviours which ideally characterize American democracy. Conscious of the pluralistic nature of American society, Rawl's concept of the "veil of ignorance," postulates an ideal by which individuals publicly deliberate over social issues without knowing which position they will inhabit in the society. Very

particular multiple viewpoints are thus neutralized and the group argues according to more general principles which will benefit the whole. But Rawls' theory leaves little room for the joint role taking that characterized the interaction of 19th century study groups deliberating over the nature of Shakespeare's characters. Taking different parts while reading the play aloud, investigating the possible motivations inspiring characters' behaviour, and identifying with often alien viewpoints, helped to train individuals, I think, to expand their interpretive perspectives when debating public issues. Habermas' concept of debate over public issues (discourse ethics), accounts for just this kind of interaction. Individuals participate in rational discourse in a noncoercive milieu, where "everyone is required to take the perspective of everyone else, and thus project herself into the understandings of self and world of all others" ("Rawls" 117). Ideally, an extended perspective of what may benefit all will result in a common understanding of what constitutes a valid norm, binding for all participants. As I understand it, the strength of Habermas' concept of discourse ethics rests on the idea of self-determination as a procedure rather than as resulting from a material idea of the good. Autonomy may be obtained and preserved by participating as an equal partner in decisions defining the public good. This concept underscores, I think, the focus on self-determination, on personal freedom within a democratic society, that seem so characteristically American.

I have also chosen Habermas' concept of the public sphere and to a lesser extent his theory of communicative action because with some modification they provide a comprehensive means of understanding the ways in which 19th century American rational critical society may have developed and deteriorated. After completing much research on 19th century Shakespeare study groups, I read Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere at the suggestion of Professor Mette Hjort, and was struck by its pertinence to my data. I was impressed foremost by the emphasis Habermas placed upon group literary study as a means of developing the "audience-oriented subject" trained to read critically, defend and modify claims in a non-coercive domestic environment, and later, to debate in a public forum. Although I argue against a wholesale application of Habermas' theory to the American experience, key elements are helpful in accounting for the largely middle class group interaction and sense of community so prevalent in American Shakespeare clubs; the cooperative role played by more experienced amateur scholars; and the

protective attitude academics displayed toward Shakespeare study toward the turn of the century.

I do not wish to imply that Shakespeare study alone cultivated the habit of carefully reasoned opinion and effective public interaction in American citizens. Other voluntary associations and experiences certainly contributed to this development. But one question I have attempted to answer is why the textual study of Shakespeare appeared to be the primary literary means by which an emerging middle class achieved self-understanding and effective self-expression. Another preoccupation has been with amateur and more professional approaches to the study of Shakespeare, and ways in which the gulf between the two may have developed toward the end of the century. As an amateur, I found myself sympathetic to the rather naïve 19th century bourgeois acceptance of Shakespeare's greatness; the belief in the character-building value achieved through study of the plays; perhaps even the complacency acquired from having derived pleasure from, and having identified with, some of this difficult work. At the same time, the elevation of Shakespeare study to a profession bespoke, I think, the desire to explain an increasingly complex modernity with the authority of accreditation demanded by modern society, as well as within the comforting bounds of tradition. Further, the major spread of mass entertainment and its perceived ills rendered Shakespeare--understood by many throughout the second half of the century as the icon of culture--the chief weapon in the resistance to modern vulgarity and commercialism. The wedge which developed in Shakespeare discussion between amateurs and academics around the turn of the century may be partly explained by a developing mass consumption mentality which Habermas contends segmented the public into protective, specialized minorities and an often uncritical mass of consumers.

Chapter one lays out Habermas' concept of the 18th century public sphere, as well as examining some arguments against a wholesale application of his theory to the American experience. Nonetheless, I will claim that around the mid-nineteenth century urban and industrial development led to the emergence of a significant American middle class. Shakespeare's plays became established as literary sources of cultivation in the bourgeois home. And this study helped to develop the "audience-oriented subjects" of an

expanding public sphere—individuals trained to privately form sound, reasoned ideas which they shared, defended and modified in public.

The textual study of Shakespeare became popular partly due to the efforts of a few American editors. Chapter Two focuses on these individuals both as independent scholars and as a collaborating group. Since they either lectured, contributed to literary journals or were active in prominent Shakespeare societies, these editors enjoyed a fair degree of interaction with the public. In their work, they often promoted the idea of collaborative correction and interpretation of the plays which belied an editorial quest for what Shakespeare "actually wrote." I also scrutinize the ways in which their desires to achieve excellence clashed with more mercenary concerns. Nonetheless, in various ways they helped to initiate discussion of Shakespeare. Their work contributed to the middle class sense of collective self-understanding through literary debate so critical to Habermas' concept of the public sphere.

Discussion of Shakespeare's plays frequently took place in organized clubs, and Chapter Three examines some of the habits and preoccupations of Shakespeare societies. The zeal with which their formal rules appear to have been generated and observed suggest the importance attached to private preparation and public participation. Private preparation sharpened one's arguments; punctuality, consistency and loyalty bespoke consideration for other members. Combined, these elements encouraged critical thought, incited discussion and modified ideas. In these ways Shakespeare societies cultivated self-reliance in forming a position along with behaviours promoting civil group interaction, elements critical to the successful function of the public sphere.

Shakespeare societies were also instrumental in training women for public life. By several accounts, public debate in the first half of the nineteenth century frequently consisted of boisterous, white, male voices. Although women's benevolent societies during the earlier part of the century helped the poor and homeless, they fulfilled basic cultural expectations. But after the Civil War women throughout the United States began founding clubs. In literary clubs, they met to discuss papers they had researched and written, and several historians suggest the works of Shakespeare led the list of literary topics. The speaking, organization and leadership skills they inadvertently acquired

enabled them to develop and express their ideas, and built a domestic feminism from which they launched a critique of American society.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton was one of the individuals representing groups who were denied many of the rights extended to white males. Chapter Four examines the resistance of Stanton, black activist Frederick Douglass and working class advocate George Wilkes to interpretations of Shakespeare which supported narrowly sexist, racist and classist views. These individuals based their arguments on concepts of egalitarianism and autonomy. Their interpretations of Shakespeare helped illuminate the racism, sexism and classicism which belied American ideals. Activities of subordinated Americans after mid-century supports the possibility of universal access to the public sphere, although this access could not be described as open or effortless. This chapter also looks in depth at the work of current cultural theorists who contest the concept of rational discourse in Habermas' sense, and shows why it nonetheless appears to be the best means of achieving workable solutions to social problems.

Shakespeare lecturers, editors, and societies of all levels burgeoned and interacted within a shared and relatively accessible public culture in the second half of the century. But as I show in my final chapter, the more casual student of Shakespeare was increasingly disparaged by the early nineties. The amateur scholar developed into the "legitimate" student of Shakespeare, and a gulf developed between amateur and professional Shakespeare discussion. As Thomas Bender has noted of nineteenth century professional culture in general, "contributions to society began to flow from their own self-definitions rather than from a reciprocal engagement with the general public." Further, the attempts of Progressives to create a superior citizenry through education influenced Shakespeare study both within and outside the university. Another element contributing to the distance in Shakespeare discussion between amateurs and academics was a developing mass consumption mentality which divided the public into critical professionals and a more passive majority of consumers.

My thesis owes much to the work of Lawrence Levine. <u>High Brow/Low Brow</u> (1989) mainly examines the participatory nature of Shakespeare theatre audiences throughout the 19th century. Levine's exhaustive research reveals that participation involved expressions of approval or contempt for the performances. It took the form of

harassing favored actors into many encores, and pelting recalcitrant ones with vegetables. It was also expressed by talking, singing, eating, urinating, brawling and sometimes fornicating during the play. Levine maintains that control over Shakespeare productions and audience behaviour was successfully wrested at the turn of the century from ordinary people by hegemonic groups and academics intent on preserving the plays from the masses.

Like Levine, I am primarily interested in cultural history, and my thesis makes no contribution to the body of textual interpretation which comprises a large part of Shakespeare studies. I have chosen to examine the practices involved in Shakespeare appreciation partly to better understand the process by which cultural institutions become established, but I focus mainly on the ways in which this process influences communicative behaviour and public debate. My work concentrates primarily on the positive aspects of the more sober, textual, study of Shakespeare, largely in amateur reading circles, after mid-century. Levine contends that, unhappily, audience behaviour was curtailed by bourgeois habits and values toward the century's end. I maintain that the same influence (in many ways positive, I think), was exerted in the public sphere, when Shakespeare debate in private club circles helped to determine the style and content of public argument. Levine and I reach similar conclusions about the more specialized direction of Shakespeare reception at the turn of the century. My examination, however, considers an emerging middle class, the role of Shakespeare in its development, the positive influence of study groups on public debate, and the ways in which these elements affected Shakespeare study in the reorganized university. Combined, I think these factors add a more complex dimension to Levine's valuable perspective on the implications of what at first glance seems simply the curbing of rowdy behaviour at the theatre.

Michael D. Bristol's Shakespeare's America (1990) has profoundly heightened my awareness of the ideological nature of amateur and professional Shakespeare study. Through a relentless investigation of Shakespeare editing practices, amateur-initiated archives, and university teaching, Bristol shows that the promotion of bourgeois values--particularly radical individualism--through Shakespeare study has helped train Americans to accept and serve the interests of a corporate capitalist state. A "therapeutic" use of "priceless" Shakespeare and his "timeless, universal meanings" induces feelings of

authenticity and fulfillment, but is merely a symbolic protest against a ruthless market economy. Further, such an approach generates well-adjusted individuals whose energy perpetuates existing social and economic conditions (25).

Certainly this can be seen in my thesis, where middle class group study of Shakespeare was viewed as "character-building." It instilled in a young person the values and habits—punctuality, sense of duty, loyalty, communication skills, air of cultivation—which distinguished him from a working class counterpart who appeared to have only manual labour power to offer a potential employer. It trained him, in other words, to serve the system in ways that seemed natural. I want to claim, however, that however ideologically based their Shakespeare study, nineteenth century Americans also learned to read critically and to modify their ideas in a group situation. Some of these groups did learn most effectively to publicly question exploitive policies and regulations and to convince others that laws which contradicted American ideals promoting self-determination, democracy and social justice had to be changed. America was founded on the hope of abolishing structural hierarchy and domination, but the practice of "othering," often associated with dehumanization, allowed exploitation to continue. Appealing to "universals" through Shakespeare allowed exploited groups—such as blacks, women and their champions—to shatter negative stereotypes and begin to make a case for equal status. I am not claiming that abolishing advancing corporate capitalism was foremost in people's minds. But neither did ideology blind everyone to exploitive conditions.

John Lauck's doctoral thesis "The Reception and Teaching of Shakespeare in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century America" (1991) covers roughly the same period as mine does. His very broad-ranging survey of American Shakespeare criticism assesses the religious orientation of this work and its dissemination through the educational system, in lyceums as well as schools and colleges. He maintains 19th century Shakespeare criticism reflected the struggle which took place between Anglican-based sects and the Unitarian/Transcendental reform movement of the 1830s in order to gain social control. Lauck's scrutiny of many public Shakespeareans includes Henry Hudson, and briefly, Richard Grant White, and Joseph Crosby, figures I also investigate. His thesis, however, highlights the religious and political considerations guiding the teachers and texts employed by the education system. Through an examination of their

correspondence, I focus on this trio, as well as H.H. Furness, but as a collaborating group of editors who embodied in microcosm the collective effort involved in Shakespeare interpretation. I also highlight the ways in which their work may have helped both to develop and crystallize the self-understandings of an emerging middle class, and encourage the private study and public debate which developed the audience-oriented subject of the public sphere.

A contemporary perspective on the activities of this quartet of Shakespeareans was provided by John Velz and Francis Teague's compilation of Joseph Crosby's letters to Joseph Parker Norris in One Touch of Shakespeare. The book gave me the first indication that this small community knew and helped each other through correspondence, and inspired my investigation of their individual papers for a further glimpse of their interactions. Since Crosby was writing to a trusted friend, his views when expressed to Norris reveal many disparities when compared with his other correspondence. Through this book and my own research, I was able to piece together some understanding of the veiled animosities which troubled this community's relations, while appreciating the good will that characterized their interactions. In a similar sense, Robert Gibson's The Philadelphia Shakespeare Story--a biography of H.H. Furness which focuses on his activities as a Shakespearean and examines much of his correspondence--was invaluable in giving me some idea of Furness' tremendous sense of community and duty. Gibson's evidence supplants my own examination of Furness letters to show the ways in which Furness was an important part of the process which "professionalized" Shakespeare study toward the turn of the century.

I have relied considerably on Michael Warner's influential "Professionalization and the Rewards of Literature" (1985) in this latter discussion, as I wished to locate the appearance of Shakespeare on the university curriculum within the general upheaval experienced by colleges in the decades following the Civil War. College administrators began to reorganize in the 1870s, and arranged the new universities into departments representing major subjects. English literature, traditionally viewed as an element of a normal gentleman's upbringing, was introduced gradually as a subject for university study. I support Warner's assertion that a conflict arose over the "true" approach to literary study, including Shakespeare, during the latter half of the century. But Warner

argues against the view that 19th century university literary study was a more focused continuation of amateur practices. He asserts that the new literary professionals did not respond to a formed social need: "We have no evidence that...a need for interpretation antedated and somehow called forth the profession of literary criticism" (6). He overlooks, however, the important area of amateur Shakespeare studies. I argue that, contrary to Warner's view of university literature studies generally, Shakespeare in the university was an outcome of the prevalent study of the plays in home and club circles, and of the relations these groups had with amateur scholars.

Three cultural histories of the United States which included the period from about mid-nineteenth century to 1920 furnished me with a cultural historical foundation for this thesis. Stuart Blumin's Emergence of the Middle Class (1989) scrutinizes urbanization, labour practices, and the environmental factors which increasingly helped to distinguish the middle from the lower class by about mid-nineteenth century. Blumin intensified my perception of the ways in which industrialization dramatically altered local life patterns--reflected in the places and practices of work, leisure and home--and impacted group identity. I have drawn most strongly on his examination of manual and non-manual labor and his understanding of the class-bound nature of voluntary associations to support my claim that the development of Shakespeare reading clubs around mid-century was closely tied to an emerging middle class.

With special attention to the nineteenth century, Robert Wiebe's Self-Rule (1995) examines the nature of American democracy. Wiebe provides a record of boisterous partisanship, energetic if often ribald political activity, and the substantial election turnout of the white fraternity which comprised American voters until the latter third of the century. Although we differ over the merits of this activity (Wiebe applauds its celebratory, uninhibited nature), his work supports my thesis that public debate until the latter part of the century could not be generally characterized as sober, reasoned and deliberative. I have also drawn on his elaboration of the appeal to universality by which Americans oppressed due to class, gender and race effected change to support my hypothesis that access to the public sphere after mid century was open although not effortless, and rested on the credibility of an individual's utterance, rather than on his or her social status.

Richard Ohmann's Selling Culture (1996)--an exhaustive study of the role magazines played in evolving consumer culture--provided the basis for my final chapter. As have many cultural historians, Ohmann has found that professionals exerted increasing control over public policy toward the end of the century. His focus on radical and frequent changes in domestic architecture, its role in the development of the more individualistic identity increasingly fostered by the middle class after the Civil War, and the part architecture played in the Progressives' approach to reform at the turn of the century helped me to better understand the ways in domestic space may influence group self-understandings. His examination of a developing middle class identity sensitized me throughout my work to the ways in which seemingly innocuous elements such as dress, demeanour, and leisure activity can draw public, social boundaries.

Mette Hjort's The Strategy of Letters (1993) stimulated my awareness and understanding of the distortion of communicative action. Hjort bases her understanding of this phenomenon on Habermas' model of an ideal speech act, fashioned to provide a counterfactual standard against which distorted modes of speech might be analyzed. Communicative action presupposes certain universal validity claims--linguistic competence, truth sincerity and intersubjective norms--which must be reciprocally recognized. When several or all claims are violated, strategic action may result, in which communication is systematically distorted. Hjort's theory elaborates upon the range of strategic action and motivations of strategic agents, and provides literary examples as illustrations. She shows that agents seldom engage in highly strategic behaviour--in a manipulative, pseudo-cooperative manner in order to achieve completely selfish goals. They are rather influenced by mixed motives, where an agent is driven by desires both cooperative and strategic. Hjort's explanations of strong and weak strategic action and mixed motives has been invaluable to my understanding of the ways in which communicative practices and cooperative behavior may become impaired.

The writing style of this thesis reflects the belief that the gulf between amateur and professional Shakespeare studies may be attenuated. I was influenced primarily by a journalistic rather than literary background, so it is by both reflex and conscious choice that this work is intelligible to a lay public. I believe it simultaneously offers a contribution to a more scholarly understanding of Shakespeare's role in changing

communal identities, public communicative practices, and definitions of American democracy and social justice. In 1863, George Curtis, amateur Shakespearean and longtime editor of Harper's, noted that "it is by talk, by argument, by comparison, by enlightenment, by every means incessantly brought to bear upon public opinion, that we are governed" (132). Throughout this dissertation, I hope to show how reasoned public debate may not simply conceal vested social interests—as many cultural theorists suggest—but is the best means of replacing relations of domination with those of human mutuality. I will also be illustrating why I believe this kind of interdependence to be a desirable and achievable condition.

Chapter 1 - Habermas and the American Public Sphere

In The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere (1968), Jurgen Habermas examines the nature of public debate and its ability to influence political decisions in 18th century Europe. He claims specific social conditions encouraged widespread, rational debate of public issues; and that the force of the better argument rather than social status settled these issues. Since its 1989 translation into English, Habermas' concept of the public sphere has been quite widely debated by American scholars interested in the processes of public discourse. Many American theorists have questioned the pertinence of Habermas' theory to American cultural history. This chapter will examine some of the arguments against a wholesale application of Habermas' theory to the American experience. At the same time it supports the thesis that literary (particularly Shakespearean), domestic, rational-critical debate helped change the nature of public discourse in 19th century America. I will contend that around mid-century, urban and industrial development led to the emergence of an American middle class, and that Shakespeare's plays became established as literary sources of cultivation in the bourgeois home. This study helped to develop the American variant of the rational, "audience-oriented" subject of Habermas' bourgeois public sphere.

According to Habermas, the 18th century European public sphere mediated between the state and the private realm of the bourgeois family. The private, domestic realm encompassed both economic and intimate domains: The property-owning male ran the business from the home. And the home in its "intimate" capacity also provided a non-coercive and cultivated environment. Within the intimate domain, reading and discussing literature facilitated the development of an "audience-oriented" subject. This practice allowed members of the household to experiment privately with ideas of what constituted a common humanity. They then discussed and refined these ideas within the non-coercive atmosphere of the home. From this idea of a common humanity and from this atmosphere of group deliberation they developed the notion of a common interest in truth or right, and the idea that rational argument was the arbiter of any issue. Home circles of literary

debate developed into literary societies. The habits formed in these groups were maintained in debates on political questions. The public sphere thus comprised individuals capable of forming sound, reasoned, opinions, which they then shared, defended and modified in a public forum. This public sphere in turn influenced state decisions.

The 18th century European idea of a capable and autonomous person was not linked, as it had been previously, to status based on family background, or feudal hierarchy. The concept did depend on an exclusionary premise, however, since to be considered autonomous a person had to hold property. Preservation of autonomy depended upon keeping the state out of private life--in both the intimate and economic realms. The property qualification served to exclude people in circumstances so distressed that they might be easily coerced with a promise of material gain, and who would welcome state intervention in their private lives as a means of improving their material conditions. The public sphere self-regulated the economic aspect of private life, relying on the supposed inherent logic of the market to dictate rules of commodity exchange. But when capital and power concentration emerged in the form of oligopolies and trusts, smaller businessmen joined dependent laborers in demanding state intervention. As the masses gained state protection, commodity owners lost the power of self-regulation and with it, a large portion of their autonomy. When an increasingly powerful state intruded on the intimate sphere, the family also lost exclusive power to shape the conduct of its members. The state assumed control of education, and curtailed personal risks related to unemployment, accident and old age once born by the family. Within this reduced intimate family sphere, cultural activity was no longer associated with rational critical debate oriented to a public seeking self-understanding and intent on preserving privacy and autonomy. Culture became a means of diversion. Subsequently, cultural standards were lowered to appeal to a wide market seeking public entertainment for passive consumption rather than rational critical debate. As is now the case Habermas contends, critical cultural commentary became largely left to intellectuals whose specialization inhibited widespread public interaction. Public opinion was more easily formed by manipulative state publicity rather than

through public debate. This state of affairs led to the current problems of an increasingly state-administered society, where many people have lost their interest in and capacity for rational critical debate. Decreased participation in the regulation of society further erodes autonomy. When everything is for the people, but not by the people, a kind of "refeudalisation" occurs, by which rights become arbitrary gifts bestowed by fickle rulers.

Habermas stresses the importance of the historical conditions under which the 18th century public sphere developed, but recognizes as well as its ideological, self-interested nature. The legitimacy of democratic bourgeois autonomy rested on the belief that everyone had equal opportunity to become a property owner, and thus gain access to the public sphere. This was not the case. Nonetheless, Habermas claims, 18th century European civil society provides the first example of public opinion formed through widespread debate in order to preserve autonomy and minimize government intervention:

> On the basis of the continuing domination of one class over another, the dominant class nevertheless developed political institutions which credibly embodied as their objective meaning the idea of their own abolition—the dissolution of domination into easy-going constraint that prevailed on no other ground than the compelling insight of public opinion (88).

THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

Michael Warner has investigated the eighteenth century beginnings of an American public sphere in his Republic of Letters (1990). As in Europe, restricted portions of the population--mainly white, educated, propertied males--constituted these early American public spheres. The new medium of print, says Warner, was organized around the market-dependent interests of elites who claimed to represent the wishes of all. Print culture allowed privileged groups to preserve their systems of local self-government and eventually foment revolution by distributing pamphlets and broadsides containing arguments which questioned British authority in different areas. After the Revolution, claims Warner, print remained associated

with republican virtue and public sphere participation, so that even readers formally excluded from eighteenth century public discourse imagined themselves participants.

My thesis concentrates on the nineteenth century expansion of this public sphere, precipitated in large part by the emergence of a middle class around mid-century. Calhoun points out "the transformations of the public sphere that Habermas describes turn largely on its continual expansion to include more and more participants (as well as on the development of large scale social organizations as mediators of individual participation)." It is with these "transformations" or expansions that my thesis is mainly concerned. Habermas' concept of the European public sphere cannot be applied to 18th and 19th century America without considering some significant differences. Michael Schudson identifies the "golden" age of political culture in the U.S. as the period between 1840 and 1900, rather than the 18th century, pointing out that "the more people participate as citizens in politics, the closer one comes to the ideal of a public sphere" (147). The growth of literacy and the growing market for literature during this period better equipped Americans for public participation, and 19th newspapers often devoted themselves to politics rather than avoiding political commentary as in the 18th century (Schudson 152-6). Many cities were well established in 18th century Europe. But only in the 19th century did the industrial revolution and a plethora of technological advances around 1850 prompt significant urban development in the United States. The nature and relations of communication changed as many people moved from rural isolation to close contact with new people and ideas in cities. For a growing middle class the benefits of work began to mean more than just survival. Men's work moved increasingly outside the home, and as it became less a place of production, women spent more home time nurturing individual development and encouraging self-expression (Clark 32). Most critically, by the early 19th century the link between property and citizenship was broken in America, and almost all adult, white, males could vote. By the early 19th century, according to cultural historian Robert Wiebe, Americans believed that the leveling of authority, abundance of land, and high mobility rendered every white male a potential self-

employed property-owner, gave them a broad range of choices, and thus transformed them into truly autonomous citizens (18-26). This citizenry, however, was not necessarily committed to rational debate in Habermas' sense. I will show that it was only in the latter part of the nineteenth century that rational critical debate became the norm for a broad public; and I will support Habermas' thesis that literary societies--in the American case Shakespeare clubs--played a significant role in this development.

A " FRONTIER" PUBLIC

In his well-known "frontier thesis" (1893), Frederick Jackson Turner suggests the manners and refinement cultivated by Europeans were redundant in pioneer America, where survival was the primary concern, and that an anarchic spirit clung to a people who had tamed a seemingly endless frontier by their own rules. Rather than advancing linearly, maintains Turner, American development continually returned to primitive conditions, due to the perpetual advance of the frontier line. At first

> the wilderness masters the colonist. It finds him a European in dress, industries, tools, modes of travel, and thought.... It strips off the garments of civilization and arrays him in the hunting shirt and the moccasin....The environment is at first too strong for the man..... Little by little he transforms the wilderness, but the outcome is not old Europe...(but) a new product that is American" (4).

The continual threat of Indian warfare, according to Turner, highlights the importance of the frontier in "keeping alive the power of resistance to aggression, and developing the stalwart and rugged qualities of the frontiersman" (15).

Unaccustomed to these qualities, European travelers in the first half of the 19th century reacted with fascination and alarm to the frequently drunk, violent, rough-mannered Americans, in rootless, perpetual search of a better opportunity (Wiebe 42-50). Furthermore, this unpredictably volatile behaviour influenced the process of choosing and advising government representatives, and was present as

well as in government officials. Charles Dickens noted that Americans' rough resistance to authority excited a sense of lawlessness in political life, and remarked on "the many legislators of coarse threats; of words and blows such as coalheavers deal upon each other" in the House of Representatives (82). Alexis de Tocqueville commented that

> mountebanks of all sorts are able to please the people....On entering the House of Representatives at Washington, one is struck by the vulgar demeanor....I have often heard the probity of public officers questioned; still more frequently have I heard their success attributed to low intrigues and immoral practices" (1: 208, 211, 234).

It might appear that the active public press during the 19th century would play an important role in galvanizing rational-critical debate. But Michael McGerr suggests that, although each newspaper supported a political party, the press simply hardened attitudes along partisan lines instead of encouraging public discussion by presenting many sides to any issue:

> By reducing politics to black and white absolutes, the press made partisanship enticing. The committed Republican or Democrat did not need to puzzle over conflicting facts and arguments; in his paper he could find ready-made positions on any candidate and every issue (cited Schudson 156).

Many sides to a question might have been acquired by reading all newspapers, but Schudson claims nothing indicates papers were read in this fashion "no more that one would expect the Baptist to peruse the church newsletter of the Presbyterian" (156). For the mass public, maintains Schudson, early nineteenth century politics was more a communal ritual or popular entertainment "than an act of individual or group involvement in rational-critical discussion" (159). Schudson compares audiences at political debates to those at Shakespeare performances, interpreted as "just the sorts of melodramas to which they were most partial....draped in the expansive oratory that Americans liked both in their theater and their politics" (145). Public meetings, Mary Ryan claims, were "spiced with drink," fist fights

and shouting matches (267). Wiebe maintains public support for political figures often took the form of lodge brotherhoods, by which fragmented factions endorsed candidates' platforms with street drinking and cavorting (74-75). Hate and stereotype played an important role in lodge politics, as each faction suspiciously scrutinized the undertakings of the others. Rather than a belief in everyone's right to their own habits and customs, equality simply meant every white male had the same chance to participate in a rowdy election process through which the majority eventually ruled (Wiebe 80-83). According to European visitors, democratic self-determination frequently unleashed "a sovereign mob" which scorned "the example of quiet and good men" and elected "brawny, cadaverous-looking...uncultivated, magistrates" who were slaves to their constituents (cited Wiebe 62). Allowing for some element of exaggeration in these accounts, 19th century American public life in the first half of the century cannot be described as rational and deliberative in Habermas' sense, but more, Wiebe suggests, as "affirmation, instruction, diversion, entertainment and inspiration." (78).

CONSENSUS AND MORAL OR ETHICAL QUESTIONS

In light of the fragmented, volatile, state of early 19th century American public debate, I'd like to consider Thomas McCarthy's recent critique of Habermas' concepts of practical discourse and rational consensus as viable models for political debate and collective decision-making. Although Habermas developed these theories later in his career, they relate to his concept of the public sphere as means of exchange, and of expressing a common interest.

Habermas insists on the goal of rational consensus as a presupposition of argument. He claims that to present others with reasons for our beliefs would be nonsensical without the faith that we could convince them of the merit of our claims. Abandoning the goal of consensus would thus eliminate rational practices. Violence and coercion would become the sole means of resolving conflict (McCarthy 65).

Habermas distinguishes between what he terms "moral" and "ethical" deliberation. A moral question is binding for all humans; an ethical question is valid for a particular community. Discussions on questions of justice are moral in that they have universal implications. This exercise of moral deliberation requires that participants transcend interest-oriented and value-based perspectives. Political legitimacy, in the sphere of justice, is what all could will by participating in moral deliberation. Conversely, evaluations in the ethical sphere of the good are generated by a more narrow, personalized or group-oriented understanding. These ethical evaluations, according to Habermas, do not require the self-transcendence questions of justice do. Reflective ethical discussion is bound to the context of action and experience in a way that Habermas claims discourses on justice are not (McCarthy 57).

Rationally motivated consensus in the comprehensive sphere of justice entails validating norms which best satisfy the needs of all concerned. This is accomplished by means of moral (impartial) deliberation. Yet Habermas claims that *needs*, to be perceived as valid, rely on *shared values* for recognition and justification. Since Habermas recognizes cultural values may be valid only for a particular form of life, McCarthy wonders how--in a pluralistic society with multiple sets of cultural values and thus differing perceptions of needs--rational political consensus may be achieved (52-3). Habermas conceives of discourse ethics as a response to plurality, claiming discussion consequently becomes more abstract, and norms winning consensual validation become increasingly general with the participation of diverse standpoints (McCarthy 58-9). But McCarthy claims most regulative norms cannot be as easily generalized as, for example, the need for security against violent attack (59). And as Nancy Fraser points out, interpretations of needs, once they have been established as norms, will vary. An acknowledged need for shelter could range in definition from a bed in a mission to a permanent house, and could affect policies in rent control, subsidy, job creation, day care, tax incentives and other areas (163). The consequences and the interpretation and assessment of the consequences of any given norm will differ among individuals and groups. On what ground, McCarthy asks, could we believe

everyone could agree on which norm would best serve the different, differently interpreted, assessed and weighted needs of everyone affected (61).

McCarthy's point is that the more personalized, group-oriented values generated in the ethical realm cannot be completely divorced from the (supposedly impartial) standpoint adopted in the sphere of justice. Moreover, the strong presence of ethical values makes it difficult to arrive at a common understanding of just what questions should be offered for debate in the realm of justice. What is a moral question (deemed binding for all humans) for one group may be considered simply a pragmatic matter for another. An important consideration is that McCarthy, like Habermas, is far from maintaining that values formed in the ethical sphere may not be reevaluated and changed; or that ethical/particular values may not be validated through public debate as moral/universal. But what McCarthy suggests is that ethical values may not simply be bracketed when participating in moral-political debate.

Relatedly, Fraser observes that perception of general social needs tends to be colored by particular standpoints--"authoritative views purporting to be neutral and disinterested actually express the partial and interested perspectives of dominant social groups" (181). Although her discussion applies to late capitalism, some elements pertain to 19th century American society. Concentrating on struggles over establishing, interpreting and satisfying needs, she claims

> ...needs become politicized when, for example, women, workers, and/or peoples of color come to contest the subordinate identities and roles, the traditional, reified, and disadvantageous need interpretations previously assigned to and/or embraced by them. By insisting on speaking publicly of heretofore depoliticized needs, by claiming for these needs the status of legitimate political issues, such persons and groups do several things simultaneously....They contest the established boundaries separating "politics" from "economics" and "domestics"....offer alternative interpretations of their needs...create new discourse publics from which they try to disseminate their interpretations of their needs..." (171).

Fraser does not, however, suggest that all need interpretations merit equal weight. Following Habermas, she maintains "the best need interpretations are those reached by means of communicative processes that most closely approximate ideals of democracy, equality, and fairness" (182).

Both Fraser and McCarthy suggest that public debate may proceed with the knowledge that irreducible value differences between parties will lead to persistent disagreement on normative issues. McCarthy believes the debate will not necessarily degenerate into the coercive, manipulative, practices Habermas has predicted will follow any doubt of reaching rationally motivated consensus. McCarthy proposes two alternative means of reasoning which do not have consensus as their goal. In the first, community-minded participants will have a reason for arguing if they enter into discussion with the expectation that rationally motivated agreement may involve elements of conciliation, compromise, and accommodation. "The only supposition that seems necessary for the genuine give and take of rational discourse is that the force of the better argument can contribute to the final shape of whatever type of agreement is reached" (67). This kind of particular, community-oriented discussion would fall under the rubric of ethical political debate. Yet McCarthy maintains this type of rationally motivated agreement may function as well in the moral realm of justice, where norms are considered binding for all humans. Although majority rule would take precedence in the event of intractable disagreement, parties might be "rationally motivated to consent to laws they regard as unwise or unjust in the hope that they will be able to use the same resources to change them" (68).

FIGHTS, STRATEGY AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Habermas' fear, however, that the elimination of rational practices could result in violence as the sole means of resolving conflict is obviously not baseless. Conflict resolution theorist Anatol Rapoport points out in Fights Games and Debates that it is important to distinguish between these types of conflicts. Rapoport maintains that not all struggles derive from debate. The most obvious of these are fights. Fights are rooted in what he terms "semantic reactions" based on

sets of stereotypes, convictions and identifications. When this kind of "instantaneous recognition" occurs in both parties, they engage in combat, each hit elicits a counterhit and the conflict escalates. In a fight, according to Rapoport, no attempt is made to non-coercively convince an opponent to see things as you do.

Rapoport's description of a fight might describe the current, ongoing conflict between Shakespeareans in the Cultural Materialist and Humanist camps. According to Cultural Materialists, the text should be a "battlefield" upon which opposed readings compete for ideological power. In Meaning By Shakespeare, Terence Hawkes asserts that, because we cannot have access to Shakespeare's intended meanings, interpreters simply use the plays to promote self-serving ideologies. Unlike traditional humanist Shakespeareans, Cultural Materialists admit to imposing meanings on the plays which serve specific interests in their struggle against race, gender and class oppression. They frequently describe literary criticism in conflictive, war-like terms, reflecting a perception of society as groups engaged in perpetual power struggles. According to Hawkes, the Shakespearean text is "a no-man's land", an "arena" and a "battleground." Critical dissent is a "combative process" relying on "strategy", and the past functions as a "strategically placed ballistic missile, trained on the present" (8, 126, 154, 133, 129). As Mette Hjort points out, "strategy" has become a popular term in contemporary theory, and is frequently used by groups contesting humanistic values. Idealist theories of self-knowledge, autonomy, and social harmony which underlie humanism are rejected as attempts to homogenize and thereby dominate multifarious populations. Use of the term "strategy" has war-like connotations of discord. The term underscores what is perceived to be the ineluctably conflictive nature of pluralistic societies as well as expressing an anti-humanist stance (Hjort 41-50).

Keeping Rapoport's and Hjort's observations in mind, some of the 2000 members of the Internet Shaksper conference will recall the prolonged debate which took place between Hawkes, humanist Bill Godshalk and their respective supporters over the concept of subjectivity in Shakespearean drama in the summer of 1994. The Cultural Materialist/Humanist conflict appears to be based on a sense of "instant recognition": a contempt for humanism which is instantly identified as

homogenizing; and a knee-jerk distrust of Cultural Materialism as nothing more than "jargon" and political correctness. I share many Cultural Materialist concerns and believe they have raised important issues. But their position that the text should be a "battlefield" upon which opposed readings compete for ideological power seems a limited and contentious one which locks the Shakespearean community in perpetual combat. Perhaps more seriously, this model of reading represents a paradigm for social relations which Cultural Materialists seem to want to perpetuate. If, as they maintain, we are indeed capable of continuously forming and changing our world, surely a battlefield is not the common ground upon which we would choose to interact.

Although I believe current Shakespeare criticism occasionally offers a literary, symbolic, example of the kind of violent social interaction Habermas dreads, I would maintain with McCarthy that the "consensus or coercion" model is too restrictive to serve even as an ideal for collective decision making; and that "citizens may enter public debate with a variety of expectations, of which the possibility of unanimity is only one" (68-9). McCarthy's view is one I will be supporting throughout this paper, as collective decision-making in both the ethical and moral realms in America during the latter half of the 19th century strikes me as having been influenced by particular values. Although public debate did not appear necessarily to achieve consensus nor have it as its goal, debate began nonetheless to be characterized after mid-century by reasoned argument.

Habermas' insistence upon rational consensus as the goal of moral-political discourse does not seriously undermine a Habermasian understanding of the public sphere in the 19th century United States. American citizenship in the first half of the 19th century was not associated with the sober, reasoned, collective, decision-making of Habermas' public sphere. But around mid-century, urban and industrial development led to the emergence of an American middle class which sought self-improvement largely through a refined, domestic environment and cultivated behavior highlighting duty, sobriety and reasoned debate. I will briefly examine the emergence of the 19th century American middle class before determining the means by which Shakespeare's plays became established as literary sources of cultivation

in the bourgeois home. This study helped to develop the American variant of the rational, audience-oriented subject of Habermas' bourgeois public sphere. But before I focus on conditions which led to the emergence of an American middle class, I will take some space to define and elaborate upon the concepts of class and ideology that are basic to my discussion.

CLASS: TOWARD A DEFINITION

Social differentiation occurs in any community of people with distinct individual qualities and social roles. It does not necessarily mean different social positions must be ranked on a hierarchy. In technologically more complex societies, however, social differentiation does precede social stratification or structured inequality. Inequality which is structured follows a pattern, displays relative constancy and stability and is supported by ideas that justify it. Strata in most industrial societies is based on a mixture of ascription (uncontrollable elements such as race or sex) and achievement. Class may be defined in terms of position in occupational and authority structures and ownership (or absence) of profit-making property (Kerbo 10-13). These factors generate inequalities in status, material reward and power. They also affect the degree of control an individual wields over her own life and those of others. Class is distinguished from the system of caste--and to a lesser degree, slavery and estate--by its dynamic quality. Although mobility is determined in the United States by both achievement and ascriptive factors, the latter play a larger part than is usually acknowledged (Kerbo 15).

Colonial America's class system was inherited in part from British colonizers and was based on inequitable land distribution, black slavery, and white indentured labor. Influential Anglo Americans obtained large parcels of land, while much of the agrarian population comprised poor freeholders and small farmers. Heavy rents and taxes forced them to borrow money at high interest rates from the upper class by mortgaging future crops. As the French Charge d'Affaires wrote to his Foreign Minister before the Constitutional Convention in 1787 "although there are no nobles in America, there is a class of men denominated

"gentlemen"...Almost all of them dread the efforts of the people to despoil them of their possessions and, moreover, they are creditors..." (cited Kalra 46). Madison observed that those who hold property and those without always form distinct interests in society. Madison's Constitutional efforts were directed at checking

> the leveling impulses of the propertyless multitude that composed the majority faction. To secure the public good and private rights against the danger of such a faction and at the same time preserve the spirit and form of popular government is then the great object to which our inquiries are directed (cited Kalra 46).

Madison, it appears, wished to retain a class system while maintaining a formally democratic government. Kerbo suggests that class systems are maintained by ideology. "Ideology" is a term used frequently among cultural theorists, including Shakespeareans, often without clarification. Oppositional Shakespeare criticism such as Cultural Materialism contends that ideology saturates our interpretations of Shakespeare. Cultural materialists emphasize Shakespeare as an "hegemonic instrument" used in a "deeply ideological fashion, to propagate and 'naturalize' a whole social perspective. [The plays] are filtered, and sometimes quite transformed, to represent a class position that accords with an elitist notion of culture and a ruling-class view of the world" (Margolies 43). A closer look at the term might encourage a more stringent evaluation of what might constitute ideological use of Shakespeare's plays, and will provide a foundation for my discussion in later chapters.

IDEOLOGY

Raymond Geuss distinguishes between "descriptive", "positive" and "pejorative" concepts of ideology. In its descriptive format, ideology is non-evaluative. Using the term in this sense means describing the beliefs, attitudes, values, motives, and rituals that characterize a group without praising or blaming its members for "having an ideology" (5). Ideology in the positive sense comprises beliefs and attitudes that are actively cultivated by a group to help further their own needs while prohibiting desires or methods that are consciously false, exploitive, or

inconsistent (23-4). Ideology in the pejorative sense refers to the sets of beliefs of agents who are deluded about their true interests and whose "false consciousness" supports or legitimizes oppressive hegemonic practices. True interests would be those formed in conditions of non-deprivation, non-coercion and minimally correct information. Although these conditions are ideal, agents may nonetheless be free enough to recognize and abolish some of the coercive elements under which they live, thus opening the route to optimal conditions of freedom and knowledge (45-54).

A rather flabby use of the term among cultural theorists thus leads to some confusion. Cultural Materialists, for example, appear to incorporate all three senses of ideology in their discussions. Terrence Hawkes' definition of ideological power seems descriptive, and non-evaluative: " the power to say what the world is and should be like" is presented as being won at different times by different groups who are constantly competing for hegemony (8). Similarly for Alan Sinfield, (for whom ideologies are "stories"), "the perpetual contest of stories that constitutes culture....reinforce or challenge prevailing notions of what the world is like, of how it might be" (31-33, 50). On Hawkes' account, it appears beliefs become ideological only when they are hegemonic. Ideology for Sinfield, however, seems to be both the sets of ideas held by the powerful as well as the dissident ideas held by the disempowered—descriptive, pejorative and positive seemingly simultaneously. They are descriptive "stories" which "explain who we are, who the others are, how the world works," repressive but persuasive "stories" enforced by hegemonic groups, and positive "stories" actively constituted by gay or black subcultures for dissident purposes (32, 33, 38). Only once in Faultlines does Sinfield explicitly define ideology pejoratively as "those beliefs, practices and institutions that work to legitimate the social order—especially by the process of representing sectional or class interests as universal ones....the dominant tend not only to speak for the subordinate but actively to repress it as well" (113). A footnote identifies this definition as partial, however, and refers to Jonathan Dollimore and Janet Wolff for ideology's "other aspects" (320).

Dollimore locates Cultural Materialist use of the term between the "cognitive" view—"ideology as a process of conspiracy on the part of the rulers and misrecognition on the part of the ruled"—and the "materialist" idea of ideology as the "very terms in which we perceive the world, almost...the constitution and grounds of consciousness itself." On the latter view, ideology is not, like the former, a set of false beliefs capable of correction (9). Wolff relies on Raymond Williams' characterization of ideology as having dominant, residual and emergent properties, and then broadly describes ideology as "a system of beliefs characteristic of a particular class or group" (54). With all these bases covered, it is difficult to conceive of any activity or thought which is not ideological. It does not seem possible to use the concept pejoratively unless this definition is specified before discussion. As Michael Bristol points out, a plethora of definitions rules out a critique of ideology. Bristol regards ideology as differing "both from knowledge and from deliberate or malicious deception." He equates ideology with religion, as the expression of both a truth and a delusion: just as in religion, a socially unjust world requires the fabrication of a just afterlife

> ...the ideological is what makes possible the integration of functional and dysfunctional elements within social reality. This may also be understood as the integration of aesthetic with anesthetic functions within the sphere of cultural production (10).

On this view of ideology, reading Shakespeare allows individuals to take comfort in the private, inner, realization of a better world, without working to change an unjust social reality.

PUBLIC SPHERE AND IDEOLOGY

Bristol's identification of ideology as false consciousness is similar to Habermas' description of bourgeois ideology. As Habermas maintains, the bourgeois saw himself as both private *homme* (the universal human) and public *citoyen*. As *homme*, his authentic humanity was developed and nurtured in the non-coercive, cultivated domestic environment. As *citoyen*, he brought this authentic humanity into the public realm, where consensual opinion was refined through debate with other cultivated, authentic *hommes/citoyens*. But when the markets were overtaken by oligopolies, new relations of power between owners and wage earners were created. It became increasingly difficult for a wage earner to own property. The commitment to universal autonomy that was expressed by self-regulating the sphere of commodity exchange and social labor degenerated into a particular interest. It became a different species of feudalism, perpetuated by exploiting others (Habermas 124-5). Habermas recognizes

> the abstract human being who in the pursuit of his private interests never left behind the unfreedom of the property owner, of an agent in the process of capital valorization, who hence never developed into the "actual and authentic" human being in whose capacity the bourgeois wanted to assume the functions of a citoyen" (125).

The 19th century United States version of the bourgeois homme/cityoyen was somewhat different than that of 18th century Europe. By the early 19th century repeated challenges to the Protestant establishment, medicine, law and state-chartered corporations began to diffuse power. As I have claimed, Americans believed that the leveling of authority, abundance of land, and high mobility rendered every white male a potential self-employed property-owner, gave them a broad range of choices, and thus transformed them into autonomous citizens. Nonetheless, this ideal was eroded by the implicit belief that self-directed work was equated with greater control.

EMERGENCE OF THE MIDDLE CLASS- MANUAL VS NON-MANUAL WAGE-EARNERS

Wiebe maintains that although most white American males could vote by 1830, wage earners were implicitly regarded as less self-directed, less autonomous, due to their dependence on their employers. Actual work relations belied the Lockean concept of contract which influenced American ideals of workplace freedom. When Charleston workers tried to fix the price of labor in 1840 "to keep ourselves from being ground down into slavery" they found "there are enough more ready to take our places" (cited Tomlins 10). One worker observed in 1844 that a laborer seeking better wages could apply to many places, but remarked sarcastically that the so-called contract was one-sided, as wages and work conditions were set by employer consensus (cited Tomlins 9). Although wage earners could vote, they found their needs ignored by politicians who "have talked much about the rights, interests and dignity of labor...[but] what have they done for us" (cited Tomlins 12). When capital and power concentration emerged in the form of oligopolies and trusts later in the century, opportunities for wage earners to own property further decreased. Thus, as Wiebe contends, wage earners were considered less autonomous than self-directed workers; but Stuart Blumin, who has completed one of the few studies of middle class formation in 19th century America, has shown it was the *type* of wage earning that helped divide the middle from the lower class by mid-century.

Blumin points out that with increasing industrialization and urbanization, the economic and environmental circumstances of manual and non-manual workers became more disparate. Capitalist production of everything from soap to furniture displaced cottage industry and drew millions who would have worked domestically into wage labor. Young rural men flooding cities and town with the hope of obtaining employment sought the more prestigious, better paid, non-manual positions of clerk, accountant, salesman or bank teller, which were considered the temporary stops on the way to self-employment. Manual workers were banished to the "dead-end" jobs in factories and shop floors that were dirty, bare, and poorly lit,

and they had to struggle to cover living costs (Blumin 109). They moved to affordable and crowded tenements where boundaries between public and private space were permeable (189). Workers gathered at the saloon, and watched prize fights which Leslie's Illustrated identified "with all the coarsest, lowest vice of our cities...the very last subject that should be mentioned in a paper which finds its way into decent families" (cited Mott 2: 202). Middle class families, on the other hand, were beginning to lodge by mid-century in houses with parlors and indoor toilets; young, unmarried, clerks and accountants generally lived in respectable rooming houses and had access to middle class parlors for social evenings (Blumin 189). Indeed housing—in terms of architecture and location—plays such a large role in class distinction that it is worth scrutinizing in some detail.

DOMESTIC SPACE

Life in the 17th and 18th centuries was unpredictable. Because people were particularly vulnerable to the ravages of disease, crop failure and war the family functioned in a highly utilitarian way. The home sheltered parents and children but also grandparents, orphans, laborers, apprentices, indentured servants and even convicts. This extended "family" worked hard to survive and had relatively limited contact with the outside world, thus developing a strong sense of shared responsibility and interdependence (Clark 12). Houses were simple, informal and functional. Richard Ohmann maintains that in the 18th and into the early 19th centuries most people lived on farms and in villages, where homes were built with the help of neighbors and local artisans. Because heating was limited, even as late as the 1840s rooms were often used for many purposes. The kitchen, for example, might have served as a dining area as well as a bathing space and a warm place for the family to congregate. Bedrooms were often laid out in dormitory style, with a single bed sometimes serving two or more people (Ohmann 138). But by mid-century housing construction was transformed due to the mass production of brick, tiles, roofing, shingle, windows, glass doors, central heating and plumbing (Ohmann 137). Housing reformers mounted a crusade to set a new standard for domestic architecture and social behavior (Clark 15). Most felt that with the

increasing separation between home and the workplace and the growing network of public services, the family was free to assume different responsibilities and specialized functions which would stabilize and strengthen the social order (Clark 29). The home was viewed as a refuge protected from the instability of an increasingly transient population, rapidly expanding and dangerous cities, and the competitive business world. The family which had previously been bound by harsh necessity was now expected to bond in an atmosphere of love and nurture. The house, for those who could afford it, expanded in order to provide each family member with his own room and thus a degree of privacy. It was understood that "by giving them their own apartment they themselves become personally identified with it and hence love to adorn and perfect all parts" (Clark 35).

By the end of the Civil War, this celebration of self-expression resulted in houses which were constructed in an eclectic mix of historical and geographical styles (Ohmann 139-40). Inside, specific space was allotted for each domestic event--such as private family or individual activity, work and socializing—so that genteel activities were sharply separated from the instrumental necessities of domestic work and bodily functions (Ohmann 141). The comfort, security and taste exhibited in private space was meant to facilitate personal development and express a refinement that had been impossible to cultivate within the bare necessities of early rural environments. Refined domestic space remained out of reach for workers, however, who had to struggle to cover bare living costs. Yet middle class homes expressed the fullness of high Victorian domesticity, Ohmann maintains, and each family member had a private area for "self-expression, development and rest. Articulation and specialization of household space fostered the valued interior depth of each person" (141). More houses were built in the three post-war decades than in the previous 250 years, and as Ohmann points out, American domestic space transformed radically before the eyes of one generation (138). This architectural transformation obviously has implications for the development of Habermas' audience-oriented subject, who apparently at mid-century began to have access to private space for reading and reflection. These ideas were then expressed, debated and refined in the "public" space of the parlour.

The parlour, according to Ohmann, was where outsiders saw the family character and its understanding of culture. Through photos and momentos the parlour recorded family history. But it was also the space where cultivation was displayed. The piano, busts of literary or musical figures, and books all signaled a civilized progression from the stark necessity of colonial life (142-3). Personal refinement was expressed materially through a "softening" with drapes and upholstery. The smooth, polished and heavily carved wood indicated increasing control over materials, just as polished manners signified perfect self-control. (Ohmann 147). What Ohmann calls "parlour culture" linked the private spaces of middle class people. Standards of behaviour and cultural references built class consciousness and served as rites of admission (153). Clubs and societies were an important part of parlour culture. Meetings enlarged the meaning of domestic space, as they took place apart from the rituals of formal calling and dining. Club business was cooperative work as well as pleasure. The literary societies which initially concentrated on self-improvement often built bridges between private and public responsibility. They helped to create modes of self-expression and foster class solidarity. These behaviours extended to public life (Ohmann 156). Blumin suggests that most historians recognize the middle class character of the "canon of domesticity " by which individuals preferred home-based pursuits with friends and family. He maintains that exaggerated social ambition was associated with excessive consumption and neglected domestic duties (186). Thus, domestic entertainment was preferred over the "vain and fashionable sociability of the rich and the promiscuous sociability of the poor," and the home was a means of controlling the company the family kept as well as the cultural forms to which it was exposed (Blumin 187).

As the culture of middle class respectability developed, their distance from the ignominious working class widened (Wiebe 119). On the street, elaborate rules of dress and behaviour were a practical means of coping with the anonymity of increasingly crowded cities. Scrutiny of clothing and demeanour often substituted for personal familiarity when deciding how to respond to strangers (Ohmann 152). Ohmann claims that mid-nineteenth century domestic and social ritual was a means

of drawing boundaries in new conditions where fluid populations and the competitive market had eroded the more rigid and obvious hierarchies of the past. The range of cultural accomplishments and references cultivated at home both alone and interacting with guests were seen to accompany and justify certain values and habits—of dress, speech, social interaction and self-discipline. Internalizing these attitudes, claims Ohmann, counted as building character. A carefully cultivated character was seen as equipping a young man for non-manual work. His accomplishments signaled habits of punctuality, prudence, honesty, and respect for employers and clients; commitments to stability, duty, sobriety, family, community, and respect for law. They were thus associated with the responsible attitude needed for actual or potential self-employment. These accomplishments and qualities set an individual apart from his working class counterpart who appeared to have only labor power to offer an employer (Ohmann 161). Cultural accomplishments were acquired largely at home, but the public lecture was one salient cultural pursuit sanctioned outside the middle class domestic sphere. It played a large role in introducing Shakespeare as a source of cultivation within the home.

PUBLIC LECTURE

Through the lecture, claims historian Burton Bledstein, "would-be middle class Americans were seeking mental guidance on how to upgrade their condition" (26). By mid-century, the lecture audience was "aspiring, ambitious personally, socially or culturally...in a state of preparation or expectation" (Scott 801). "I saw what I might call the middle-class culture in process of formation," noted one lecturer in the 1850s (cited Bledstein 25). The lecture was viewed as having discouraged the need for base entertainment, and as J.G. Holland asserted in the Atlantic Monthly in 1865, it "destroyed the desire for all amusements of a lower grade...those who attend the lecture rarely or never give their patronage and presence to the buffooneries of the day" (369). Like the barrage of advice manuals designed to instill a code of conduct which would develop moral character and help young people advance socially, the lecture appealed to the tenets of the self-culture or self-help movement by cultivating the mind (Cayton 605). The doctrine of self-

help followed changes in approaches to religion, medicine, and work beginning around the 1820s which emphasized individuals' responsibility for their own development (Wiebe 19-20; Larson 118-119).

The lecture was also influential because it was viewed as strictly American. "It is the one institution" claimed Putnam's in 1857, "where we take our nose out of the hands of our English prototypes...and go alone (cited Scott 791). In the 1860s Harper's, MacMillan's and the Atlantic Monthly all characterized the popular lecture as a robust American tradition (Curtis, Higginson, Holland). As Donald Scott has shown, by the mid-thirties most cities and towns had their own lyceum, and gradually big name lecturers, usually strangers to their audiences, were the invited guests. The lecturer appeared both in cities and towns, and by the late 1840s attendance at public lectures totaled close to 400,000 people per week. Printed excerpts reached thousands more through books and newspapers. Shakespeare's plays were firmly associated with the lecture system by mid-century. This process established them as serious sources of knowledge rather than part of the P.T. Barnum variety of entertainment with which Shakespeare, in the forms of parody and burlesque, was so often associated until after mid-century (Levine). This was an important development, because although Levine and others insist the 19th century American stage catered to all classes and tastes, attending the theatre was still not quite respectable in the first part of the century.

THEATRE

Robert Allen maintains that theatre held an ambiguous place, in terms of respectability, in American culture from the colonial period until the Civil War (45-72). Dunn has shown that stage productions had been banned in most northern states until the mid-eighteenth century, and moral opposition continued into the nineteenth. In 1832, Fanny Kemble recalled visiting the rector of the most fashionable church in New York, who commented that "his congregation are so straitlaced that he can neither call upon us nor invite us to his house, much less set his foot in the theatre" (cited Dunn 157). In the same year, Francis Trollope complained that the theater in Cincinnati was "poorly attended", noted of

Washington that "even here theatre cannot be supported for more than a few weeks at a time", claimed the "company in the boxes" at Philadelphia's Chestnut theater was "anything but elegant" and was told that theater in Baltimore was "far from being a popular or fashionable amusement. We were, indeed, told this everywhere throughout the country" (Trollope 59, 183, 230, 174-5). In 1841, Arcturus claimed that "public opposition has set in, with all the force of ignorant prejudice, against the profession of an actor and theatrical entertainments....We are not a theatrical people." The Dial regretted in 1842, that "the better part of the community should have been induced to look so coldly on theatrical exhibitions" (cited Mott 1:429-430). As late as 1854, Putnam's Monthly commented wryly on statutory restrictions relating to the stage: theater was prohibited on Saturday and Sunday in Massachusetts and was illegal in Connecticut, where "Shakespeare may be read (only) in the parlor, or from the pulpit" (142). That the third tier in the theater was customarily reserved for prostitutes during the first half of the century further incensed those who decried the indecency of the stage. The prolific New York journalist George Foster claimed at mid-century that

> "our theaters are nearly deserted on ordinary occasion, save by dead-heads, rowdies and whoremongers. The respectable and virtuous public will not visit an assignationhouse, even though it be called a theater, unless impelled thither in fashionable crowds by some extraordinary genius like Miss Cushman..." (155).

As Ohmann notes, social spaces allowed people to locate and identify themselves with others who shared similar work, leisure and behavioural habits. Public cultural spaces such as theatres and lyceums were valued (or scorned) not only for their content, but for the real and imagined relations to people frequenting them (160). Consequently, a textual, educational, Shakespeare was a pleasure accessible to the morally upright, allowing them to avoid the controversy that attending the plays might have aroused, and appealing to the prominent desire for self-improvement. As John Lauck has demonstrated, the Lyceum reclaimed Shakespeare "from the popular but vulgar stage...for the higher purpose of revealing him to be the poetic

exemplar of the American culture, and the supremely eloquent interpreter of the moral code of modern life..." (78).

Because this chapter provides a foundation for those to follow, I'd like to highlight the claims I've made so far. With some modification, Habermas' theory of the 18th century European public sphere may be employed to describe the American experience. American society inherited a largely two-class system from Great Britain, by which a small elite controlled government and the economy, while largely isolated homesteaders, and those in small villages and towns concentrated on survival. The American class system was sustained in part through ideological means, by characterizing and often understanding particular interests as expressions of the universal good. With the emergence of an American middle class, the deliberative, critical, public sphere began to expand around the mid-nineteenth century. Increasing industrialization and urbanization rendered the economic and environmental circumstances of manual and non-manual workers more disparate. Inspired by innovations in construction materials, a new middle class—with more money and time--established a housing ideal which encouraged individual self-expression in family members. This new class developed largely protective behaviours which distanced them from "disreputable" workers and the "idle rich." Cultural accomplishments were acquired mainly in the protective, nurturing home. They signaled habits and values which equipped a young person for non-manual work and potential self-employment, and distanced him from a working class counterpart who appeared to have only labor power to offer an employer. The public lecture, one cultural pursuit sanctioned outside the home, played a large role in introducing Shakespeare as a source of literary cultivation within the domestic sphere. In part, appropriation of Shakespeare allowed an emerging middle class to develop self-understanding and self-expression within traditional boundaries.

Habermas claims that European cultural standards experienced a downslide in the 19th century, catering to mass demand for easy intellectual access. But the American experience suggests that after mid-century, textual Shakespeare was taken seriously by a good portion of an emerging middle class. An educational

Shakespeare appealed to the prominent middle class desire for self-improvement and self-understanding over indulging in more vulgar forms of entertainment.

As I will show in the next chapter, several American editors furthered this interest. Through their different approaches, these editors helped to build the idea of the audience-oriented subject. They stressed the importance, in Shakespeare discussion, of individual deliberation, group debate, presentation of evidence to support claims, and the idea that established opinion could be challenged through the process of argumentation. They also highlighted the importance of the individual within the community through formal recognition of intellectual labor.

Chapter 2 - Nineteenth Century American Editors of Shakespeare

Many individuals studied Shakespeare's plays in their leisure hours, and a number concentrated on making the textual emendations and explanations which were a significant part of Shakespeare criticism throughout the 19th century. Some of these amateurs eventually published their own editions. Partly because until mid-century Shakespeare texts in America were mainly British reprints, American editors of Shakespeare were the most prominent and respected "critics" during the latter half of the century. Although a number of important American editions appeared after 1850, these textual scholars were not trained experts; nor were they solely comprised of the wealthy elite usually associated with the gentleman of letters. Further, since they either lectured, contributed to literary journals, or were active in Shakespeare societies, they enjoyed a fair degree of interaction with the public. They also formed a small community through correspondence. Their cooperative efforts and attempts to set a standard of excellence were occasionally dogged by a preoccupation with markets and financial achievements. But despite personal conflicts which sometimes evolved from these aspirations, they functioned on a cooperative level, helped to initiate national discussion of Shakespeare and contributed to a sense of collective self-understanding through literary debate so critical to Habermas' concept of the public sphere.

The three editors I focus on in this chapter are also interesting in that they represent differing positions on editorial practice while seemingly adhering to the idea of Shakespeare as sovereign author of the plays. The ideal of the solitary genius who never revised his work and the editorial quest to restore the lost, but perfect, playtext is a prevalent concern. And these ideals have negative implications in terms of the collaborative interpretation of the plays, which was an important element of the 19th century American public sphere. Yet the actual methods of these editors do not consistently demonstrate an understanding of their own editions as sacred representations of Shakespeare's intentions. A review of the history and

current state of Shakespeare editing will serve as a base from which I will analyze the contradictory practices of 19th century American editors.

EDITING AND THE QUESTION OF AUTHORSHIP

Since the Heminge and Condell First Folio of 1623 appeared seven years after Shakespeare's death, editors of the plays appear to have been guided primarily by their concept of authorship. To many, this has meant that a single, gifted, individual produced refined works that required no revision; others believe that Shakespeare alone revised his work throughout his career; and some promote the concept of collaborative authorship, by which many agents intentionally contributed to the plays. These differing perspectives arise in part due to the infamous editorial comments on the 1623 Folio. John Heminge and Henry Condell, Shakespeare's former King's Men colleagues, suggest that the collection was printed from copy authorized by Shakespeare, that he never revised or altered his work and that the Folio supersedes other "maimed" fraudulent copies. Yet different versions of many plays exist, and none in manuscript form which could thus be definitely attributed to Shakespeare. Eighteen plays printed in the First Folio appeared earlier in Quarto or Octavo form, although Shakespeare's name first appeared on Quarto title pages only in 1598. Some later Quartos show substantial differences from earlier ones. The First Folio excludes Pericles and Two Noble Kinsmen, plays considered to be partly written by Shakespeare. Other plays exist which Shakespeare may have contributed to or adapted, such as The Taming of a Shrew. And even the many different copies of the First Folio contain variants, and errors often attributed to careless printing (Ioppolo 2-17).

Although current debate over the nature and extent of revision has been particularly heated for two decades, theories of revision are not new. As Grace Ioppolo has illustrated, editors from the seventeenth through the early twentieth century--such as Pope, Johnson, Malone, Coleridge, Knight, and Wilson—have argued that Shakespeare revised his plays to some degree. Until recently, however, editors generally used either the work of other editors, a Folio, or a Quarto as worktext while consulting other extant texts to correct obvious corruption. This

composite approach was believed to be the best means of producing the single lost version of each play as Shakespeare intended it, as closely as each editor could surmise. This obviously led to the publication of many divergent texts. Editorial approaches have ranged from a conservative adherence to the First Folio wherever possible, to a radical rewriting of intelligible passages considered to be unShakespearean (Ioppolo 2-17). In the mid-twentieth century, the New Bibliographers sought to standardize editorial theory. W. W. Greg's rationale for "copy-text" advocated that the editor create a composite text in matters of substance while adhering to a base text for "accidentals". New Bibliographers locate the ultimate reality of the text outside its material manifestations--Fredson Bowers wrote of lifting the veil of print to produce an ideal version approximating Shakespeare's intent (Marcus 29-30). Both Greg and Bowers denied that Shakespeare willingly and regularly revised his own work, and attributed variants and anomalies to nonauthorial corruption, and censorship (Ioppolo 18).

The denial that Shakespeare revised his own work has been repudiated for the past two decades by scholars calling themselves the new textual revisionists ("old" revisionists maintain that Shakespeare revised the plays of others and then continued to revise his own revisions). Although new revisionists are united in their belief that Shakespeare willingly revised his work, some more radically discourage conflated editions where more than one text of a play is extant. All texts, including the "bad" or supposedly pirated Quartos of some plays, should be considered stages in Shakespeare's composing process. This view is promoted by Ioppolo, who describes Shakespeare as

> a creator and re-creator, viewer and re-viewer, writer and re-writer of his dramatic world....the Quarto and Folio texts, with each granted an authorial integrity, origin, and historicity, are not unfixed or unfixable copies but specific and particular products fixedly descending from the author (4).

Like Ioppolo, Leah Marcus is a new revisionist anti-conflationist, but with a self-described post-structuralist orientation. Unlike Ioppolo, she accepts "theories of textual variability that subordinate the author to other sources of alteration" (24).

She concedes, in other words, that Shakespeare's associates may have had a hand in fashioning the plays. She advocates an "unediting of the Renaissance" which would favor the study of Quarto, Folio and other extant copies of plays which may have been written, collaborated upon or adapted by Shakespeare—such as The Taming of a Shrew--in their original printed versions. With these texts as a base, scholars may "question the origins of even the most standard glosses and emendations" contained in modern editions (5). Marcus takes this approach "for the purpose of advancing a poststructuralist sense of the undecidability of the works we like to call Shakespeare," and regards different versions of the plays as "fixed evidence of unfixity" (100). Marcus claims to be rejecting assumptions about the transcendent status of literature, and to combat the traditional editorial quest to restore the text to its original splendor (32). This quest has often ended in "disfigurement" and the editor's preferences are mistaken for the author's intentions (3).

Marcus's study is interesting, but I believe her stated goal-- purportedly to advance a postructuralist sense of radical textual indeterminacy—is misleading. If this is truly her goal, what would be the point of a "temporary abandonment" of copious modern editions in favor of the original, stable, Renaissance reprints? (100, 5). The demonstrated "undecidability" of the plays simply means they exist in different versions, which is by now an old story. And although some of these plays exist in several versions, they are, after all, finite. Perhaps the greater interest and value of looking at original Renaissance reprints would derive from comparing them with later editions in an attempt to understand cultural change, as Marcus's own study suggests. Seemingly to advance the cause of radical indeterminacy, Marcus describes projected computerized hypertext formats of all versions of the plays as offering "a dazzling, unsettling new form of empowerment" as individuals will be able to construct their own editions of Shakespeare (129). Yet Marcus seems uneasy with the idea of infinite textual variety in the form of individualized versions. Further, she optimistically foresees textual control where control has traditionally been wielded—in the hands of scholars and editors:

> ...the chief danger is...a disintegration of the standardization by which we are able to imagine that, in talking about Shakespeare, we

> are all talking about the same thing. No doubt the fears are unjustified. No doubt future scholars and editors will continue to be able to distinguish A Shrew and The Shrew, and develop mechanisms to control the proliferation of all variant texts just as they have in the past (130).

Indeed, what would be the point of radically individualized versions of Shakespeare texts if we are using the plays, as Marcus does so effectively, for cultural discussion. Some common textual ground is necessary for this practice.

As Michael Bristol points out, rejecting the concept of Shakespeare's plays as finished literary artifacts doesn't confirm postructuralist notions of textual instability and 'free play'. Different versions of the texts simply suggest different agents have modified them (Shakespeare's America 117). Bristol also questions the new revisionists who maintain that Shakespeare revised his own plays. This stance adheres to a traditional, author-centred orientation by which the "ministerial" influence of editors corresponds to the authority of a single glorified individual (113). Bristol argues that the idea of collaborative authorship is a more realistic means of looking at Shakespearean drama:

> ...a play is actualized in a specific social event, namely a theatrical performance of the play-text, and that this kind of social realization is always and inherently collaborative. The 'lost original' that textual scholars desired was never a written document or even an ideal existing in a poet's mind, but a practical collaboration between a playwright and other parties to the performance (119).

With this debate on editorial practice in mind, I will examine three 19th century American editors of Shakespeare. I will consider them in terms of their contributions to the public sphere, as well as their sometimes conflicting attitudes toward editing the plays.

HENRY HUDSON AND "DOMESTIC SHAKESPEARE"

The Reverend Henry Norman Hudson (1814-86) played a significant part in moving Shakespeare's plays from the realm of theatrical entertainment to that of

textual study for a large segment of the middle class. In this section, I will show the ways in which Hudson's popular lectures and editions helped to associate the study of Shakespeare with effective public speech and develop a collective middle class self-understanding. An emerging American middle class may have related to Shakespeare partly because--on Hudson's interpretation--the playwright's situation corresponds to American experience, and his method for success reproduces material from popular 19th century conduct manuals and self-help lectures. Hudson's expurgated editions, heavily annotated and sanitized, could be read aloud before family and the most sensitive friends without embarrassment or fear of moral damage, thus encouraging the group study which helped produce the "audience-oriented subject". Further, Hudson suggests American lay interpretations of Shakespeare might surpass that of scholarly elites. This helped to emancipate the making and understanding of cultural meaning through Shakespeare from upper class Anglo-American and British scholarly control. Group interpretation of Shakespeare thus became a serious means of developing a collective middle class self-understanding. Finally, Hudson promoted literary discussion as a training ground for public debate, claiming it provided groups with material for rational discussion, and laid the groundwork for active participation as citizens.

Hudson was by many accounts the most popular Shakespearean of the 19th century both as a lecturer and editor (Westfal 145). Hudson must have appeared as living proof of the potency of self-help, blooming from a poor Vermont farm boy into a lecturer, teacher, editor and finally professor of Shakespeare at Boston University. Hudson began lecturing on Shakespeare in the early 40s, attracting the attention of Whitman, Poe and Emerson, and reputedly rivaling the latter in popularity (Middlebury 6). With no formal training in Shakespearean drama qualifying him for the supposed intellectual rigor of the lecture circuit, Hudson must have regarded his initial success with some astonishment. Although he boasted a lifelong love of Shakespeare, a schoolteacher in Kentucky claims to have introduced Hudson to the plays at the age of thirty, about the time he began lecturing (Shertzer 670). Hudson might have viewed his popularity as evidence of the power of oratory to move people and bring personal prominence, a common

sentiment among Americans during the period. Associating Shakespearean drama with public speech training possibly stems from the appearance of Shakespeare excerpts in public school and college readers (Simon 43, 52-58). Although Poe claimed Hudson had "an elocution that would disgrace a pig, and an odd species of gesticulation of which a baboon would have excellent reason to be ashamed," a more tactful observer described Hudson's lectures as "rare displays of totally unique powers of public speaking, of a way of saying unforgettable things in an unforgettable style" (Poe 359; George xxi). At any rate, it seems Hudson's speaking style was popular with his audiences. It is conceivable that his eloquence may have helped to further associate the study of Shakespeare with effective public speech.

Hudson's Lectures, first published in 1848 in two editions, sold well, and established him as a writer as well as lecturer. Shakespeare's life, times and critics comprise the first five of his sixteen Lectures. An emerging American middle class might have related to Shakespeare partly because--in Hudson's hands--the playwright's situation corresponded with their own, and his recipe for success resembled material from 19th century conduct manuals and self-help lectures. Rural migrants anticipating a social climb could identify with "the homeless, friendless and penniless youth" who left a peaceful rural existence to "cast himself into such a howling wilderness of people as London" (1:9). Starting from a "very humble station, he rose to respectability as an actor, and to distinction as a writer of plays" (1:11). Continuing as proprietor, "his talents and character gave him access to the best social advantages...the circles of wit, of wealth and of blood were open to him" (1:11). An early retirement with a handsome fortune finished the career of the talented bootstrapper whose manners and morals, even in the vice-ridden city, were beyond reproach (1:12). Having experienced something similar to the American dream, Shakespeare himself is described as a self-help educator, "the schoolmaster of a most liberal and practical wisdom, the high-priest of a most useful and manly discipline." The plays "strengthen us for the duties that lie before us...the just practical aims and interests of life" (1: viii, vii).

Further, Hudson's Lectures present Shakespeare as having been demeaned by intellectual elites and pedants, who questioned the playwright's greatness, charged him with immorality and claimed he lacked taste (1: 134, 75, 167). Americans smarting from the blows of British travel writers such as Francis Trollope could further identify with Hudson's disdain for "the general impression in certain high places, that Shakespeare was a creature of a rude age" (1:88). Demeaned as vulgar and tasteless by pedantic British elites, Hudson's Shakespeare seemed to require vindication by ordinary Americans who had been similarly labeled.

In addition to two regular editions of Shakespeare, Hudson expurgated 23 plays--advertised for use in "Schools, Clubs, and Families"--which appeared throughout the 70s ("Ginn Heath" 13). For the group study prevalent in clubs and societies during this period, Hudson's expurgated editions were perfectly suited. Annotated and cleansed of naughtiness, they could be read aloud before family and the most sensitive friends.

There is no doubt that Hudson regarded the plays as the almost miraculous product of a single individual. And he often implicitly presented his interpretations, as well as emendations he produced for passages he considered "unShakespearean" as representing the probable intentions of the author. But the point is that his bowdlerizing, and what might have initially been idiosyncratic decisions were actually responses to a community need. The New York Evening Express commended Hudson's generous hand for having cut, from King John, "no less than fifty-one [lines] from the first act of the play alone," and the expurgated editions were praised in dozens of reviews as "the best editions for classes and clubs" or for "school and family use" ("Ginn Heath" 27, 20, 23). Hudson's ruthless censorship responded to a perceived public need rather than claiming to represent the author's intentions, and was thus generally applauded.

Further, through his expurgated editions, Hudson may have helped eradicate the "untouchable" aura surrounding the plays and their interpretation by a lay-public. I think it is plausible to suggest that Shakespeare's plays, more than the work of any other single cultural/literary figure, institutionalized lay judgment in

the 19th century cultural arena. The now-canonized Dickens and Browning were popular in the 19th century United States. But they were contemporaries largely free from centuries of academic mystique. Hudson's editions prompted the recognition that an engaged readership of Shakespeare could encompass more than scholars or an educated elite. Not only does Hudson provide a sense of Shakespeare's life as similar to the American middle class experience, but he suggests American lay judgment might surpass that of scholarly elites.

Thus the appropriation by ordinary Americans of Shakespeare was not simply as entertainment in the parodic stage form everyone recognized as buffoonery, or in the declamatory fragments found in school readers. It became a serious means of developing a collective self-understanding. It helped emancipate the making and understanding of cultural meaning through literature from upper Anglo-American and British scholarly control. After mid-century, American editions geared to family and amateur literary circles rendered Shakespeare more generally accessible both materially and psychologically. Discussing the plays generated a sense of public inclusiveness. And literary discussion, according to Hudson, trained individuals for political discussion.

In the preface to the family edition of A Midsummer Night's Dream, Hudson resembles Habermas in his suggestion that literature allows readers to experiment with ideas of a universal humanity, encourages creative interpretation, provides them with the material for rational discussion, and lays the groundwork for active participation as citizens ("English in Schools"). His concept of the guiding author is of a superior being in his unruffled, spontaneous, grasp of truth and reality. The author's sagacity conflicts with Hudson's understanding of ordinary mortals as having to grapple with questions of truth and duty. Nonetheless, Hudson recognizes that powers of interpretation and discussion can develop when engaging intensely with the plays:

> an author brings us face to face with real men and things, and helps us to see them as they are; that he furnishes us with enablements for conversing rationally, and for wrestling effectively, with the problem of living, operative truth; that he

> ministers guidance and support for thinking nobly and working bravely in the services, through the perils, under the difficulties and adversities of our state ....This is not always done directly...because they call for and naturally prompt our own mental and moral cooperation in turning them to practical account (" English in Schools" 14-15).

Shakespeare is discussed with reference to the "literary slums and grog-shops" of dime novels, implicitly associated with the working class who inhabited tenements and frequented saloons (13). Yet Hudson also disdains the "aristocratic idler or trifler or spendthrift or clothes-frame..." whose literary culture cannot "shield him from the just contempt of thoughtful men and sensible women" (6). Through Hudson, reading Shakespeare is associated with values which reinforced the self-definition of the middle class as distinct from those above and below in the social hierarchy:

> intelligent, thoughtful, sober-minded men...prudent, upright, patriotic citizens, with heads so stocked and tempered as not to be 'cajoled and driven about in herds' by greedy, ambitious, unprincipled demagogues, and the political gamesters of the day....(and) prudent, skillful, dutiful wives and mothers and housekeepers; home-loving and home-staying" (8-9).

To sum up some critical points, Hudson played a substantial role in encouraging Shakespeare study by crystallizing and appealing to American middle class values in his lectures and family editions. Although he promoted a concept of Shakespeare as a solitary genius, Hudson's own work on the expurgated editions hardly presents these texts as "pure" Shakespeare. They were obviously geared to family and group discussion, explicitly for the purpose of developing rational, independent, citizens with interpretive, argumentative skills.

RICHARD GRANT WHITE AND THE CONCEPT OF AUTHENTICITY

Journalist and Shakespeare editor Richard Grant White (1821-85) had a significant impact on the public. He seriously questioned British Shakespeare

authorities, and his focus on evidence and cooperation influenced the ways in which the middle class presented and modified their understandings of Shakespeare drama and developed as audience-oriented subjects. White promoted a collaborative view of authorship, which underscored the involvement of Shakespeare's colleagues in the process. Further, White never attempted to disguise his own editions as the seamless products of Shakespeare's mind, and acknowledged the labor of others in producing them. Finally, White questioned the sense of ownership and superior understanding which subtly underwrote the authority of British scholars, and showed American readers could bring valuable insight to the plays.

Son of a rich New York manufacturer and trained in medicine and law, Grant White joined the New York Morning Courier and Enquirer as music critic when his father faced financial ruin in the 40s. Throughout his career, he penned a series of magazine articles on Shakespeare for the middle-class readership of Putnam's, the Galaxy and the Atlantic Monthly, and published two editions of the plays. Like Hudson, White was acclaimed as a popularizer. The digest Shakespeariana claimed upon his death that "of the Shakespearian writers of the day none has been so deservedly popular nor has exercised so extended an influence as Richard Grant White....He has done more, probably, than any man of his generation to popularize Shakespeare" ("Reviews" 39). Unlike Hudson, White had a horror of amateur Shakespeare clubs. Although he had been a member, along with eminent Shakespeareans such as actor/theatre manager William Burton and Harper's editor George Curtis, of the New York Shakespeare Society, he claimed "there is hardly anything less admirable to a reasonable creature than the assemblage at stated times of a number of semi-literary people to potter over Shakespeare and display before each other their second-hand enthusiasm" ("On Reading Shakespeare" 56). He geared his work, with few notes and comments, to the individual lay reader who could appreciate Shakespeare "without having it chewed up and put into his mouth like pap," thus appealing to American pride in self-reliance. He nonetheless distances Shakespeare study from the working class by associating less-developed skills with plebeian tastes. A critic who complained

about White's paucity of explanatory notes was told "a reader who needs explanation of such words has no business with a Shakespeare....(They) could not read a newspaper of a higher class than a Police Gazette" ("Anatomizing" Sept. 319).

Grant White first gained public attention as a Shakespeare scholar in 1853 through two Putnam articles which led the attack on John Payne Collier's "corrected" folio. The highly respected British scholar's Notes and Emendations, purportedly unveiled a corrected playhouse copy of the 1632 Folio traced to a pre-Restoration actor named Perkins. Collier suggested that Perkins had been a colleague of Shakespeare's, and had corrected the errors to restore much of the text to read as Shakespeare had intended it. The Perkins folio aroused substantial public excitement in the U.S. as well as Europe. But White's meticulous analysis of the so-called marginal corrections discredited Collier's claim. He pointed out, for instance, that the additions mentioning trees had to have been made after 1662, when this kind of scenery was first introduced to the British public stage (Shakespeare's Scholar 56). Many of the changes had been erased, and replaced with other emendations, showing the "vacillation of conjecture, not the record of authority" (Scholar xxxii). Far from being the authoritative text of Shakespeare, White surmised the changes should be judged on their merits like any other. Five years later paleographers at the British Museum declared the Perkins folio a forgery, with many of the marginal corrections made in ink purposely simulated to appear faded with time. The Putnam articles, later included in Shakespeare's Scholar (1854), won White public and critical respect in Europe as well as the U.S. Even the exacting British Shakespearean J.O. Halliwell-Phillips congratulated White in a letter which called his analysis the "most logical and ablest article which has yet appeared on the Perkins controversy" (Letter). Press reaction to Shakespeare's Scholar probably further fueled public enthusiasm for Shakespeare study--New York's Evening Courier lists twenty-one rave review excerpts from both dailies and periodicals.

White expressed more than a passing interest in Shakespeare and forgery during his career. He provided a synopsis of the most recent evidence against the

Perkins folio in his first edition. White also wrote the introduction to a confession of William Ireland's, where Ireland admits to the highly successful 18th century forgery of a play and other papers he claimed were Shakespeare's. White was also concerned with plagiarism in editorial practice, disdaining editors who used notes and emendations of others without creditation (Works 1: xxii). These two deceptions seem to be conceptual opposites—forgery passes your work as another's while plagiarism passes another's work as yours. But obviously White was concerned with authenticity, both of Shakespeare's text, and of editorial contribution to the text. White's attitude is interesting when scrutinized beside the claims of radical textual revisionists who automatically assign certain assumptions to more traditional editors. Leah Marcus has listed these as a single-minded promotion of the transcendent status of literature, a concept of authorship stressing solitary genius, a quest to restore the text to its original splendor and disguising editorial preference as authorial intention (Unediting). Part of White's concept of Shakespeare the author is predictably and perhaps understandably influenced by the remarks of Heminge and Condell and Ben Jonson. His essay on Shakespeare's genius is laced with references to the careless prodigy who never revised his work. Yet he also describes a more mundane, collaborative aspect of authorship, with reference to

> ...plays written as daily labor, by a man whose sole object in writing was to please a promiscuous audience, by a play-wright who worked merely as one of a company or partnership, his part of the business being to furnish words for others to speak, who composed sometimes in joint authorship, and who worked over the old material which lay nearest to his hand, and was best suited to his money-making purpose, always saving time and trouble as much as possible (Works 1: ccxxxi).

White also confesses himself indifferent to the authorship of the plays. In an article on the Bacon/Shakespeare controversy, he maintains that the plays have multi-faceted value which is not confined to their aesthetic or moral worth. Written in a specific time and place, they act as a cultural/historical and linguistic record,

and their authorship "affects in no way their literary importance or interest, their ethnological or their social significance, their value as objects of literary art, or their power as a civilizing, elevating influence upon the world" ("Bacon" 152).

Although White makes predictable editorial claims about presenting as closely as possible the text of Shakespeare, he does painstakingly outline the editorial principles by which he was guided. White recognizes the unfinished nature of the plays, stressing that writing for the stage and not for print meant speeches were often simply sketched (Works 1: xxiv). He gives reasons for the "authority which goes with authenticity" which he grants to the First Folio in the absence of an authorized text. He maintains that "the incompleteness of the folio text, being often manifestly the result of adaptation to stage purposes, is evidence of some weight in favor of the genuineness of what is given" (Works 1: ix). A mention of any deviation from that text "has been deemed obligatory" (1:xii). Such "deviations" are obviously made in order to render the text accessible to the lay reader who does not wish to embark on a labor-intensive collation of original texts. White, therefore, is far from trying to disguise modern editions as the seamless product of Shakespeare's mind:

> many even of those who read and enjoy Shakespeare talk of being content with "the text" itself without note or comment....But that very text...is the result of the painful labors, through many generations, of the very editors of whom they speak so slightingly....If the text of Shakespeare were put before these captious amateur critics uncorrected by editorial labor and without comment, they would not recognize many parts of it; they would not believe that it was "Shakespeare" ("King Lear: the Text" 186-7).

White presents his editorial credentials as having been obtained through hard labor which acknowledges the labor of others. Apart from a knowledge of Elizabethan history, culture, orthography, and idiom, a more discerning judgment comes

> after perusing the works of his author perhaps ten times as often as the generality of his readers,--after examining what others have written

> relative to him professedly or accidentally,--after a constant perusal of other authors with a special view to the elucidation of his own (Works 1: xxvi).

Nowhere does White claim that his emendations are anything other than reasonable conjecture. It seems doubtful, therefore, that from reading his edition White's readers would be duped into believing they were in contact with the original ideas, the finished plays and the genial mind of one individual named Shakespeare. The issue of plagiarism and Shakespeare editing, which will be discussed below, signifies the extent to which editors wished to be credited for their erudition in suggesting plausible emendations. And the huge fuss White made over forgery further stresses the difference between claiming a conjectural emendation is the editor's and claiming it is Shakespeare's.

White questioned the sense of ownership and superior understanding which subtly underwrote the authority of British scholars, and proved ordinary American readers could bring valuable insight to the plays, simply by virtue of their linguistic memory. Grant White's note on "pheese"--a term from Shrew for which various British editions had offered dubious explanations--courteously flaunts a superior American comprehension. In response to various explanations of Johnson, Gifford and Knight, White remarks: "All wrong, as any "Yankee" could tell the learned gentlemen. The word has survived here with many others which have died out in England, and are thence called Americanisms. "To pheese," is "to irritate," "to worry:" Nothing is more common than for a New England housewife to come in, irritated by some domestic conflict...to break out "Plague on that hussy! She's put me all in a pheese" (cited Westfal 163-4).

White was the first American editor to have, ostensibly, used the First Folio rather than another modern edition as a work text, to have scrupulously examined the emendations and commentary of every past edition, to conscientiously acknowledge the work of others, and to argue for First Folio readings wherever meaning could be wrung from them. James Russell Lowell noted in the Atlantic Monthly that White "has thus far given us the best extant text, while the fullness of his notes gives this edition almost the value of a variorum" ("White's Shakespeare"

259). Although White's contemporary, Joseph Crosby, claims White fell short of these aims, they nonetheless became an established ideal for the critical community.

Further, with the attack on the Collier forgeries which began his career, White helped to develop a code by which American Shakespearean scholars would ideally conduct themselves in the decades to come. Establishing his credibility almost literally on the blood of an Englishman, White helped to promote Americans as possessing technical, intellectual and moral rigour, and his forthright public exposure of a high-ranking British scholar embued American scholarship for the first time with a no-nonsense quality in the public eye. (White's reputation for intellectual honesty was apparently never damaged by his unsavoury extramarital affairs and his taste for showgirls, which sometimes made newspaper headlines.) Through Shakespeare study, White promoted the idea that even respected authority bore close scrutiny, that conflicting evidence and conclusion could be offered by an ordinary individual for public examination, and that revision of an authoritative opinion could result.

H.H. FURNESS: COLLABORATIVE SHAKESPEARE

If Grant White promoted the idea of the individual presentation of evidence and dissent, Horace Howard Furness' (1833-1926) New Variorum primarily appended amateur American Shakespeare study to a prestigious European tradition and presented it as an intercontinental effort. Son of a Unitarian minister, a Harvard graduate, Philadelphia lawyer and spouse of the rich Helen Kate Rogers, Furness was inspired at fifteen years of age by Fanny Kemble's public Shakespeare readings ("How Did You Become a Shakespeare Student" 438). He joined the Philadelphia Shakespeare Society in 1860, and embarked on his massive variorum project several years later, when he began toiling in earnest through different editions in preparation for his society meetings:

> ...it constantly happened that we spent a whole evening over a difficult passage....only to find that the whole question had been discussed and settled by learned men elsewhere. Hence it dawned

> on us that if we were to pursue our studies with any of the ardor of original research we should exactly know all that had been said or suggested by our predecessors. It was nigh on fifty years since the last Variorum and the time seemed ripe for a new one ("How Did You Become a Shakespeare Student" 438).

The New Variorum was inspired by the needs of serious amateurs who wished to do original work and the first volume, Romeo and Juliet (1870), was dedicated to the Philadelphia Shakespeare Society. Enthusiastic reviews accompanied its publication. The enormous accomplishment, claimed the Literary Gazette, "by a scholar of our own, from a printing press and publishing house of our own" was evidence, for the American public, of an impressive competence in an area previously monopolized by the British forefathers (cited Gibson 72).

Furness' edition implicitly addressed itself to the question of democratic access to information. With the New Variorum, material from expensive sources had been collected in one volume, allowing more democratic access to scarce material. In principle, Shakespeare students could now familiarize themselves with the history of debate over a textual crux, allowing them to argue convincingly for more conceivable emendations, as well as supplying an easy mode of verifying claims to originality. As did White's Perkins articles, the Variorum stressed the importance of presenting an argument for a claim. Unlike the Perkins controversy, however, which involved a rather straightforward validation of authenticity, argument for emendation was based on conjecture, and thus highlighted the importance of community effort and the contribution of a variety of opinion in the construction of meaning. Bristol has commented on "Furness's more or less democratic and ecumenical attitude to the texts' multiple historical identities," and maintains that Furness "aimed not at excluding undesirable variants, but rather at making those variants available for comparison (Shakespeare's America 101). As Furness himself stressed, "I have struggled hard to give every one his due, & to let every one have a fair chance to say his word—of its value let others judge" (cited Gibson 76).

Both Furness and Hudson consulted an eminent American Shakespearean who planned, but never managed, to publish a Shakespeare edition. Mid-west grocer and scholar Joseph Crosby (1821-91) was a graduate of Queen's College, Oxford. He left his parents' Methodist farm in England to set up a grocery business in 1843 with an uncle already settled in Zanesville, Ohio. In the mid-60s, Crosby began purchasing books for the Shakespeare library which eventually became one of the three finest personal collections in nineteenth century America, and his texts are filled with marginal notes exhibiting a variorum-like knowledge of Shakespeare scholarship (Velz 25). In a letter to Furness, Hudson called Crosby "one of the most intelligent and accomplished Shakespearians now living" (4 Jan. 1875). Although Crosby never published his dream edition, he was respected as an exceptional Shakespearean by eminent British and American scholars until he forged a promissory note in 1884 and fled to Montreal to escape prosecution. His many contributions to the popular journal Shakespeariana plainly illustrate his devotion to his subject and the generosity with which he shared his knowledge with anyone, scholar or amateur, who expressed an interest in Shakespeare.

COMMUNITY OF SHAKESPEAREANS

This quartet formed a community, mainly by correspondence, through their common interest in Shakespeare. Their letters exhibit the sense of community service, mutual obligation, and the concern with establishing and maintaining high standards which characterize professional organizations (Larson 49). Despite these individuals' obvious commitment to what Bristol, following Alistair McIntyre, calls the internal rewards of their practice—which have nothing to do with financial success or celebrity—they were also concerned with making money and attracting public attention. This tension between the satisfaction with internal reward and the desire for a more commercial success will be examined with reference to Bristol's understanding of fame and celebrity (Big Time).

Since I do not wish to supply an idealized picture of their interactions, I examine in some detail instances of envy and underhandedness. I think it reasonable, however, to describe the aspirations of these editors in terms of mixed

motives: cooperative efforts and attempt to set a standard of excellence were attended by a preoccupation with markets and financial achievement. Despite conflicts this small community functioned on a cooperative level. These famous public scholars helped to unite the American Shakespeare community, and to promote the concept of cooperation in interpretive effort.

Their relations were often born of sheer desperation, as American Shakespeareans were new to the practice of textual emendation. As Hudson prepared his "school" editions throughout the 70s the lack of knowledgeable support led him to rely heavily on Crosby and Furness for help. His tone when he first approaches Furness for help is sedate: "We have no Shakespeare society in Boston. I wish there were as I often have occasion to consult with men of judgment in matters of the poet's text." Five years later, trust has obviously been established: "...oh that I had your precious person within practical reach. There is not one man that I know of about here that can be called a Shakespearian in any right sense" (Letter 28 Feb, 1871; 3 Mar. 1876).

Help with editions was tactfully offered, and the concern for high standards was often discreetly alluded to before suggestions were made. In a letter to Furness, Crosby exhibits the kind of skill by which a colleague's perceived blunder might be avoided:

> ...if I can be of the least service to you either in collating anything or otherwise I beg you will command me....I am satisfied you will not hastily introduce any changes in your text that will mar the reputation you have so justly earned for carefulness, purity, and conservatism. Having said this much, I hope you will pardon me for stating plainly and candidly what I think of one or two allocations that you mention" (Letter to Furness 9 Feb. 1879).

Their loyalty often exhibited a sense of the local, through defense of their members from more prestigious European scholars. As Grant White remarked, "I am somewhat sick of the German esthetic about Shakespeare. Hudson's is worth all of it" (Letter to Furness 6 April 1880). This loyalty also manifested itself in an attack on perceived slights from the press. In a letter to Furness, Hudson hotly denounces

the "paltry and pitiful notice the North American Review gives of your Hamlet." Hudson's request to the magazine to write a review of Furness' Hamlet was met with a suggestion from the editor to "limit it to one page. I was so disgusted I did not answer...Your workmanship in Shakespeare will stand without any aid from the North American Review or any other organ of the kind" (24 Dec. 1877).

Hudson's denunciation is interesting in that it combines contempt for the idea of publicity with an understanding of its effectiveness. Despite these individuals' obvious commitment to what Bristol calls the internal rewards of their practice—which ignore commerical success—they were also concerned with making money and attracting public attention. This tension between the satisfaction with internal reward and the desire for a more commercial success may be examined with reference to Bristol's Big Time Shakespeare. Bristol distinguishes between fame and celebrity, but also examines the point at which they may intersect. Fame springs from the "small time" of the local—the extended family or professional organization. Fame is the outcome of consummate achievement, and "the moral dignity of the famous enhances the cohesion of the community over time" (4). The "big time" celebrity, on the other hand, is a product of the culture industry. The celebrity of serial killers, mobsters, certain religious figures and journalists may be achieved without excellence and is mainly the effect of publicity directed at "a public socialized to the habits of mass consumption" (4). A cultural figure such as Shakespeare combines both small and big time elements: the plays continue to live through the small time efforts of scholars, editors, local directors and actors who recognize its literary value, as well as through Shakespeare's big time manifestation as a mass cultural icon, created in the interests of profit-making by means of publicity (5-6).

This species of publicity, according to Habermas, has its roots in Medieval Europe, when visibility was a status attribute. Manorial and ecclesiastical lords boosted their importance by displaying themselves in lavish pageants and church spectacles before their humble subjects (4). Habermas asserts that what Adorno termed the "culture industry" is a kind of "refeudalisation" based on this type of meretricious public prominence. Since profit is the bottom line, cultural products

and the celebrities associated with them are produced and displayed for quick and easy access by the broadest strata. Culture becomes consumption, or non-cumulative experience (166-7). Politicians are part of the entertainment industry, scripted, primped and paraded before the public. The autonomy of civil society, once maintained through private reflection and public debate, is now asserted through patterns of consumption, where public discussion revolves around the latest products and personalities. Far from an exercise in public deliberation over issues, an emotional, plebiscite democracy is protracted by a starstruck public. Habermas locates the source of the modern culture industry in the late 19th century. Instead of cultural works passing through an educated stratum tutored in the use of public reason and then trickling down to less educated groups, inferior cultural products were directed at the largest possible market. The reading public thus split into "minorities of specialists who put their reason to use non-publicly and the great mass of consumers whose receptiveness is public but uncritical" (175).

Bristol, however, traces the beginnings of the modern culture industry to 16th century England:

> Just as today, the early modern culture industry was a high-risk, high-reward occupation. Despite its many perils, it offered the chance of rapid social and economic upward mobility (Big Time 56).

Bristol maintains that Shakespeare and his associates prospered by transforming performance from community participation to cultural commodity, and by appealing to as many sectors of an anonymous market as possible through their practices (Big Time 34-41). The cooperation of Shakespeare's partners, Heminge and Condell, with a printing firm in the publication of Shakespeare's collected works years after his death was "an effort to capture a portion of the up-scale market for printed books" (Big Time 49).

With Habermas' and Bristol's assertions in mind, I will turn now to what I believe are the motivations behind 19th century Shakespeare editorial practice, with a focus on the tension between commercial and "internal" value. The sometimes conflicted, unscrupulous nature of this small community's relation are evident and the more deplorable elements of their commercial ambitions are well illustrated in

the concern over, and practice of, intellectual plagiarism. Nonetheless, this community generally circumvented these conflicts and operated on a cooperative level.

PLAGIARISM AND THE COMMUNAL TEXT

A shift from the informal sharing which took place on the lecture circuit or in the Shakespeare society to a concern with ownership of ideas occurred after the Civil War, when American editions of Shakespeare began to be marketed in earnest. In the absence of international copyright law (passed in 1891), there was considerable debate over whether an individual's thought or ideas should be legally considered his property. Grant White published several articles and a small book on the copyright question, and was a vocal advocate of the view that an individual using a writer's produce "without his consent...is a thief and a robber" (American View 65). In the midst of the copyright controversy, Hudson emerges as the most egregious plagiarist on the American Shakespeare editorial scene. As Hudson himself admitted "in hundreds of cases I have got my own thought so mixed up with other men's that I cannot distinguish which is which....I daresay I sometimes do injustice to others when I am as far as possible from meaning it" (Letter to Furness 29 April 1879). Of Hudson's first, Chiswick-based edition of the plays, the eminent British Shakespeare scholar J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps charged with disgust that "many of my notes have been almost literally adopted by an American editor--the Rev. Mr. Hudson--without the slightest acknowledgment" (cited Shertzer 669). While preparing his single play editions throughout the 70s, Hudson wrote frequently to Furness requesting advice on emendations. A passage from a letter to Furness is typical of the content and tone of Hudson's letters:

> I am now in correspondence, as I believe you also are, with Mr. Joseph Crosby. He has sent me his copy of Brae's pamphlet, and I have made good use of it. Can you give me any help in that dreadful passage of Winter's Tale..."good expectation be my friend and comfort"...this has been a real brain cracker to me..." (27 Sept. 1873).

Crosby sent Hudson hundreds of original notes throughout the 70s and the latter's light hand was a running joke in Crosby's correspondence with J. Parker Norris. Of one note Crosby claimed

> "Poor old Hudson picked my pocket of it....After he had "given it up"--"was at his wit's end"&c&c--I sent this to him. In a week or 8 days afterwards, he writes me that the same thought had occurred to him, & that he was glad to find he agreed with me. The whole thing was so plain...I really blushed myself for him when I read his letter & saw the cool way that he appropriated somebody else's work" (Velz 185).

When Hudson's Hamlet appeared in 1879, Norris exposed his larceny in the literary journal the Epitome, where he claimed that Hudson had pilfered not only from Crosby but from Furness as well. Crushed, Hudson accused Norris of "personal spite" but blamed his "oversights" on publishing deadlines in a plaintive letter to Furness (Letter to Norris; Letter to Furness 21 April 1879).

Crosby's many sharp remarks over plagiarism suggests he might have been increasingly annoyed that his frequently unacknowledged suggestions contributed to the gain of others in terms of reputation and thus, indirectly, monetarily. Shakespeare editor W.J. Rolfe was another American who profited from Crosby's generosity. "I have written hundreds of notes for his plays," wrote Crosby to C.F. Ingleby, "one in ten of which is credited although almost all used....His sole object in his correspondence is to make all the use he can of me" (Letter to Ingleby). Significantly, Crosby refers to Hudson's predicted parsimonious acknowledgment of his services in commercial terms: "That you know pays the obligation, as so many of my business debtors are now doing, at about 5 cents on the dollar, yet grants him a receipt in full of all demands legal & equitable" (9 March 1877, Velz 223). Crosby's disgust with the pillage of his own work, and what he obviously regarded as a crude reduction of art to market values is evident in his jocular plans for his own Shakespeare edition:

> I will print an edition of Shakespeare....just one copy--no more, for my own library alone.... Then wouldn't I be even with old Mr. Collier, & Mr. Halliwell, with their limited editions of 50 or 100

> copies? You know "Everyone who pretends to have a fine Shakespeare Library must have this edition"; and yet it could not be procured 'for love or money'" (30 July 1875, Velz 93).

Grant White was another target for Crosby's sharp eye. Although White was a self-proclaimed stickler for properly acknowledging the work of others, Crosby claims Shakespeare's Scholar is riddled with booty from obscure sources. Crosby's copy of this text, which may be consulted at the Folger library, is extensively marked with indignant marginal notes which sarcastically and thoroughly indict White. Surprisingly, Crosby's only letter to White credits Shakespeare's Scholar with kindling the former's interest in further study: "...for over fifteen years this study has been the delight of my existence....Your valuable and beautiful edition occupies a prominent place in my library. I have read and marked it a great deal and have much to say to you on the subject should I ever have the pleasure of meeting you" (Letter to Grant White 2 Sept. 1874). White's reply, perceived as a snub, led the sensitive Crosby to sever the connection, and he spoke thereafter of White with both bitterness and admiration (Letter to Norris 31 Jan. 1875 Velz 37).[1] Crosby exposed many of White's "mare's nests" only to Norris in personal correspondence, but on one occasion asked Norris to alert Furness to White's pilfering of a MacBeth emendation, for which he had been widely praised (Letter to J.P. Norris 3 Dec. 1874).

White's behavior is surprising, given his strong language in the copyright controversy, and his insistence that an author's intellectual ownership was a moral right (American View 66). I believe it illustrates the kind of contradictory motivations these scholars experienced when the conventional romantic separation between culture and the market clashed with the desire for commercial success. Jean-Cristophe Agnew has pointed to "the concerted efforts of nineteenth-century

---

[1] In his note Velz seems unaware of the admiring letter Crosby wrote to White. Apparently oblivious that he had slighted Crosby and unconscious throughout his career that he was being monitored by the latter, White thought enough of Crosby's letter (2 Sept. 1874), to preserve it between the pages of his own copy of Shakespeare's Scholar, which may be consulted in the Grant White papers at the New York Historical Society.

Anglo-American thinkers to reserve a portion of their collective world of meaning from incorporation within the price system (cited Bristol, Shakespeare's America 24). But far from regarding Shakespeare as an exercise in appreciating the beautiful and useless, Grant White equates editing Shakespeare with manual labor, and, implicitly, subject to the same material rewards: "...a man's right to his own productions in writing is as perfect as to the productions of his farm or his shop...Why do the productions of manual labor reach higher in the scale of rights or property than the productions of the intellect?" (American View 64). It appears that White's desire for an international copyright law sprang mainly from concern for commercial gain. But White's magazine articles probably had a wider distribution than his actual editions of Shakespeare. Although both editions (1858-65 and 1881), received rave reviews and ostensibly attempted to bolster reader confidence for a plunge into the largely unaccompanied text, the first did not sell. White's contemporary, the German Shakespearean Karl Knortz, claimed the first edition sales "were in a most unfavorable proportion to the enormous cost" (cited Westfal 165). White's own papers show a subscription list for one of his editions composed of less than forty names. White was recognized both by scholars and the general public as an influential critic and Shakespeare scholar and his reputation was firmly established. But as he points out in a letter dated the year and month he published an article on copyright in Broadway Magazine: "...the work which got me most credit and which occupied me for years has brought me nothing--absolutely nothing. My disappointment has been great and bitter....May I ask you not to speak even kindly of the pecuniary failure of my literary labor" (Unaddressed letter 20 May 1868).

MIXED MOTIVES

White betrays his fundamental ambivalence when his published motivations for his own work are considered. Shakespeare's Scholar was written for the sake of Shakespeare lovers (viii) in the full knowledge that "it would not pay me day laborer's wages for the mere time I have devoted to the preparation of it"(xv). White prefaced his first edition of the plays (1858-65) by claiming "the studies of

which this work is one result, were begun, and were continued for some years, only for the pleasure they afforded, and without any ultimate purpose" (1: xxxii). His final claim, that his edition--completed just after the Civil War--was "a peace offering" stresses his work as a gesture aimed toward community healing rather than self-interested profit-making (1:xxxiv). Yet in a letter to Furness congratulating him on the Variorum project, White remarked that he wouldn't undertake such an endeavor "for anything less than a small fortune, and for that I would do or try to do, anything" (Letter to Furness 7 June 1877). Furness, on the other hand, already possessed a small fortune. Comfortable with his wife's half share of a 1.7 million-dollar estate, Furness could afford to subsidize the Variorum publishers up to $2,000 per volume. After forty years he had received close to $29,000 in royalties, a sum far below his own investment (Gibson 85).

Hudson denied a profit motive in his own work and that of other American Shakespeareans by pointing out, with reference to the scholarship of White, Furness and Crosby, that "such pursuits have to be their own reward....If they had nothing to feed upon but what their Shakespeare knowledge brings them, they would have mighty little use for their teeth" ("How to Use" v). To bolster his own prestige, however, Hudson truthfully ventured that "Shakespeare work does more towards procuring a livelihood for me than for either of the gentlemen named" and with the "Harvard" edition Hudson demonstrated a commercial interest in White's territory ("How to Use" vi). Not satisfied with having cornered the popular market, Hudson, in his "Harvard" edition, tried to capture both general and scholarly readership, competing with what had been recognized as the "standard" scholarly American edition of Grant White. Hudson recognized the superiority of White's 1865 edition to his earlier 1851-8 attempt, but he boasted to the German Shakespearean Karl Knortz that with his whole new "Harvard" edition ready for the press, "I can beat him as much as he beat me" (cited Westfal 165). The "Harvard" preface calls attention to the two sets of notes which render the edition "admirably suited to the uses of both the general and the special student" and was advertised with laudatory quotes from "our most eminent Shakespeareans" which are supplied as evidence

"that this is to be 'The Standard American Edition of Shakespeare'" ("Ginn, Heath" 7).

Hudson's rivalrous attitude to White continued after the latter's death, as Hudson had White's final "Riverside" edition (1881), to contend with. At White's death in 1885, Hudson wrote Furness: "I knew White very well and used to meet and talk with him when I lived in New York. I have not seen him for two years....Of his last edition of Shakespeare I have seen but little, not enough to make up a fair judgment. But from what I have seen I judge it to be no improvement as a whole upon his earlier."

COMMERCIAL SHAKESPEARE

Agnew claims nineteenth century Anglo-American intellectuals resisted the incorporation within the price system of what they considered to be the "priceless" aspects of culture, but did little else to challenge that system (cited Bristol Shakespeare's America 24). Bristol maintains that the idea of the autonomy of art is "a denial of the institutional and social reality in which both Shakespeare and the people who read his work are embedded." Reading Shakespeare is linked to the promise of personal fulfillment, but quenches the need for practical opposition and indirectly supports repressive practices:

> ...the art of Shakespeare is conceived as the sphere of reconciled wholeness, expressivity, libidinal satisfaction, and thus opposed to the tyranny of GNP and the state apparatus. But the emancipatory desire of such an erotics of reading is never linked to the idea of a social agency. On the contrary, the energy of free expressivity is privatized and thus recaptured for the purposes of an inimical power structure." (Shakespeare's America 25).

But 19th century American Shakespeare editors and critics appeared to have contradicted this conventional romantic belief in the absolute difference between poet and businessman, developed in opposition to capitalist society. White's position, for example, becomes more interesting when his views on Shakespeare's own motives as an artist are considered. Grant White's Shakespeare, like Hudson's,

was a bootstrapper. While White was sympathetic to Shakespeare's early poverty, he disdained the playwright as a mercenary, sordid, businessman and social climber, who had no care for his art beyond the large house and gentleman's status it bought him. The playwright, White maintained, wrote primarily from mercenary motives, and he held and expressed this position throughout his career. White's visit to Stratford-on-Avon, chronicled in his travel book England Without and Within, played a substantial role in maintaining this attitude. Acutely disappointed in the town, which had "a smug business look, an air of money-making that would have delighted Shakespeare, but which offended me," White was horrified at the "poverty-stricken, squalid, kennel-like" condition of Shakespeare's family home in Henley street: "For the first time I knew from how low a condition of life Shakespeare had risen" (526-27). Shakespeare, according to White, wrote "with no strong impulse to literary art, no social aim, religious or political, no motive of intellectual ambition, but merely at first to earn his bread, and afterward in the furtherance of an almost sordid desire for money" ("Anatomizing" May 597). This view of a profit-motivated Shakespeare was apparently not uncommon during this period. In 1854, the North American Review wrote of Shakespeare that "the only success of any one of his plays which he seems to have cared for, was its effect in swelling the profits of the theatrical company in which he was both an actor and a shareholder" ("Restoration" 372). In an 1880 letter to White, H.H. Furness praised a magazine piece on Shakespeare and pointedly mentioned that he "liked the part of the article saying Shakespeare wrote to fill the theatre and his own pocket" (15 June 1880).

The characterization of Shakespeare as a businessman appears to have been popular among those peddling him as a cultural commodity, such as editors and magazine journalists, and may have helped attenuate their uneasiness with this aspect of scholarship. The claim, in other words, that Shakespeare regarded his own work as a purely commercial enterprise helped to obscure the contradiction arising from the attempt to profit from art promoted as priceless. An editor's expectations of significant material gain from his labors could be more easily justified if Shakespeare himself wrote only to line his pockets. Further, this view of a profit-

motivated Shakespeare would also have broadened his appeal for a middle class who wished to associate business practices with honorable creativity. Art on this view would be the by-product of the serious pursuit of profit.

Shakespeare's career almost certainly includes an opportunistic attempt at commercial success. But as Bristol suggests, a mixed account of Shakespeare's motives which includes a love of theatre, pleasure in craftsmanship and group obligation, as well as a desire for profit seems more enlightening.

> The orienting purposes of Shakespeare and his associates, their aspirations and frameworks of evaluation, were determined not only in terms of commodity but also against a social background defined by a more traditional moral and economic dispensation. Recognition of success in the sense of unfettered personal achievement and unrestricted private commodity becomes an evaluative orientation for human activity only within those institutional formations most characteristic of modern Western individualism in its most isolated and aggressive forms (Big Time 56).

Obliged to consider the demands of the revels office and the public, and in continual dialogue with other writers and company associates, "Shakespeare's vocation can thus be interpreted both as the practice of a craft and as the production of a commodity in the context of a nascent show business" (Bristol Big Time 57).

I believe this account of "mixed motives" aptly describes the aspirations of 19th century editors. They express an obvious reverence for the plays, a painstaking care in puzzling out cruces, a sense of community and mutual obligation, and an attempt to set a standard of excellence. These elements combine with a fixation on markets and financial achievement, and the evidence of envy and duplicity which can accompany strong desires for commercial success. These mixed motives are perhaps exemplified in Grant White's response to a proposed emendation in which references to community obligations and standards are expressed in commercial language:

> Mrs. Clarke's "sunny days" is deplorable. She is a good creature and we all owe her much. But we can't afford to discharge our obligation

at such an expensive rate as the acceptance of that sort of emendation" (Letter to Whiteman).

OTHELLO, NOBLE MOOR

Attached to the concept of motivation in Shakespeare editing is the idea of editorial judgment, and the ethical values which influence decisions. Editorial judgment is particularly interesting when considering Habermas' claim that all human action and interpretation is "interested." Following Habermas' assertion, Mette Hjort maintains that editorial work is undertaken within a categorical framework, "a set of unconscious and culturally mediated presuppositions and habitual modes of inquiry." The standards underlying any categorical framework are based on "attitudes that require critical consideration by means of arguments" ("Interests" 266). Hjort uses the concept of a categorical framework to demonstrate that traditional editorial assumptions about the sovereignty of the genius author and the sacred status of his work rely on curatorial and aesthetic impulses. These ignore a more democratic understanding of the collaborative nature of creativity and the value of art. Hjort's conclusions apply in some respects to 19th century American Shakespeare editors. But I'd like to apply the concept of categorical framework to Furness' implicit challenge to the values guiding a variety of editorial interpretations. These interpretations were compiled in Furness' New Variorum and center on Othello's color. I hope to illustrate through this discussion the ways in which Habermas' distinction between moral (universal) and ethical (particular) values is not always possible.

Hudson and White agree on Othello's refinement. For Hudson, Othello possesses a "high and delicate honor", is all "grace, modesty and gentleness", and although his tales of valor might have implied "a rude, coarse, animal strength" they contrarily "disclosed the history of a most meek, brave, manly soul" (Life, Art 2: 477, 482, 485). White stresses that although Othello had won fame and fortune by his sword, he had a "grave, reserved, and silent manner," was "modest as a maid" and adverse to brawling ("Florentine" 103, 104, 109). What Blumin calls the middle class domestication of males related to the curtailing of what was

considered base, unrefined behavior. Middle class women attempted to "refine, and more specifically to domesticate personal habits formed in less elegant surroundings, including the rustic ones in which many city men had been born and bred" (183). The middle class favored habits, claims Blumin, "that could set a family apart from both the rough world of the mechanics and the artificial world of fashion (188). The downplay of Othello's aggressive, warrior attributes and the highlighting of an almost maidenly refinement reflects, I think, the attitudes of a middle class whose "dress, etiquette and manners," as Harper's claimed, were under women's tutelage (cited Blumin 183).

Othello's refinement, however, could not be reconciled with his blackness. Abigail Adams probably expressed a common sentiment in 1786, when she saw Mrs. Siddons as Desdemona in London, and experienced "disgust and horror...every time I saw him touch the gentle Desdemona....I lost much of the pleasure of the play from the sooty appearance of the Moor" (cited Dunn 94). Othello's color was an issue for white Americans who, after the Civil War, had to deal with the threatening possibility of black man/white woman miscegenation. Othello was thus often rendered an acceptable marriage partner, and his refinement justified, by lightening his color. In Studies in Shakespeare (1869), Mary Preston declared Othello to be "a white man", defending her claim on the grounds that "Shakespeare was too correct a delineator of human nature to have colored Othello black, if he had personally acquainted himself with the idiosyncrasies of the African race" (cited Furness Othello 395). The American Bibliopolist (1875), declared "that in Shakespeare's time a dark or brunette complexion was indicated by calling a person 'black' " (cited Furness Othello 395). "Othello was not meant to be a Negro...but a veritable Moor" according to Hudson. "His kindred, the Mauritanians...though apt to be confounded with the negroes [sic], were as different from them externally as brown is from black; internally, in mind and character, the difference was far greater" (cited Furness Othello 395). Grant White protested he "could never see the least reason for supposing that Shakespeare intended Othello to be represented as a negro" for Moors were "enterprising and

civilized...whereas the contrary has always been the condition of the negroes [sic]" (cited Furness Othello 393).

Furness included seven pages of such comments in Othello, and recognized the fear of miscegenation underlying it (391). Nonetheless he insisted "that Shakespeare meant to present Othello as "black" I cannot but think, and "black" in the full meaning of the word, not "dark-complexioned" (395). A fervent admirer of John Quincy Adams, Furness also claimed Adams' comments on the question (he denounced Desdemona for marrying a "rude, unbleached, African"), "cannot but make the judicious grieve" (391). That all participants in the debate claim to represent Shakespeare's intentions is evident, but not the point here. By implicitly rejecting the common knowledge that initiative, bravery, honor, and gentleness were not characteristics which could be attributed to blacks, Furness highlighted the racist interests of those who claimed to stand for democratic equality.

ABOLITION: ETHICAL OR MORAL QUESTION?

Furness' abolitionist parents affected his view of blacks, and his background illustrates the difficulty in separating ethical values from moral arguments. In the Philadelphia of the early 1830s, many members of the Unitarian congregation where Furness' father preached had strong family and business ties to the South. Some owned plantations with several hundred slaves, and a number petitioned against the anti-slavery sermons delivered by Furness' father (Gibson 16). Slavery was largely considered a matter for the private sphere--a domestic, economic, affair--yet in the senior Furness' sermons "there would be impassioned pleadings for the slave and eloquent adjurations to guard liberty and the rights of man" (Gibson 18). Thus although Furness presented his arguments according to the more abstract, moral, standards of the justice sphere, "the furious stamping through the aisle to the exits" indicated members of his congregation thought his remonstrations an invasion of privacy, and an attempt to direct ethical, personal, decisions (Gibson 18). As Fraser maintains, domestic and economic systems

> enclave certain matters into specialized discursive arenas; both thereby shield such matters from generalized contestation and from

> widely disseminated conflicts of interpretation....Under special circumstances...processes of depoliticization are disrupted. At that point dominant classifications of needs as "economic" or "domestic"--as opposed to political"—come to lose their " self-evidence," and alternative, oppositional, and politicized interpretations emerge in their stead (168-9).

Furness junior's attitude to blacks was shaped by debate generated within an abolitionist family—by an ethical question which became a moral stance that saw slavery abolished and the political equality of blacks constitutionally enshrined. Furness' editorial defense of Othello in his adulthood was based on ethical values, just as the racist comments of the other editors were. Furness senior's defense in the face of opposition relates well to the difficulty of bracketing interest-oriented perspectives so critical to Habermas' concept of moral justice. If ethical/particular questions may prove to be moral/universal, there is no way of discovering this if participants in any debate must bracket their ethical interests.

AGENCY, ETHICS AND UNIVERSAL JUSTICE

H.H. Furness' remarks on Othello connect with the practice of behavioral ranking, with Habermas' idea of a common humanity developed through literature, and to concepts of subjectivity--issues which are hotly debated in Shakespeare circles as in other areas of cultural studies. Highlighted in these concepts is the importance of self-scrutiny and individual deliberation, practices critical to effective participation in the public sphere. In this section I will show that public challenges mounted against redundant norms rely critically on the self-concepts of individual agents—in other words on ethical/particular values which when presented in public develop into moral/universal questions.

Charles Taylor's and Shakespearean Alan Sinfield's competing understandings of human agency might help to clarify what is at stake in this

debate. Agents, Taylor maintains, are characterized by their ability to evaluate their desires while deliberating over choices. Weak evaluation involves decisions over trivial choices, such as what to have for dessert. Strong evaluation, conversely, involves decisions that profoundly involve the agent's sense of self. In strong evaluation, ranking desires in contrasting terms, such as admirable or dishonorable allows the agent to make decisions coherent with the kind of person she understands herself to be. Decisions involving this type of conscious self-interpretation are attempts to avoid, as Taylor puts it "a distortion of the meaning things have for me" ("What is" 27). Ranking desires involves the minimum degree of reflexivity we associate with human agents, and is critical to the exercise of the will. Both the process of conceiving alternatives and the choice indicate the agent's allegiances, and support or challenge important self-understandings.

According to Habermas, desires are what drive us to satisfy the needs which rely on recognized values for justification (McCarthy 53). Ranking desires then, would finally depend on standards derived from established cultural or group values, which are specific rather than universal. Habermas' claim that ideas of a common humanity were formed privately, through literary discussion within the ethical sphere of the bourgeois family, illustrates the restrictive nature of this commonality. This exercise in self-understanding would surely involve a bourgeois-specific ranking of desires (inspiring the needs upon which moral norms are based). Habermas refers to

> ...the needs of a bourgeois reading public that later on would find genuine satisfaction in the literary forms of the domestic drama and the psychological novel. For the experiences about which a public passionately concerned with itself sought agreement and enlightenment through the rational-critical public debate of private persons with one another flowed from the wellspring of a specific subjectivity. The latter had its home, literally, in the sphere of the patriarchal conjugal family (43).

This public came to a particular, rather than universal, "self-understanding...through entering itself into literature as an object" and by reading

the moral weeklies viewed as "censor(s) of manners and morals" by which the "public held up a mirror to itself"(43). Further, if we agree with Taylor that a sense of authenticity, of a self as an autonomous human agent is bound so inextricably to these ethical evaluative questions, how may the values formed in the ethical sphere be bracketed without relinquishing a critical standard by which to judge so-called moral, universal norms. Values fostered in the ethical realm must have implications in the realm of justice. These values however, may be modified or changed through argument or experience, *replaced* rather than bracketed.

We have seen that, following Taylor, autonomous action involves deliberation over significant choices. But in a model of subjectivity which Cultural Materialist Shakespearean Alan Sinfield endorses, the agent is an emergent effect of the act. Sinfield's generous reflections on 19th century American Shakespeare study in the last chapter of Faultlines (1992), make his remarks particularly pertinent to this discussion. He regards Shakespeare as a prominent tool of exploitation in the U.S., blames U.S. appropriation of Shakespeare on a white, ruling, leisure, class, and implicates Furness and Grant White in this process.

"For agency to operate," Sinfield claims, "...a "doer" does not have to be in place first; rather she or he is constructed through the deed" (38). On Sinfield's view, an individual's ethical and moral actions are the result of chance procedures rather than rational deliberation, so that choice becomes redundant. I am not denying that this form of random behavior occurs--as Taylor points out, choice in its full capacity is a potential which must be developed, demanding that we become self-conscious enough that we do not adhere to or adopt a code through fear, sloth or ignorance ("Atomism" 197). But although he appears to favor the concept of random action, the importance of choice seems to be a key notion underlying Sinfield's indictment of domination/exploitation--understood as a curtailment of autonomy through choice restriction in order to satisfy the needs and desires of one individual or group over another. If the subject, as Sinfield claims, is personally inconsistent and easily manipulated by competing stories/ideologies, choice is replaced by an indiscriminate act (Faultlines 64, 78). In the absence of a subject who possesses the capacity--however curtailed--to weigh alternatives and choose

with reference to some consistent self-understanding, it is difficult to understand how autonomous action may be violated. As Taylor maintains, it is by recognizing our potential for self-determination that we may grasp the concept of domination ("Foucault" 174-175).

Sinfield appears to satisfy this requirement by embracing the concept of group identity, "since personal subjectivity and agency are, anyway, unlikely sources of dissident identity and action: "political awareness does not arise out of an essential, individual, self-consciousness of class, race, nation, gender, or sexual orientation; but from involvement in a milieu, a subculture....It is through such sharing that one may learn to...develop a plausible oppositional selfhood" (Faultlines 37). Yet group-only identity—in the realm of gay life, for example—would appear to compromise an explicit struggle for liberation and autonomy by validating only a narrow range of action. Sinfield's model reduces human potential to the capacity for political dissent; it also implies a purely instrumental notion of community as existing solely for the achievement of political ends.

There are further problems with the idea of group identity. Subcultures, as Sinfield himself points out, are not particularly "authentic, or politically pure, or vital....Subcultures may well exhibit racist, sexist and homophobic features" (Faultlines 298). A subjectivity developed solely through immersion in a working class group with racist or homophobic sentiments, for example, would lead to the promotion of one exploited group at the expense of others. The agent would thus perpetuate the very racist or sexist or homophobic stances by which she identifies and denounces dominant groups. Finally, I am not suggesting that a single-minded, political, commitment is unfeasible. I would maintain, however, that such a commitment implies an agent who chooses a politicized, group, identity based on profound aspects of a personal, self-understanding. Self-understanding, as I comprehend it, may rely on a broad range of choices, available through prior and continuing engagement with different groups, communities, individuals and situations. Or it may be the result of a fairly limited experience within a single community. These interactions affirm or challenge beliefs, attitudes and behaviors which support an agent's most fundamental understanding of herself—as an

advocate of, for example, human liberty and community, and the ways in which she interprets these concepts. Highlighted in concepts of the human subject and agency is the importance of self-scrutiny and individual deliberation, practices critical to effective participation in the public sphere. Public challenges mounted against redundant norms rely critically on the self-concepts of individual agents.

In his presentation of Shakespeare as a prominent tool of exploitation in the U.S., Sinfield maintains that Furness and Grant White, along with "the East Coast European-derived gentry sought a cultural hegemony within the United States, deploying Shakespeare especially to legitimate their claim." By the end of the century, Sinfield asserts that the leisure class had monopolized Shakespeare and set the criteria for academic study of the plays (266). This contention is misguided. To deny the often blatant gender, race, and class biases prevalent in the approach of Shakespeare commentators would be absurd. Yet prominent in Furness' Othello is the continuing importance of an individual's scrutiny of authoritative opinion, formed in this case through a haze of racial bias which belied an explicit commitment to democratic equality. As I will show in chapter four, it is these kinds of challenges which promoted a more inclusive, deliberative democracy in the United States.

Critically, what American editors presented to the public was a Shakespeare whose meaning was made collectively, through individual deliberation, presentation of evidence, group discussion, and challenges to established authority. As I show in the next chapter, it was partly through their exposure to a scholarly Shakespeare community that the American middle class formed their own discussion groups. Within the family and through clubs, they engaged in a process which helped to produce the "audience-oriented subject" of Habermas' public sphere.

Chapter 3 - Shakespeare Clubs and Public Voices

Shakespeariana (1883-93) was a magazine created in response to the burgeoning American interest in Shakespeare. Its content ranged from debate over textual cruces to the latest developments in Baconian theory, and it took a particular interest in Shakespeare clubs. In 1888, the magazine published a list of about one hundred Shakespeare societies unearthed by the editorial department ("List" 88-92). The smallest, "the club of two" carried on its proceedings entirely by correspondence; one of the most prestigious, the Shakespeare Society of New York, had a library which comprised 2-3000 volumes. The societies mentioned in the journal were those who contributed to Shakespeariana's club news section and thus probably represented only a fraction of the groups across America who studied the plays. Nonetheless, Shakespeariana charted a phenomenon which began around mid-century. By 1881, as Joseph Crosby wrote to the British Shakespearean C.F. Ingleby, there was "hardly a town of any size of importance that does not have a "Shakespeare Reading Club."

This chapter focusses on the formation and preoccupations of Shakespeare societies. Through these clubs, members acquired speaking, organization and leadership skills which enabled them to develop and express their ideas in a public forum. Shakespeare societies cultivated self-reliance in forming a view along with behaviours promoting civil group interaction. Willingness to consider other positions and develop competent means of resolving conflicts were elements critical to the successful function of the public sphere. Shakespeare was particularly effective in this respect. Because of the dramatic nature of the material, members were often encouraged to assume roles during club readings, a practice which helped to enrich empathetic identification with different viewpoints. The mitigation of hierarchical structure was nurtured by more experienced Shakespeareans, who often interacted with novices. And a real sense of participating in a national discussion characterized their debates, since everyone dealt with the same body of work.

CLUBS, CLASS AND PRACTICES

Shakespeare societies were part of the numerous literary associations, lyceums and voluntary associations present in most 19th century communities. Stuart Blumin notes that through these societies individuals expressed social preferences and to an extent shaped themselves as community members (206). Blumin's analysis, which suggests that these organizations were generally class bound, is worth describing in some detail.

Elite societies--such as the Boston Athenaeum or the Historical Society of Pennsylvania--were philanthropic or cultural organizations which enhanced and exhibited the importance of the upper class. This group maintained its prominence and identity by instilling in its members a distinct value system, and associating them with intellectual and literary figures (Blumin 206-207; Story). The Boston Athenaeum, for example, was founded by a group of professional men who met weekly for dinner and conversation. As Ronald Story has shown, the Athenaeum was considered important to its members primarily because familiarity with literature and scholarship would, "heighten the enjoyment of all the blessings of life" and allow the experience of pleasure "from a multitude of new sources" (190). The emphasis on pleasure over utilitarian function seems to describe the motive behind the founding of the Shakespeare Society of New York in 1852. Its founding members were generally rather high-brow public figures, including the actor and proprietor of Burton's theatre, William Burton, Richard Grant White, magazine intelligentsia George Curtis and Park Godwin and Shakespeare editor William Verplanck. The club's weekly dinners were reported as social events in the New York papers (Records of the Shakespeare).

Lower social strata also formed small societies or clubs for the purposes of literary discussion, music or sport. Unlike upper class groups, however, Blumin claims these pursuits were thought to encourage the moral and intellectual development deemed necessary for the success of the members. Like the public lecture, these middle class organizations were regarded as educational. They were, Blumin maintains, "schools to teach a variety of new skills, values, and a new

social discipline demanded by modern society.... The process...gave dozens of men within the community first-hand experience in drafting constitutions, recruiting members, presiding over meetings, public speaking and resolving conflict (Blumin 215). Most of the middle class organizations of young merchants, clerks, and accountants generated constitutions and bylaws with rules emphasizing order and dignity, and met in the controlled, respectable, environment of parlors or meeting rooms (Blumin 211-15). With regard to Shakespeare societies, this domestic milieu may have been inspired by the family-based heart of some clubs which had one or two families as core members, and probably began as family circles. The Lebanon Shakespeare club (established 1883) was initiated by Mrs. J. C. Wallace, who started reading Shakespeare with her daughter but later invited friends to join them ("Shakespeare Societies" 2:49). The original members of the Rochester Shakespeare Society (established 1865) included Mr. and Mrs. James Angle and son, as well as four members of the Crittenden family ("Shakespeare Societies" 1: 159). The Manchester NH Shakespeare Club (established early 1870s), included by 1898 three generations of the same family (Croly 795).

Some clubs were composed of young people of a similar age. The Shakespeare Club of Huron, Dakota, consisted of thirty-five high school students. The members of Shakespeare's Amateurs of Canisteo, New York were twelve-year-old girls ("Shakespeare Societies" 5: 265; Croly 913). The ages of young people in other clubs were mixed, "with two or three in school, and the others working to support themselves with little time for study" ("A School" 457).

As Blumin suggests of other associations, most Shakespeare clubs appeared to have annually elected an executive, as well as drafted a constitution and by-laws. The records of the New York Shakespeare Society list thirteen regulations concerned with election of regular and committee members, and attendance. "The stability of a society", noted one Shakespeare club manual, "will largely depend upon the strictness with which its laws are kept" (Griffiths 23). The earnestness with which the rules seemed to be generated and observed suggest the importance attached to preparation and participation. "Everyone is expected to do his duty" was the primary rule of order of the Avon Shakespeare Society, Topeka, Kansas, and

rule number five of the all-ladies club of Grand Rapids, Michigan stated severely that every member must devote fifteen minutes of daily study to the play under examination and "must also promise not to criticize any of the workings of the class outside of it"("Shakespeare Societies"1: 29; 5: 30). The Nashville Query Club and the Sister's Shakespeare Society of Elizabeth, N.J. (which imposed fines for tardiness and absence), required memorized quotes for each meeting ("Shakespeare Societies" 5: 314; 1: 159). It is notable that club rules conform to the industrial work ethic that was instituted and broadly disseminated in the nineteenth century (Gutman). Punctuality, duty, productivity, sober seriousness, loyalty and attendance were important elements of club life. Quick and visible productivity and evidence of acquisition were sought in the memorization requirements, quizzes, and prepared papers. Tardiness was frowned upon, attendance was taken and persistent absence penalized. Members' work was often severely criticized ("Shakespeare Societies of America" 483). Yet it would be a mistake to say that Shakespeare was consciously used to foster these attitudes, or that an "industrial" approach to the plays was generally endorsed. Shakespeareans, as Hudson maintained, are not made "by the help of any labor-saving machinery....Our education has totally lost the idea of culture...it makes no account of any thing but acquirement....the process of acquirement is conscious and loud, because its work is all on the mind's surface" ("How to Use Shakespeare" v, xix). Perhaps the stress on visible productivity and the strictly observed rules are evidence of the members' general seriousness. Private preparation sharpened one's arguments; punctuality, consistency and loyalty bespoke consideration for other members; and criticism discouraged flabby thought, fomented discussion and refined ideas. In these ways, Shakespeare societies cultivated self-reliance along with behaviours promoting harmonious group interaction.

Shakespeare societies were both gender specific and mixed, and generally had between twelve and thirty members. Although clubs differed in areas of interest and levels of sophistication, proceedings were generally regarded quite seriously as "work." Some clubs occasionally hired actors or guest lecturers--the Old Cambridge Shakespeare Association, for example, listened to a course of lectures

delivered by Henry Hudson over the winter of 1882 ("Shakespeare Societies 1: 29). The plays naturally lent themselves to dramatization, and some groups were mainly reading clubs. Evenings With Shakespeare, written for aspiring clubs, advocated membership consisting of seven women and eighteen men, for the purpose of reading through the plays (Griffiths 22). The Baltimore Shakespeare club consisted of twelve women and twelve men, and read and discussed one act of a play each meeting ("Shakespeare Societies" 4; 324). The West Philadelphia Shakespeare Society cast parts before the meetings, and discussed characters after an act had been read ("Shakespeare Societies 1: 60). Indeed, for a class with more time to analyse itself by pondering what it is to be human, as Habermas claims, Shakespeare's characters were perceived as providing well-developed and complex examples of humanity. One Shakespeariana article enumerating the purposes of Shakespeare study claimed the plays were "rife with moral sentiment" and dealt with "universal nature...life with its...thoughts, affections, passions, motives and relations" (Weld 450, 445). Reading Shakespeare, claimed another article, allowed the student to become

> acquainted with the people to whom Shakespeare introduces us, listen to what they say, compare their expression of themselves in private with their public utterances, and judge of their mental and moral characteristics. We talk about these people, and get many lessons upon the conduct of life...("A School" 457).

These statements, I think, implicitly define the concept of personhood in terms of self-determining action. Characters, whether "good" or "evil" were regarded as complex, deliberating agents whose motivations and decisions could be analysed in terms of moral choice--acting according to strongly held values and beliefs. The term "conduct" has several valences, and in this context I think suggests controlled behaviours that are chosen because they adhere to a sense of authenticity or "rightness." That Shakespeare's characters were discussed in their capacity to provide "lessons upon the conduct of life" implies a group attempting to come to an agreement on what might constitute authentic behaviour, based on values and beliefs held by self-determining individuals who were also social beings.

Further, by taking the part of characters with behaviours alien to their own, they conceivably developed empathetic identification with a polarized point of view:

> I do in my conception assume the personality of another and so, regarding myself as himself, I am to judge the case accordingly and thus determine what is his due from me (Weld 440).

The Shakespeare student also formed "correct taste, habits of critical analysis, a terse, vivid and graceful style" and developed dramatic expression (Weld 439-440). Thus members learned to better understand themselves and others as self-determining agents through assuming different characters while they developed critical habits and effective speaking skills. In addition, even clubs at a basic level learned to listen to others and modify their own positions. The Atlanta Shakespeare Club admitted that "its chief object is the mere reading of the plays, and no pretense is made to a critical study of the text, yet incidentally much is learned....and discussion ensues" ("Shakespeare Societies 1:29). Club members were advised to:

> read and read again....When you meet with your associates ...you will find their reading is not altogether your reading. Agreement and opposition both will have their use in giving you new light and fresh suggestions....You talk not to dispute, but to realize your own impressions and enlarge your mental horizons by learning what your neighbors' impressions are (" A School" 465).

The range of plays apparently studied is surprising, and the popular tragedies--Othello, MacBeth, Hamlet, Lear--were dissected along with the history plays, and the less familiar works. In addition to concern with characters, clubs concerned themselves with problems such as plot sources, Shakespeare's artistic development, and for the more sophisticated, textual cruces. The Lock-Richardson Club of California, for example, issued its members nasty quizzes on textual emendation and various editions ("A Quiz" 123).

It would be misleading to suggest that all Shakespeare societies were harmonious circles of goodwill. Bitter personal conflicts sometimes marred group interaction, as evidenced in the minute book of the New York Shakespeare Society

(1852). An apparent conflict between the secretary, Robert Balmanno, and president, William Burton, resulted in Balmanno erasing Burton's name and signature from every page of the minute book (Records). Some clubs experienced friction when it came to electing officers. The secretary of the Stratford Club of Concord, New Hampshire noted that " in all my dealing with women I have found one great drawback in their effective and harmonious work, and that is their reluctance to debate in open field. They will not express an adverse opinion in public, the only proper place; but by compensation nourish much ill feeling and unkind speech in private. Our method of balloting, being secret, compels perfect honesty" ("Shakespeare Societies" 4:327). Members sometimes clashed when work was too harshly criticized. Persistent adverse commentary could have dire results, and "an exceptionally severe critique of a member's best work will often lay the seed of discord that will eventually end in the breakup of the society" ("Shakespeare Societies of America" 483). The positive outcome to these conflicts was that they had to be collectively talked out and overcome.

It would also be misleading to suggest that Shakespeare societies were single-mindedly studious. The Philadelphia Shakespeare society, formed in 1851 by four young lawyers was initially more of a lark than a serious endeavour. "Chance of fancy at the meeting" determined the play to be read, according to founding member Garrick Mallery. By the sixth year the membership had swelled to fifteen and at the meetings there was "an infinity of good eating and drinking, but an infinitesimal amount of Shaksper, discussed. Indeed, on one occasion, the Society was disgraced by the omission to read or even quote a single line of the Poet..." (Mallery 9). By 1858, however, a more systematic study had begun with plans for a library and by the time Horace Howard Furness joined in 1860, members had agreed to prepare papers for each meeting.

The Philadelphia Shakespeare Society was composed mainly of upper class professionals, as was the first New York Shakespeare Society. Occasionally Shakespeare societies, apparently status-seekers, called attention in the club news section of Shakespeariana to the professional standing of their members. The Greensburg, PA. Shakespeare Society boasted two physicians, four attorneys, one

judge and one "ex-lieutenant governor" ("Shakespeare Societies" 1:60). Francis Teague maintains that the Zanesville (Ohio) Shakespeare Reading Club was a self-improvement organization which also certified its members' social standing (20). Its president, Joseph Crosby, wrote pleasedly to a friend that the group was composed of "the nicest and most intelligent people of our city. Two or three clergymen--a judge--several lawyers and all their wives; & several young ladies & widows." Nonetheless, according to Crosby this club was "willing to read & study, and to stick to it" and prepared one play every two weeks. Crosby also offered background on the plays and lectures on Elizabethan society, and helped members to interpret difficult passages as they read their parts (Teague 20).

Many groups appear to have combined this type of snobbery with a desire for study. Indeed, it appears that middle class Shakespeare clubs both aped and distanced themselves from elites. Although they sometimes consciously highlighted their members' social standing, middle class Shakespeare study had a definitely utilitarian, rather than culinary, function. It helped an emerging class develop and crystallize a collective self-understanding, rather than reinforcing an already existing identity. And Shakespeare study was viewed as an enlightening practice to be shared, rather than an exclusive delight reserved for elites.

This sense of a shared practice was expressed in the inclusive attitude of more advanced scholars, such as Crosby and Furness, toward amateurs. Nineteenth century scholars communicated with a largely middle class public who appreciated their work and to an extent helped to form it. Interest in Shakespeare grew within a shared and relatively accessible public culture. This attitude was expressed as well in the disposition of metropolitan centres to recognize small town clubs. Although Crosby complained about the provincialism of Zanesville, "where hardly one in a thousand has ever read a line of Shakespeare," Shakespeariana claimed that Shakespeare societies were sometimes more successful in small towns with few distractions. "Even though they be composed of amateurs" the magazine noted in 1885, "...it must not be inferred that they are any the less an integral part of our Shakespeare growth.....One is impressed by the singular earnestness that pervades all their deliberations" ("Shakespeare Societies of America" 481).

By contrast with the rather insulated, predictable and refined character of the proceedings of Shakespeare societies, the most prominent activities of trade associations and fire companies formed by working class manual laborers took place outdoors in the form of a conflict. As Blumin suggests, "in both form and content the strike emphasized class division within society, and so too did orderly parades in support of strikers which integrated labor agitation with more traditional and consensual forms of outdoor collective activity" (216). Firefighters were usually working class, and fought the community's most important political and cultural battles with their fists, on the street. Unlike clerks and accountants, who had access to respectable parlors, manual workers also gathered at the saloon, and the boxing ring. While middle class manliness was based on the development of character through self-control, sobriety, and steady productivity; the concept of honor among peers in the saloon depended heavily on physical toughness. The working class saloon, as Blumin notes "was no place for a dry goods clerk" (218). From Blumin's analysis, then, it might be surmised that a Shakespeare society was no place for a brawling workingman. Working class appreciation of Shakespeare in the first half of the century was more likely to take place at the theatre, where it often took a physical and overtly political form.

WOMEN AND PUBLIC DEBATE

It appears then, that literary societies and Shakespeare clubs among them were largely confined to the middle and upper class; and that before the habits of literary societies and other voluntary associations took effect, public debate in 19th century America frequently consisted of raucous, drunken, and violent white, male voices. The situation of women during this period was different, in that they had no legitimate public voice. In pre-industrial America most women's labor was essential to the home business. With spreading industrialization and an emerging middle class, many more men worked outside the home, but could afford to support wives who stayed home and attended only to domestic tasks. As the middle class woman emerged, she was defined as domestic and moral by nature. De Tocqueville avowed in 1835 that

> nature has appointed such wide differences between the physical and moral constitution of man and woman...causing each of them to fulfill their respective tasks in the best possible manner....An American woman cannot escape from the quiet circle of domestic employments, [yet] she is never forced...to go beyond it....Women of the United States are confined within the narrow circle of domestic life, and their situation is in some respects one of extreme dependence (222-25).

On Mary Ryan's account, women held a largely ceremonial place at public celebrations in the first half of the 19th century and their presence lent a respectable tone rather than a verbal perspective to political rallies (Ryan 266). Women's participation in the temperance movement in the second half of the century has been well-documented, and women's moral societies did join campaigns to control prostitution which were initiated by male evangelicals in the Jacksonian 30s (Ryan 271). But although women's benevolent societies during the early years of the century helped the poor and homeless, Anne Firor Scott maintains they fulfilled basic cultural expectations, and that very few during the first half of the century practiced social analysis (25). The Moral reform societies begun in the thirties entered prostitutes' residences and prayed for their salvation; only in the second half of the century did the Moral Reform Society of New York, for example, begin a social service program instead of simply disseminating publicity urging moral perfection (Scott 41).

Ryan maintains that the antebellum cult of domesticity more closely resembled the lot of women who until the latter third of the century were largely "excluded, silenced, or shouted down in the public, democratic, and male-dominated spaces" (Ryan 173). Thus the early 19th century American concept of the ideal lady virtually banished respectable middle class women from aggressive public activity, and silence rather than argumentative skill was considered a virtue. Remarked one member of the women's literary organization Sorosis, "women not only had not the experience which would make them exact thinkers and accurate in the presentation of facts, but they lacked the self-possession to do so before an

audience" (cited Blair Clubwoman 67). Yet with the rise of women's literary clubs, what Karen Blair calls "domestic feminism" became prevalent. Women throughout the United States during the 70s, 80s and 90s began founding literary clubs, where they met to discuss papers they had researched and written (Blair Clubwoman). Scott claims the works of Shakespeare and Browning led the list of literary topics (118). Discussing literature with a group of non-coercive women in a domestic setting allowed women to overcome their self-consciousness. As one 19th century literary clubwoman remarked, women "who had not the courage to speak our minds before several hundred in formidable array expressed our humble opinions freely over the teacups" (cited Blair Clubwoman 67).

Inadvertently, they acquired speaking, organization and leadership skills, which enabled them to develop and express their ideas, and built a domestic feminism from which they launched their critique of American society (Blair Clubwoman 57). One Sorosis clubwoman claimed

> no one could have expected...the frightened and unready women of that time who clinging to a chair for support and with eyes chained to the manuscript uttered in husky tones their halting thoughts, could be transformed into the really skilled debaters that some have become (cited Blair Clubwoman 67).

Blair maintains that the recently prosperous expected their wives and children to acquire polish, and that literary clubs were a means of consolidating class. The rationale for improving middle class women's minds was founded on rather than opposed to domestic occupation, since a woman's cultural accomplishment served to refine and edify the family. By preserving conventional appearances, these women opened new public avenues for themselves (Blair Clubwoman 5).

Alice Winter Ames, who wrote a book about organizing women's clubs in 1925, implicitly identifies 19th century American women's cultural clubs as the impetus which helped to create the specifically female audience-oriented subject, participating in the public sphere:

> Our women's clubs began half a century ago as self cultural bodies...the period of the old fashioned cultural club was one of

> incubation. Women had to turn in on themselves and learn to know each other before they dared or knew how to turn outward....We make a stupid mistake when we use culture as a sort of modern version of asceticism, namely a withdrawal from the realities of life for the sake of saving our own souls.....Human culture is the preliminary of human productiveness. The training for leadership through wisdom and the active civic philanthropic or educational work are both legitimate fruits (10).

Shakespeare's work was a critical ingredient in women's cultural clubs, both in the 19th and early 20th centuries. The first literary organizations formed, for example, by the women of New Hampshire were Shakespeare clubs in the early 1870s; a Shakespeare room was established in a public library in Concord in 1888 for the use of Shakespeare societies; and Jane Croly details seven Shakespeare societies active in New Hampshire alone in her 1898 survey of women's clubs (795-800). Of the roughly seven women's clubs in Montana in the 1890s devoted strictly to literature three were Shakespeare societies, and two others dedicated a generous portion of their study program to Shakespeare (Christie). Neither were Shakespeare clubs necessarily composed only of whites. Although their records have rarely been preserved, free black women established literary societies as early as the 1830s to develop their talents and attempt to destroy negative stereotypes (D. Porter). Anne Meis Knupfer maintains that black women's clubs formed in the 1890s in Chicago emphasized self-cultivation and respectability largely through the appreciation of classical music and the study of Shakespeare (59). The ten black women's organizations which helped to form a federation of art clubs in Kansas in 1900 included a Shakespeare club, founded in 1889 (Brady). These black middle class and elite organizations, like their white counterparts, were emblematic of status and prestige, but usually inadvertently initiated civic and political activity.

Karen Blair describes Croly's History of the Women's Club Movement (1898), which lists 34 Shakespeare clubs, as "barely scratching the surface....Large clubs of diverse interest frequently formed Shakespeare departments for a portion of their membership" (Torchbearers 227-8). One such was the Ladies Literary Club

of Salt Lake City (1877-1927), whose Shakespeare department according to one member "earned the reputation of being one of the very studious sections of the club" (Parsons 24). Although as Blair points out, the middle class women in these clubs limited membership to women of similar background, they were formed, nonetheless, upon democratic principles (Torchbearers 3). The Salt Lake City Club broke away from its parent, which had "a limited membership and was avowedly exclusive in character." The new group felt

> a club should reach out and bring into its intellectual and democratic circle all women who hungered for intellectual food and companionship—a club not only for the literary elite, but also for women who were frankly learners....A club should stand for education of the many rather than culture for a few (Parsons 23-24).

It appears, however, that most clubs' membership, as the Concord Shakespeare club claimed, "met to perfection the requirements laid down by Portia:

> For in companions
> That do converse and spend the time together,
> Whose souls do bear an equal yoke of love,
> There must be needs a like proportion,
> Of lineaments, of manners, and of spirit (cited Croly 796).

Those clubs truly interested in sharing Shakespeare study with working class women probably followed a similar route to the Woman's Shakespearean Club of Barnesville, Georgia, in the late 1890s. Somewhat condescendingly, these women boasted that "a factory Girls' Club has also been organized and permanently established in club-rooms, where a committee from the "Shakespearean" meets the girls, to furnish guidance in their instruction..." (cited Croly 368). Similarly, working class women in the early 20th century fell under the perhaps patronizing tutelage of reformers such as Jane Addams, whose Hull House had a Shakespeare club. Referring to the brutal behaviour which provided role models for the working class in sensationalist newspapers and in life, Addams maintained that Hull-House relied on the Shakespeare Club "to feed the mind of the worker, to lift it above the monotony of his task, and to connect it with the larger world" (Addams 435). (The

attitudes of Progressives and what Richard Ohmann terms the Professional Managerial Class (PMC) toward Shakespeare and the working class around the turn of the century will be discussed further in Chapter 5.)

SHAKESPEARIANA

Like other Shakespeare societies, women's clubs frequently spread news of their activities through the club news section of Shakespeariana. Although the magazine was launched by the all-male New York Shakespeare Society and its contributors were largely male, it was edited for several years by Charlotte Endymion Porter (1857-1942). Educated at Wells College, New York, Porter briefly studied Shakespeare at the Sorbonne. Porter was apparently a lesbian who lived openly with her lifelong companion with whom she later founded and edited Poet Lore (1899-). This magazine was initially devoted to Shakespeare and Browning, and geared toward literary societies studying their work. Later in her literary career Porter edited a forty volume edition of Shakespeare (1903-13) [Bernstein 83-85]. Shakespeariana is a good example of the mitigation of hierarchical structure nurtured by more experienced Shakespeareans, who often interacted with novices. Porter began editing Shakespeariana with H. H. Furness' encouragement and active contribution, but made it clear that

> it is not alone to scholarly Specialists that [Shakespeariana] appeals; but to all...who are interested in taking means to lead Schools and societies, or isolated Students to investigate liberally, systematically, and faithfully the educational uses of the study of Shakespeare ("To You" ii).

Despite his reputation as a formidable scholar, Furness' advice to Shakespeare societies on the choice of edition and the subtlety of emendation was typical of the practical rather than intellectually elitist tone of the magazine. As he wrote to one club, "there are many cheap excellent editions.... There is much vain talk about the different texts....All texts are more alike than unalike...where you think that printers have misunderstood the passage you can punctuate for yourself" ("A School" 463-4). And Porter's approach to the uncertain material in Shakespeare's plays reflected

a similar approach to the reasoning powers of each individual. She felt cruces should be left for readers to puzzle over, rather than corrected by individual editors. As she wrote Furness:

> Do you really believe that one is apt to hit more than once in a thousand times on what Shakespeare really wrote....I am afraid I don't. I prefer a certain blunder to an uncertain correction ("Letter").

Shakespeariana was explicitly devoted to exchanging ideas and interpretations. One department was devoted to readers' suggestions for emendation and textual explanation. The magazine also assigned a regular section to news from Shakespeare societies nationwide, allowing each to share ideas related to study and discussion procedure. The "School of Shakespeare" section was based on the belief that "attempts to study Shakespeare...if made co-operative and inter-dependent, might gain in directness, force, and value ("To You" ii). A congress of Shakespeare societies was planned for the summer of 1891 in the hope that all could compare notes and study results ("Miscellany" 8:247).

The magazine sometimes provided study outlines for clubs. Porter's study questions for the Merchant of Venice explicitly dealt with social issues involving questions of race, class and gender. Her outline included queries on the "Wrong-doing and Wrong-suffering of Society proceeding from long continued Class or Race Oppression"; "Effects of differences of Race and of Race-influence on Beliefs"; "Consequences of Sex in further modifying such differences"; "the Feudal society as compared with ours" ("Outline" 516-17). Such topics imply an awareness that race, gender and class color beliefs, and a willingness to discuss these issues. Commentary in Shakespeariana could also reveal a more narrow view of Shakespearean drama with respect to race and class:

> The latest would-be sensation in New York is the production of Othello by a company of colored amateurs at the Cosmopolitan Theatre. While the intention is probably to burlesque, the reality is not so, for the men enter into the spirit of the play as best they can. Benford, as Othello, and J.A. Arneaus, as Iago, are fairly good, and the audience were reduced to guying the Roderigo of J.S. Webster

and the Brabantio of C.F. Chinn. The performance, however, is not patronized by the better class of negroes ("Miscellany" 1: 264).

BACON-SHAKESPEARE CONTROVERSY

But within the pages of Shakespeariana and elsewhere the most protracted debate revolved around the Bacon-Shakespeare authorship question. Frank Wadsworth claims "it was, without any exaggeration, one of the main topics of discussion among the cultured men and women of the day" and the subject of endless debate in magazines, newspapers and lecture platforms (65). The Bacon-Shakespeare controversy highlights several important elements of 19th century American Shakespeare reception that are central to my argument, and will be scrutinized in considerable detail. Perhaps suggestions that anyone from Bacon to Elizabeth I secretly authored the plays appear absurd, or at best, extraneous to an understanding of the public sphere. But this controversy foregrounded basic elements of 19th century American Shakespeare discussion, such as democratic access to public debate and use of evidence to support claims. Serious efforts to determine Shakespeare's identity scientifically, by means that others could reproduce, began after the Civil War. The discussion was often conducted through public media and both sides were committed to presenting convincing arguments due to the self-evident nature of popular belief in Shakespeare's innate genius. But in addition, some Shakespeare skeptics questioned the very nature of authorship. These queries highlighted the cooperative effort which ideally characterizes social relations.

Virtually everyone, it seems, had an opinion on the controversy. Herman Melville was amazed by the suggestion that Shakespeare did not write the plays (282-3). Henry James claimed that he found it impossible to believe either Bacon or Shakespeare had written them (281). Richard Grant White dubbed the controversy the "Bacon-Shakespeare Craze." Mark Twain wrote a book denouncing the Stratfordians. Even Walt Whitman's Leaves of Grass contains a poem on the authorship question. In 1874, a six-week long discussion in the New York Herald involved different participants each day, and opinions were sought from eminent

figures such as Richard Grant White, theatre manager Lester Wallack, and H.H. Furness. The mayor of New York felt it appropriate to offer his thoughts on the question, and contributors to "the Public Discussing it" column were printed daily. The New York Herald discussion was conducted almost daily from Sept. 6-Oct. 19, 1874 (Wyman 36-42). A series of six articles in the Philadelphia Sunday Mercury denouncing the Baconion theory was answered by twelve articles in the Philadelphia Sunday Republic supporting it (Wyman 34-5). And in 1892-93, the Boston monthly the Arena featured a debate which lasted fifteen months (Wadsworth 65).) Most Shakespeare clubs took a stand on the subject. Forty of the 115 clubs listed in Shakespeariana in 1888 expressed a "decided opposition" to Bacon authorship theories ("List"). The Dallas Shakespeare club went so far as to debate and then vote on the question. The Ladies Shakespeare Club of Decatur, Indiana composed a song pledging its members "all Baconites to eschew" and to Shakespeare "to be true" ("Shakespeare Societies" 4: 325; 6: 286).

The Baconians were also treated to endless mockery. The "Society for the Suppression of Shakespeare" was formed in the Cincinnati monthly The Present, in June, 1885. Jokes were made about Delia Bacon's incarceration in an insane asylum after completing her book on the theory ("Miscellany" 2: 404; "Mr. Richard" 3). Editor J. Gilpin Pyle facetiously used Ignatius Donnelly's notorious cipher method to uncover Francis Bacon's prediction—embedded in Hamlet—that "Don-nill-he...will worke out the secret of this play" (25). Yet intellectuals such as W. H. Furness and Ralph Waldo Emerson initially supported the theory, and respected Shakespearean artists such as Charlotte Cushman were Baconians (Morgan 232; O'Connor Mr. Donnelly's 44). The popular novelist William D. O'Connor also sanctioned the Baconian movement. The hero of O'Connor's anti-slavery novel Harrington: a Story of True Love (1860), declares himself unable to believe the vulgar Shakespeare wrote the plays and implicitly suggests Bacon is the author (216-19). O'Connor devotes the Epilogue of Harrington to this episode, expressing profuse admiration for Delia Bacon, the American who started the controversy.

DELIA BACON

Born in Ohio to a Calvinist clergyman and missionary, Delia Bacon was sent to live in Connecticut with a family friend in 1818, at the age of seven, when her father died. (Contrary to popular opinion, Delia did not claim to be related to Sir Francis.) She attended a private school for several years, and after studying one year with Catherine and Mary Beecher, she began what was to be an intermittent career of teaching. In the early 1850s, Bacon delivered a series of history lectures which were extremely successful with Boston and New York audiences. Having been convinced for several years that Shakespeare had not written the plays, she sailed to England in 1853 determined to research and write a book developing her theory (Hopkins 1-173). By all accounts an intelligent, sincere and charming woman, she gained the ear of Ralph Waldo Emerson, who had earlier declared he could not "marry the fact" of Shakespeare's "obscure and profane life" to his dramas, and who had admired Delia Bacon's lectures (cited Wadsworth 19). Emerson's letter of support to Putnam's monthly led to the first publication of Bacon's ideas in January, 1856 (T. Bacon 57). But upon Richard Grant White's advice the magazine revoked its promise to print further installments (White "Bacon" 180-81). Emerson withdrew his support after reading several chapters of her manuscript. Persuaded by his sister, who admired Bacon, Nathaniel Hawthorne generously offered both material and psychological support to her enterprise, and spent six months seeking a publisher who would touch the manuscript. Eventually Parker publishing struck a deal on condition that Hawthorne write the introduction (which states he admires the book but does not support the theory), and, unknown to Bacon, pay for the edition (Hopkins 237).

The Philosophy of the Plays of Shakespeare Unfolded appeared in April, 1857. According to her theory the "first Shakespeare Society," which included Sidney and Raleigh, conceived a new philosophy which was transmitted in both Francis Bacon's essays and Shakespearean drama. Committed to human advancement and freedom, the group fashioned the plays as a school to teach common people the doctrines of the "Baconian science of life" (Hopkins 267).

Shakespearean drama provides "actual types and models, which would set before our eyes the entire process of the mind" (Hopkins 267). This group did not overtly reveal themselves as authors of the dramas because they preferred a "more philosophic, symbolic method of indicating their connection with their writings, which would limit the indication to those who could pierce within the veil" (cited Wadsworth 30). Further, Delia claimed to have discovered in Francis Bacon's letters a cipher providing instructions to documents which held the key to the new philosophy (Morgan 102).

It appears Delia Bacon embraced the "message in the bottle" concept of interpreting the plays, whereby the intuitive reader discovers "the key" to the meaning of literary works. Vivian Hopkins' biography of Delia, however, includes an empathetic interpretation of her ideas, which--despite the potted nature of her coterie of wits theory and her search for the "key"--reveals interesting interpretations of the plays when considered along Habermasian lines. Lear, Julius Caesar and Coriolanus are discussed as demonstrating the social evils of Tudor and Stuart England. Her comment on the counterrevolution after Julius Caesar's death suggests that tyranny will never be eradicated if people are swayed by false rhetoric. Both mob and leader in Coriolanus are presented as guilty of a love of crude martial honor, "power instinctively, unscientifically and unartistically exercised" (280). What appears to be her general understanding of Shakespearean drama as attempting to subvert a tyrannical autocracy antecedes some New Historicist claims by more than a century. And explicit in her depiction of this "nobler" group of author/philosophers is a respect for developed intellect used collaboratively to benefit humanity, as well as a rejection of cultural production for monetary gain. Perhaps in a more Romantic vein, she regards the missing playscripts as the perfect, finished gifts to posterity from prescient, democratic minds. Their loss by the obtuse, mercenary scoundrel from Stratford is viewed as a traitorous act against humanity.

Delia Bacon was incarcerated in a home for the mentally ill soon after her book was published and she died two years later. Initially her book was scarcely noticed in the press, but the few reviews were damning. The Athenaeum claimed

Bacon's method could just as well prove that Shakespeare wrote the Novum Organum (cited Wyman 13). The National Review discussed "the task of extracting a definite meaning from the vast body of obscure verbiage and inconsequential reasoning" (cited Wyman 20).

PUBLIC DEBATE

Despite the paucity of reviews, Bacon's theory inspired several advocates and much debate. After her death, Emerson maintained that she had "opened the subject so that it can never again be closed" (cited Hopkins 287). William Henry Smith started the Baconian movement in England eight months after Bacons's Putnam article. The American Baconian Nathaniel Holmes, Harvard graduate, law professor and Missouri Supreme Court judge, created tremendous interest in the United States with his Authorship of Shakespeare (1866, 1868, 1876). In response, George Wilkes refuted the Baconian theory on the ground that the author of the plays was Catholic with no legal training in Shakespeare From an American Point of View (1877). Perhaps the most controversial Baconian was Ignatius Donnelly. Trained as a lawyer, Donnelly was a populist politician who served terms as lieutenant governor and member of Congress for Minnesota (Wadsworth 54). Donnelly called Delia Bacon "the greatest American yet born" and in an 1873 lecture characterized her theory as strong but inconclusive (Wyman 34). He set out to prove Francis Bacon wrote the plays and in 1887 published the 998-page tome The Great Cryptogram.

In this work, Donnelly refutes Delia's thesis of collaborative authorship of the plays, insisting Francis Bacon was the sole author. Donnelly also claimed Bacon wrote most of the dramatic works of the Elizabethan era. He asserts there were two Shakespeares—one the ignorant bumpkin from Stratford and the other the slick agent of Francis Bacon. And based on a method of adding, multiplying and dividing numbers of words from the 1623 Folio, Donnelly introduced the idea of a mathematical cipher which tells of Bacon's authorship and court occurrences. (Hopkins 293; Wadsworth 55).

I suspect that Donnelly's single-minded focus on the 1623 Folio he believes was corrupted to meet the exigencies of a cipher highlights centuries of editorial frustration with a text that often defies comprehension, and the constructed nature of what many understood as the received text. However bizarre, it is an attempt to employ "science"—by obtaining a result that may be duplicated by others--in an effort to prove an hypothesis. The Baconians, I think, generally enlarged the interest in Shakespearean drama from a focus on textual study and moral interpretation to questions about the nature of authorship, as I will discuss in the next section.

Donnelly's book was examined by four distinguished mathematicians and cryptologists, who attested to the validity of the crytogram, and the idea of a cipher inspired many mimics (O'Connor 13-15; Wadsworth 57). Perhaps the most notable was Orville W. Owen, a Detroit physician who in the 1890s began constructing a huge spool which would allow pages of the works of all Elizabethan authors to be easily viewed by unreeling a stretch of cloth upon which they were pasted. The machine revealed Bacon's authorship in the form of a long poem (Wadsworth 62-3). Despite staunch supporters, however, Donnelly's theory was widely berated by the media, and the Boston Daily Advertiser announced the "best judges" had condemned it (O'Connor 22).

SHAKESPEAREAN MYTH

One of these was Appleton Morgan, to whom Donnelly had disclosed his theory in 1885. President of the New York Shakespeare Society and attorney-at-law, Morgan was one of the country's most vocal and respected late 19th century Shakespeareans. A so-called "anti-Shakespearean" but not a Baconian, Morgan elucidated his understanding of the authorship question in The Shakespearean Myth (1881, 1886). A look at his succinct and witty account of the controversy and the voluminous response to the book will allow me to examine in more detail what I understand to be the suppositions underlying the authorship question.

Morgan suggests that the Bacon controversy drives the first wedge into the massive and seemingly impenetrable myth of the Stratford genius. Delia Bacon's

theory stresses the improbability of any single individual producing the dramas, and promotes the idea of artistic collaboration. Baconians generally refute the notion that "poetic genius" alone fashioned the plays, and highlight the knowledge derived from wide-ranging experience and broad cultural exposure the works imply.

Morgan espouses none of the theories he outlines fairly convincingly, but he opposes the possibility that Shakespeare, or indeed any single individual, produced the Shakespeare canon. The Shakespeare Morgan depicts is a more or less clever theatre manager, craftsman rather than genius, uneducated but quick-witted. What is most interesting about Morgan's understanding is his stress on the collaborative and protean nature of dramatic art. Morgan repeatedly expresses doubt that Shakespeare did "all the pen work on the dramas" (53). Material was drawn from every available source by managers on the alert for novelty. Collaboration was necessary to insert local color, gags, and to manipulate dialogue, and the text was altered "as taste or fancy dictated" (35). To believe Shakespeare conceived and wrote everything maintains Morgan "is to suppose that of his dozen or so of co-managers, William Shakespeare was the one who did all the work while the others looked on" (35). He suggests Shakespeare the editor, rather than author, deserves our veneration (300-1).

Morgan abrogates the Shakespearean myth by showing the means by which it was constructed. He indicts Edward Malone as a key player in this myth making. Instead of accepting the Stratford Shakespeare as the joker and gossip he appears to have been "after sifting every morsel of testimony," Malone denigrated vacuous locals and chroniclers who overlooked the more flattering details of Shakespeare's life and genius. Malone represents for Morgan the extreme example of historians who have constructed a "suitable" Shakespeare--a genius with an innate knowledge of the universe, "built to fit the plays" (82, 67). Morgan criticizes the unauthorized assumptions arising from Malone's "painstaking and wonderful labors," his chronological methods for establishing composition dates for the plays, and the sanction of fake reproductions of Shakespeare's likeness (76-90). Malone's creation sparked a succession of seemingly infinite "Shakespeare-makers." And "having created a Shakespeare to fit the plays" Morgan maintains, they had to

create a noble face to fit Shakespeare--"a cranial development wherein might lodge and whence might spring the magic of the works" (91). The plethora of "pictures, casts, masks, busts, or statues of Shakespeare" suggests Morgan, is a response to the Droeshout engraving. Although it is the sole image possessing some authority, it kills the phrenological argument, "for the person represented has as stupefied, stultified, and insignificant a human countenance as was ever put upon an engraver's surface" (93). It has taken an army, asserts Morgan, of novelists, painters, engravers and essayists to build "simple William Shakespeare into the god he ought to have been" (87).

Much of Morgan's discussion anticipates recent work on Shakespearean editorial practice discussed in chapter 2, and his indictment of Malone is in many aspects an abridged preview of Marguerita DeGrazia's Shakespeare Verbatim (1991). DeGrazia analyzes Malone's motives in terms of using fabrication as fact to buttress the Enlightenment concept of the individual. But Morgan appears to be attacking the idea of innate genius, the notion of Shakespeare as having "evolved, from his own inner consciousness, all the learning which playwrights like Ben Jonson were obliged—like ordinary mortals—to get out of books" (43).

The response to Morgan's Myth was substantial and reflects a reluctance to relinquish the concept of Shakespeare's unaided genius. Many reviewers remained convinced that Shakespeare was sole author of the plays, and especially resisted the idea of collaboration. "[Mr. Morgan] would persuade us that the plays and poems attributed to [Shakespeare] are the composite work of an indefinite number of minds, varying in all degrees on the scale of ability..." despaired one reviewer (Benton cited Wyman 63). The infamous Baconian, Judge Holmes, faulted Morgan for leaving the plays "open to manifold contributors, as if such a thing as this Shakespearean drama...were at all possible in that way" ("Shakespearean Myth" Wyman 81). The Commercial Gazette called "the joint composition theory...improbable and impossible" (Hooper cited Wyman 108). The Stratfordians promoted the idea of Shakespeare as a solitary, innately gifted genius in the arguments against Baconians. "The plays do not evince *learning*, but *genius*" claimed an article in the Chicago Standard. (Gilmore cited Wyman 117). And

"genius" the Shakespeare Club of Wheeling, W. Virginia asserted, "is the touch of God's hand, an inspiration that comes not out of any college" (Leighton cited Wyman 109).

SHAKESPEARE AND GENIUS

A closer look at the term "genius" will help to illustrate that genius, specifically with regard to Shakespeare, became a Romantic obsession because it seemed to guarantee individuality, a concept dear to Americans. But further, elements in the defense of Shakespeare's genius resisted the notion that only gentle blood and university education could produce such masterpieces. Arguments for Shakespeare's genius generally promoted the common person as possessing potential for intellectual brilliance, and were thus coherent with American democratic ideals.

"Genius" has had different connotations throughout history. According to Penelope Murray, in early Roman religion it was conceived as a tutelary or guardian spirit, allotted to individuals, groups and even places (3). The comprehension of genius as an attendant spirit assigned to every man endured throughout the Latin Middle Ages, and remained the dominant understanding of the term until the late sixteenth century. The concept of the English term "genius" at that time appears to be related more to the Latin "ingenium" or "innate ability," evident in Sir Philip Sidney's assertion that "a poet no industry can make" (cited Murray 3). But idea of genius as an innate capacity for imaginative, original, thought and as distinguished from mere talent developed in the 1700s. By the end of the eighteenth century, the figure of the artistic genius had obscured such ideal types as the hero and saint as the manifestation of human virtue (Murray 2).

Jonathan Bate has traced the 18th century English development of the concept of innate, untutored genius as the essence of poetry. His interesting claim is that the idea was developed and accepted predominantly due to its Shakespearean references. Shakespeare's genius, according to Dryden and Pope in the late 17th century, is original rather than imitative, but Shakespeare did not influence their own very artful, ordered "French" style (Bate 81-2). In 1711, Addison disassociated

genius from the French "esprit" claiming natural poets such as Shakespeare possessed a wild nobility distinct from the polish revered by the French; yet Addison's Cato was particularly artful (Bate 79). But by mid-century Shakespeare's "untamed genius is no longer a slightly embarrassing exception to classical decorums; it is now the very essence of poetry" (Bate 86). The image of Shakespeare as a supernatural being became prominent in practice and in theory. The rhapsodic poets, influenced by theories of Shakespeare's genius, began to invoke him in odes which emphasized poetry as grounded in inspiration rather than art (Bate 82). In the 1760s the Scottish Enlightenment aestheticians developed a detailed account of the relationship between Shakespeare, genius and imagination. Alexander Girard's Essay on Genius (1774) shaped Coleridge's theory of secondary imagination, and most of his examples were from Shakespeare (Bate 90). Much 18th century criticism had the "inspired idiot" tone when dealing with Shakespeare that Coleridge castigated, and genius was often used as the excuse to evade analysis (Bate 92). But the Romantics, Bate maintains, were both "analytical and rhapsodic" and viewed Shakespeare as working consciously while inspired by a profound unconscious power (92-3). Bate claims genius became a Romantic obsession because it seemed to guarantee individuality and the notion of the individual as unique, inimitable (94). Yet ironically, says Bate, Shakespeare was the archetype of communality rather than individuality:

> By Shakespeare we mean not an individual, but a body of work, and that body was shaped by many individuals—by Ovid and Shakespeare's other literary precursors, by the actors of his company, by the audience without whom no play can be completed" (94).

Following Bate, it seems likely that elements of the Romantic concept of genius would appeal because they bolstered a 19th century American understanding of the individual as a self-sufficient original. But there appears to be another component to the defense of the genial Shakespeare which becomes salient in the Bacon controversy. As Wadsworth has noted, a large degree of "caste-consciousness, able to associate nobility of spirit only with gentle blood and

university education" was present in many Baconian arguments (35). Elements in the defense of Shakespeare's genius appear to resist this notion, and to promote the common person as possessing potential for intellectual brilliance. A sonnet printed in the Literary World in 1883 refers to Baconians "drowsing yourselves to think the world to waken/to exalt the courtier, and the player to shame!" (Shoemaker cited Wyman). And as William Leighton told his fellow Shakespeare club members, the Baconians represented those who believed that "a yeoman must not presume to stand above a nobleman; or a poet, who has not been to college, dare to mount the winged steed" (cited Wyman 109). As I suggested earlier, Shakespeare's humble beginnings appear to have been part of his attraction for 19th century Americans. The image of an uneducated, rural individual single-handedly producing poetic masterpieces and achieving material success was hard to relinquish--partly because the image was attuned to American democratic ideals. Outstanding achievement was considered possible for people of any background.

BANKSIDE SHAKESPEARE

Whatever the arguments for Shakespeare's genial authorship, Appleton Morgan apparently stuck to his theory of collaboration. Morgan's understanding of collaboration in Shakespearean drama extended to the New York Shakespeare Society's Bankside Shakespeare (1888-92). This twenty volume set was jointly edited by Morgan and his eleven colleagues, who worked in "close harmony and consultation" so that "the general credit rests with them all" (Scammon 21). But perhaps the most interesting aspect of the edition is its presentation. The NYSS printed all eighteen of the First Folio plays which had extant Quarto versions. The first Quarto of every play was printed alongside the First Folio, so that the reader could compare the two texts. (Morgan, editor-in-chief of the Bankside, had the choice of 14 First Folio copies--he used the 'Phoenix" on loan from Columbia College--and had access to Quartos contained in the Lenox (NY), and Boston public libraries.) But further, both texts were exactly reproduced, with the old typography and the "old typographical errors, reversed and broken types, archaic spaces and punctuation marks misplaced" left uncorrected. It is perhaps ironic that

the imitation of the "extraordinary jumble" assembled "clumsily and carelessly" by seventeenth century printers would be called by one Bankside reviewer "a genuine triumph of typographical art" (Scammon 22-3) when editors for centuries had been collating, emending, modernizing and changing typeface in an attempt to render the plays accessible to the general reader. Again, Morgan anticipates scholars such as Stephen Urkowitz, Gary Taylor and Michael Warren who argued controversially in the late 1980s for two texts of King Lear rather than a single conflated version; or Leah Marcus, who in 1996 promoted the idea of "unediting the Renaissance", and of reproducing different 16th and 17th century Quarto and Folio versions of the plays side by side (Marcus).

The Bankside speaks eloquently about the changing state of amateur Shakespeare studies toward the end of the century. In one sense, it signals the growing independence of the Shakespearean. Formerly, contended Bankside co-editor Alvey Adee, "the Shakespearian student...if he be not content to take all his knowledge at second hand...is at each moment driven to ransack the original authorities" in a time-consuming effort (153). And former editors, continued Adee, often dogmatically insisted that the text be "regarded with awe, overlooking that it is often their own...mundane creation." Through these assertions, traditional editors attempted to "forbid the scrutiny of the common scholar" (155). With the Bankside, the independent student "who seeks to compare a disputed phrase or to collate for himself is freed" (Adee 163). But in other ways, discussed in chapter five, late-century editions such as The Bankside and Furness' New Variorum widened the gap between the amateur scholar and the more casual student of Shakespeare.

Thus for the less rigorous, Shakespeare Societies at mid-century encouraged debate among family and friends, and later bloomed into a national discussion of the plays. Women and children largely confined to the domestic sphere learned to debate within a supportive, encouraging environment. Women's sense of decorum in public debate and their growing presence in the public sphere in the latter third of the century may even have influenced public male behavior. Rules in all Shakespeare societies stressing preparation, duty, loyalty, and participation encouraged a genuine exchange and respect between debaters. Representing

different dramatic characters encouraged identification with different points of view. And a focus on the uncertain nature of the text and the nature of authorship promoted--however implicitly--the importance of communicative interaction in the composition of the plays, and in their interpretation. But the more casual student of Shakespeare was becoming displaced as early as the mid-nineties, when the amateur scholar developed into the "legitimate" student of Shakespeare. Around that time, as Adee notes in his Bankside explanation, it appears that "the true reader of Shakespeare is rarely of the common classes to whom Hudson addresses himself" (155). This transformation will be investigated more thoroughly in chapter five.

Chapter 4 - Other Voices: Shakespeare and a Diverse Public

The 19th century American middle class often credited Shakespeare with a transhistorical understanding of human nature. The plays were seen to deal profoundly with family life and human interaction. Shakespeare and his characters were felt to embody American ideals of self-determination and to highlight the elements of a strong, moral, character. But individuals representing groups who were denied the rights extended to white males resisted interpretations of Shakespeare which supported narrowly racist, sexist and classist views. Their interpretations of Shakespeare and their public arguments were effective because they were based on a rational critical model and reflected ideals of egalitarianism and autonomy.

On Habermas' account, increasing intervention in the private sphere by the state occurred when the bourgeois public sphere expanded at the end of the 19th century, and more diverse groups demanded exterior aid. But a more diverse and vocal public was active throughout the nineteenth century United States, and, if Madison is to be believed, the Constitution was forged to acknowledge and encourage factionalism. Although blacks gained the franchise only in 1869 and women in 1920, both agitated publicly for reform at different points throughout the century. Along with the working class, their agendas were regarded as less significant than those considered autonomous citizens, and were frequently greeted with indifference or ridicule. This chapter shows that they did, nonetheless, manage to win significant reforms after mid-century through reasoned public argument. I also show that none of the three figures discussed grew up in the non-coercive, intimate, middle class family sphere Habermas claims nurtured the audience-oriented subject. Nonetheless, they developed debating skills through other venues, largely through familiarity with Shakespeare's plays, and were influenced by public lecturers or literary-minded acquaintances.

As outlined earlier, rational debate was not the standard in the early 19th century, as it had been among the leading elites in the late 18th century. Class and social contexts shaped public expression, according to Ryan. Apart from the elite

merchants who participated in more formal, public, meetings and literary clubs, people generally congregated outdoors, expressing themselves "in an active, raucous, contentious and unbounded style of debate that defied literary standards of rational and critical discourse" (264). On Ryan's account, as previously mentioned, women held a largely ceremonial place at public celebrations in the first half of the 19th century and their presence lent a respectable tone rather than a verbal perspective to political rallies (266). The antebellum cult of domesticity more closely resembled the lot of women who until the latter third of the century were largely "excluded, silenced, or shouted down in the public, democratic, and male-dominated spaces" (Ryan 273).

After the Civil War, labour and women's groups became markedly more vocal in their demands for reform. Because they were more mobile, Robert Wiebe suggests, the dependence of white laborers on their employers was less severe than that of blacks on whites and women on men. But the demands of all three groups were often perceived as inconsequential. The logic was circular: they were seen as lacking autonomy, so their concerns were deemed irrelevant to the greater, autonomous, public. Nonetheless, after the Civil War petitions for rights to a fair working wage, equal work opportunities, the extension of women's property rights, the negotiation of marriage contracts, and the liberalization of divorce laws were couched in the language of universal justice (Wiebe 110-11).

Nancy Fraser considers the accounts of Ryan and others as evidence that "counterpublics" were "always in conflict" with the bourgeois public, whose norms they contested by employing *alternative* forms of behaviour and speech (116). But the evidence provided by several US cultural historians suggests that, although elites in the 18th century were renowned for their statesmanship, deliberative public and parliamentary debate was the exception, rather than the norm, from the mid 1820s until the latter third of the century (Wiebe, Schudson, Ryan). The most effective representatives of marginal groups, however, managed to gain support from a reluctant public for radical views by appealing tenaciously to reason, evidence and justice rather than through more violent, unruly practices. Aggressive, hyper-emotional speech or violence were ineffective tactics. In the New York draft

riots of 1863 for example, poor Irish American women looted businesses, assaulted police and abused corpses to protest against draft policies (Ryan 286). These methods called attention to their grievances, but mainly served to alienate the majority of the public and reinforce negative stereotypes. Since women and blacks were denied the rights accorded to autonomous citizens, they had to petition for, rather than demand, reform. Women's requests were based on careful marshalling of evidence and statistics presented in a dispassionate manner, as they attempted to distance themselves from the stereotype of the emotional female (Wiebe 110). Indeed, Wiebe claims that white women's participation in the public sphere may have helped to regulate male behaviour and force greater decorum in public discussion. The three public figures to be examined in this chapter were skilled public debaters, and engaged with Shakespeare's plays to argue rationally and convincingly for the rights of women, blacks and workers.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON AND WOMEN'S RIGHTS

When Elizabeth Cady Stanton, a leading crusader for women's rights throughout the century, organized a women's convention at Seneca Falls in 1848, the resulting declaration anticipated every nineteenth century feminist demand, and included, for the first time, the appeal for suffrage (Buechler 3). The convention publicly claimed women's rights issues to be parallel with the abolitionist cause, and Stanton's extensive feminist activities thereafter pushed for reform through public debate which stressed that political power was critical to individual autonomy (DuBois).

Stanton was born into a large, upper class family, but Habermas's domestic "community of love" which cultivated the audience-oriented subject does not accurately describe her home life. Her parents were devout Quakers, and her father had wished for sons rather than daughters:

> ...fear, rather than love, of God and parents alike predominated. Add to this our timidity in our intercourse with servants and teachers, our dread of the ever-present devil....I remember well the despair I felt in

those years...over the constant cribbing and crippling of a child's life (4, 11).

Although Quaker austerity no doubt helped curtail the development of the Cadys' family warmth and individual confidence, many historians have argued that the 19th century middle class American idealization of family life led to serious problems when expectations could not be met. Arlene Skolnick claims that the ideal of the companionate marriage vied with social and economic pressure in the choice of a spouse. Women were expected to run the morally upright household that would produce sound, successful, children and redeem society, yet were characterized as intellectually inferior, and expected to remain economically dependent and submissive to a husband's authority. Men validated their masculinity through work, which supported the family, yet the fluctuating industrial economy did not provide security and downward mobility was common. Impotence became a widespread problem for men who were expected to control their sexual appetites, but clandestinely consorted with prostitutes, able to desire only women they perceived to be depraved (Skolnick 35-9). Desertion was not uncommon, and orphaned children were a persistent problem. On the other hand, because possibilities for social mobility were substantial during the Victorian period, the sense of both individual and parental responsibility increased and raising children "correctly" became an obsession (Skolnick 39-40). The price, claims Skolnick "paid for inflexible ideas of femininity, masculinity, virtue and domestic perfection was often a heavy burden of failure, guilt and neurosis" (36). Other more general pressures of nuclear family life, such as small families, close contact and pressure to remain together rendered the very nature of the intimate sphere problematic, since privacy and closeness could encourage antipathies which might be violently expressed.

Although her nuclear family life was not ideal, Cady's intellectual development and taste for rational critical debate were fueled through other channels. When her sister married, her parents were glad to shift "the reins of domestic government" into the hands of Stanton's brother-in-law, as the father's law practice and the mother's house duties for a large family left them little time for

children. Stanton's brother-in-law, who possessed a "cultivated literary taste and profound knowledge of human nature...directed our reading and amusements" (27). Through reading and discussion with him, "my religious superstitions gave place to rational ideas based on scientific facts" (44). Further, as her father's law office adjoined the house, Stanton spent much of her time there, and so learned first-hand of legal injustices against women. Although opposed to her public career in later life, Stanton's father nonetheless convinced her during her girlhood that she could change unjust laws through rational critical argument:

> when you are grown up, and able to prepare a speech, you must go down to Albany and talk to the legislators...if you can persuade them to pass new laws, the old ones will be a dead letter (32).

Rather than destroying a belief in the concept of justice, these experiences highlighted unjust laws as changeable, although historically fashioned by men in their own interests. What is interesting about Cady's account is that she overtly attributes her heightened awareness of women's circumstances and her desire to change them not only to witnessing the plight of her father's clients, but to rational critical debate of Shakespeare's plays. Her father's law students would tease her by reading the most unjust laws they could find, and she spent much of her girlhood until the age of sixteen

> continually squabbling with the law students over the rights of women....They would read passages from the British classics quite as aggravating as the laws. They delighted in extracts from Shakespeare, especially from "The Taming of the Shrew", an admirable satire in itself on the old common law of England. I hated Petruchio as if he were a real man (34).

Conspicuous in Stanton's reaction to Shrew is her professed hatred for Petruchio in conjunction with her characterization of the play as an "admirable satire" experienced as "quite as aggravating as the laws". Her experience anticipates that of many current feminist responses to Shakespeare, where plays highlighting painful truths about women's situation may be viewed as admirable in their capacity to spark debate over real issues. A closer look at these responses will help

to illustrate Habermas' concept of strategic action and the ways in which this distorted form of communication appeared in 19th century public debate.

***SHREW* AND STRATEGIC ACTION**

Perhaps the most salient feature of feminist response to Kate's surrender is that it appears to fall into one of three categories: a, that Kate has been happily tamed, and will continue willingly to play Petruchio's game as his equal; b, that Kate's affection for Petruchio compels her to uphold patriarchal tradition; and c, that Kate is pretending to be tamed in order to manipulate and outwit the patriarchal order (Wayne, Andresen-Thom, Novy). All three categories, however, would need to agree on the problematic nature of Kate's sincerity in her final speech. If a, then it is uttered ironically because as Petruchio's equal sparring partner, irony is part of the game. If b, it is a placating gesture which appeases society but submits to a repugnant tradition. If c, it is a lie, expressed to mislead and gain control. Jonathan Hall points out that

> in lieu of a self-expressive language....[Petruchio] has instructed her in an ironic verbal play which makes the nature of the surrendered self forever problematic....Katherina ceases to express herself in her old "curs't" manner and now uses language strategically....The vulnerability of a transparent and manipulable self disappears (164).

Hall's characterization of Kate's mode of communication as "strategic" may apply to all three categories of feminist response. These responses, however, might perhaps be more usefully be viewed as representing different degrees of strategic action.

The first response might correspond with Hjort's concept of weak strategic action, which is based on game theory. It involves only interdependence, where an individual's behaviour depends on that of at least one other person, and where rational decisions are made by predicting the actions of others. At the opposite extreme, the third response corresponds to the strong notion of strategy. This originates in a conflict, after which the distrustful and dishonest agent predicts and

manipulates the reactions of others, generally using whatever means necessary to achieve victory over her enemies. These extremes frame the wide spectrum of strategic action, which on Hjort's view ranges from the slightly to the highly strategic. Most strategies, however, are characterized by "mixed motives". This form of strategic action describes Kate's behaviour in the second response to Shrew, and occurs when an agent is driven by desires that are both strategic and cooperative (Hjort 6-8)

CONFLICT AND RECIPROCAL STRATEGY

The reality of strategic communication, particularly in 19th century feminists' public interactions, is something Habermas' public sphere analysis does not account for and what his later theory of communicative action does consider. Habermas' model of an ideal speech act was fashioned to provide a counterfactual standard against which distorted modes of speech might be analyzed. Communicative action presupposes certain universal validity claims--such as linguistic competence, truth, sincerity, and intersubjective norms—which must be reciprocally recognized. An ideal speech act rests on the assumption that the speaker can be understood on a basic linguistic level, that the content of his proposition is true, that the speaker believes he is telling the truth, and that his utterance is appropriate within the context of a recognized normative context. When several or all claims are violated, strategic action may result, in which communication is distorted. Agents behave in a manipulative, pseudo-cooperative manner in order to achieve completely selfish goals (Habermas "Historical" 118, 209-210).[2]

While conflict resolution theorist Morton Deutsch maintains mutual cooperation is the most productive orientation for resolving conflict, he recognizes more powerful groups justify their positions by claiming superior competence and resist changes they perceive will place them under the control of incompetent, potentially hostile groups. They may be insensitive to the dissatisfactions of

subordinate groups, and will attempt to suppress them through various means, such as sham cooperation, displacement of blame, false expressions of concern which substitute for action, and outright aggression (185-6). An asymmetry of orientation--when one group resorts to strategic methods to avoid the honest confrontation initiated by another group—will frequently produce mutual competition rather than mutual cooperation (Deutsch 183).

Hjort's concept of the mimetic strategist is useful here. On her view, all attempts at genuine dialogue in an asymmetric strategic context are doomed to failure, as the strategic agent believes himself to possess the privileged view of reality. The victim (for my purposes the subordinate group), has two options. Despising the manipulative, deceitful and monologic behaviour that characterizes strong strategic action, she may wish to preserve her self-concept as an honest and outspoken agent, and refuse to behave strategically. Or, she may decide to suspend her ideals and become a mirror image of the strategist, in order to enter the game and convince others of her position. Choosing the first option results in a loss by default and indirectly supports the position of the strategic agent and a repugnant ethos. The second option forces her to embrace the manipulative mentality that is abhorred. The mimetic strategist, however, differs from the properly strategic agent in that her actions attempt to produce valid evidence to support her claims and in that she is motivated by a desire to achieve shared understanding (Hjort 123-4).

STANTON AND STRATEGIC ACTION

In her later career, Stanton's outspoken, forthright and exquisitely reasoned arguments promoting such unpopular issues as liberalized divorce laws and the rejection of organized religion cannot be categorized as highly strategic. She insisted that "I was always courageous in saying what I saw to be true...what seemed to me to be right I thought must be equally plain to all other rational beings"(216). Her insistence that suffragists acknowledge and debate their

---

[2] According to Habermas, successful communication results in consensus. I have dealt with this claim in chapter one.

differences won her many enemies, as the majority of activists wished to concentrate only on gaining the vote (DuBois 182-193).

Stanton's influence decreased accordingly, and she grew increasingly alienated from the suffrage movement in later life. Recalling her eightieth birthday celebration after sixty years of speeches, arguments and debates promoting women's rights, she expressed her ambivalent state of impotence and resilience with reference to Shakespeare:

> from much speaking through many years my voice was hoarse....I felt like the king's daughter in Shakespeare's play of "Titus Andronicus" when rude men who had cut her hands off and her tongue out, told her to call for water and wash her hands. However, I lived through the ordeal..." (457).

Stanton did, however, exhibit highly strategic behaviour in her early career, but her actions must be considered in context. She was strongly and publicly allied both with women's rights and abolition from the forties until the mid-sixties, and was frequently harassed and even physically attacked when in public speeches she drew parallels between women's and blacks' oppression (DuBois 21-2). Stanton was shocked after the war by the betrayal of abolitionists who claimed black enfranchisement was more important than that of women, and supported the "male-only" clause in the proposed fifteenth amendment which would give black men the vote. She headed a four-year attack on the black suffrage movement claiming educated white women had more of a right to vote than ignorant ex-slaves, referring to Blacks as "Sambos" and even exciting white women's sexual fears of blacks in order to press women to demand their own enfranchisement (DuBois 91-2). Until the fifteenth amendment had passed, she railed publicly and bitterly against former friends and supporters, even denigrating allies such as the formidable black statesman and abolitionist, Frederick Douglass.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS: ABOLITION AND SUFFRAGE

Douglass maintains Stanton convinced him of the legitimacy of the women's movement around 1840, just two years after he had gained his freedom. Jenny Franchot claims that, as a favored slave child, Douglass endured a status "structurally analogous to that of the middle class white woman, neither brutally subjugated nor granted equality" (147). Douglass, however, obviously did not have the normal family life associated with the middle class during the 19th century. His father was also his master and he was taken from his grandmother at six to serve as a house attendant. At eight he was sent to live with his master's middle class relatives in Baltimore where he was playmate to their son. His new mistress taught him basic reading skills, but this unlawful practice was halted when her husband explained that literate slaves spelled rebellion. Douglass thus understood at an early age that literacy could provide a key to freedom. He continued to read secretly, and was strongly influenced by Caleb Bingham's The Columbian Orator (1797), a collection of essays and dialogues on liberty, compiled to teach the elements of oratory. At sixteen he was hired out as a field hand, flogged regularly, and later returned to Baltimore to learn a trade. He finally escaped to freedom in the North at the age of twenty, where he joined the abolitionist movement and began his life's work as a black rights advocate.

Far from developing his speaking skills within a loving family environment which encouraged literacy and debate, Douglass learned in secret to become one of the most memorable public speakers and black activists of the nineteenth century. Nonetheless, his formative years were spent in a literate, middle class household and he claims to have developed faith in "a universal humanity" through the kindness of some whites during that period. Shakespeare played a large role in Douglass' political and social development. Although the influential Columbian Orator contains no Shakespeare, the Shakespearean Henry Giles was among the popular lecturers who provided Douglass with sources for his ideas and rhetorical theories (Blassingame 1: xxiii). Shakespeare, whom Douglass as a young adult began avidly reading along with newspapers and pamphlets, headed the list of

Douglass' favorite authors and the Blassingame collection documents more than 120 references to Shakespeare or the plays in Douglass' speeches, interviews, and debates (5: 499; 1-5: index).

Douglass adopted middle class understandings of Shakespeare as representing a universal humanity to argue for black rights. Shakespeare, he claimed "knew more of the human soul than anyone who went before him, or who have come after him ("Great Britain" 201). Upon visiting the playwright's house during a visit to England in the forties, he noted the multitude of American signatures on the walls. He was moved, in a speech entitled "The Skin Aristocracy of America," to remark on the hypocrisy of the purportedly democratic American admirers of Shakespeare who traveled through England voicing support for slavery (6). By applying speeches on the "human condition", such as Hamlet's "what a piece of work is man! How noble in reason!..." to blacks, Douglass used the perception of Shakespeare as representing a universal humanity to denounce slavery (255). Douglass also appealed in his antebellum speeches and debates to idealized middle class concepts of the family with reference to Shakespeare.

Many abolitionists were repelled by slavery because it was viewed as an assault on the nuclear family, according to Wilson J. Moses. Douglass argued that slave children like himself offered living proof of the infidelity white men preferred to ignore, as well as the devaluation of the child from heir to property (Martin 4). He claimed that slavery was "an enemy to filial affection....It made my brothers and sisters strangers to me; it converted the mother that bore me into a myth; it shrouded my father in mystery and left me without an intelligible beginning in the world" (cited Martin 6). Jenny Franchot has noted Douglass' "continued rhetorical exposure" of the slave mother as the concubine robbed of her children (141). But Douglass also drew parallels between African and American families in order to further encourage empathetic identification on the part of American whites. His portrait of an African family on the brink of violent separation through enslavement describes a mother with her infant, husband and two children gathered together in their hut after the day's work for an evening of conversation, after which they retire to bed. Quotes from Shakespeare highlight the "naturally" united, private and

innocent state of the sleeping nuclear family--"in the arms of 'nature's soft muse" and "lulled by sounds of sweetest melody"--about to be unnaturally torn asunder ("Pioneers" 75).

Douglass was also sensitive to the vulnerable state of free blacks, whom he felt could be easily coerced into participating in such projects as the Liberian Colonization Movement. In a rebuttal to Henry Clay's 1851 speech to the Senate advocating that free blacks agreeing to move to the African colony be supported for one year and offered land, Douglass quotes Shakespeare to focus on Clay's mention of blacks' consent:

> WITH THEIR OWN CONSENT'....These words savor of justice, of humanity...."I am much too weak to oppose your cunning; you are meek and humble mouthed;/ You sign your place and calling in full seeming,/With meekness and humility; but your heart/Is crammed with arrogancy, spleen and pride." There are different modes of gaining "consent;"....If a midnight incendiary should fire my dwelling, I doubt not I should readily "consent" to leave it...." ("Persecution" 309).

Douglass' emphasis on Clay's actions as falsely cooperative uses Shakespeare to expose the coercive nature of strategic communication, while calling attention simultaneously to the folly of one group defining the needs of another. In the same speech, he refers again to "the immortal Shakespeare" to appeal to the common bond between whites and blacks "born upon American soil; accustomed to the American climate; speaking the same language as white Americans." Africa, he claimed, would be "as much foreign to them as to any other citizen of the United States" (310).

Douglass' rather extensive use of Shakespeare, particularly in his antebellum speeches, has a several implications with respect to communicative action. The most obvious is that he seems to have understood the importance of making literary references which would not only illustrate his points, but which would underscore a common cultural background and render his audience more receptive. Perhaps more subtly, references to Shakespeare by a black man

simultaneously appealed to white bourgeois values while belying racist beliefs which questioned blacks' intellectual capacity. Serious Shakespeare was not associated with blacks. Onstage, even the role of Othello was played by white actors well into the nineteenth century and an actor as talented as the great black American Shakespearean Ida Aldridge (1807-67) had to build his career playing to European houses (Bond 29-30; Simmons 733-41). Through whites' caricatures, Shakespeare was commonly associated with blacks mainly through blackface minstrelsy, which was extremely popular during this period. According to Gary D. Engle, Shakespeare travesties dominated minstrel programs during the 1850s and 60s (xxvii). In the minstrel show the blackface clown

> manifested the weaknesses which inhibit success in a socially mobile culture. He was lazy, ignorant, illiterate, hedonistic, vain, often immoral, fatalistic, and gauche. Secondly, the figure suffered in absurdly comic ways the indignities and embarrassments that can occur when a person's ambitions lead him into roles that he cannot adequately fulfil. When the minstrel clown recited what he thought was Shakespeare...indeed when he pretended to be anything more than chattel—America was entertained (Engle xxvi).

Acting editions of minstrel travesties appeared after the Civil War and it is perhaps significant that a George Griffin (of Christy Minstrel's fame) burlesque of Othello, with prominent racial slurs, went through three editions in or around 1870, the year in which the fifteenth amendment giving blacks the vote was passed (Jacobs 59). Another Othello burlesque by Griffin, in which Othello and Desdemona sing a duet--"dey say dat in de dark all cullers am de same"--was published in 1874 (Jacobs 58). As late as 1884, the reviewer of a black production of Othello in New York initially assumed it would be a burlesque ("Miscellany" 264).

During a period when slavery and later black enfranchisement were basic hurdles, promoting commonality rather than asserting cultural difference was critical. Douglass, as an erudite, cultured and intelligent ex-slave, was very conscious of representing blacks as a group. He was anxious to stress the potential of black people, rather than embalming them in an identity of "difference" that

helped perpetuate demeaning stereotypes. Douglass' public appropriation of Shakespeare helped enlarge white bourgeois notions of a common humanity, and allowed Douglass to at least attenuate the prevalent stereotypes constructed by whites, thus rendering his audience more receptive to his arguments. Henry Louis Gates has explored some of the ironies of the "New Negro" of which Douglass was the main prototype, but Gates nonetheless tartly admits that Douglass "represented black people most eloquently and elegantly, and ...was the race's great opportunity to re-present itself in the court of racist public opinion" (129).

GEORGE WILKES AND WORKING CLASS SHAKESPEARE

One Shakespearean who publicly celebrated the blackface minstrelsy which promoted negative black stereotypes was George Wilkes. The son of a New York cabinet and frame maker, Wilkes founded the lurid and enduring Police Gazette, edited the successful sports/entertainment weekly Spirit of the Times, and brought a working class consciousness to Shakespeare criticism. A radical republican, Wilkes' work as penny press journalist, editor, publisher and militant workingman's advocate gained him a national reputation and a substantial fortune (Saxton 206). Through the Spirit of the Times he promoted workers' rights through appeals to egalitarian and Free soil sentiments, supported the National Labor Union and attacked any political activity or candidate he believed might corrupt what he perceived to be America's republican virtue. The weekly also devoted substantial space to drama, and Wilkes wrote many articles on Shakespeare.

Wilkes repeatedly denounced the playwright as representing anti-libertarian, aristocratic values alien to American ideals, and expanded his arguments in Shakespeare From an American Point of View (1877). Shakespeare, he claimed, was

> a character of much more consequence to Englishmen, and especially to the ruling classes of Great Britain, than he can ever be to the republican citizens of the United States.....the unseen source, the incessant fountain, the constant domineering influence, which has done more to continue the

> worship of the English people for royalty and rank, than all other agencies combined (6-7).

Worse, declared Wilkes, than Shakespeare's servility to royalty and rank, was the traitorous, contemptuous depiction of the working class from one who "may be regarded as one of the working classes himself" (3). Wilkes' characterization of Shakespeare as a *vendu* contemptuous of popular liberty and the laboring classes, and of his works as perpetuating the interests of the ruling class led Joseph Crosby to write that "Wilkes is spiteful & cunning enough to know that nothing will injure a man's reputation, in the eyes of the average American democrat, so much as to put into his mouth words derogatory to the "great unwashed" the *profanum vulgus*, among whom his paper has its largest circulation" (Letter to J.P. Norris 20 April, 1875: Velz 63).

Conspicuous in both Wilkes' and Crosby's observations is the implication that Shakespeare's plays were used to support class ideologies. Wilkes maintains Shakespearean drama serves the interests of the ruling class, and Crosby counters that Wilkes' interpretation of Shakespeare will appear valid only to vulgar, working class Americans. Interestingly, their assertions anticipate by more than a century basic elements of the current "oppositional vs. humanist" debate on Shakespeare.

SHAKEPSPEARE AND RESISTANT PRACTICES

Humanist or idealist Shakespeare criticism generally overlooks historical circumstance to concentrate on what is regarded as the universal appeal of the plays with their revelation of a transhistorical human condition. Oppositional Shakespeare criticism such as Cultural Materialism largely emphasizes Shakespeare as an "hegemonic instrument" used in a "deeply ideological fashion, to propagate and 'naturalize' a whole social perspective. [The plays] are filtered, and sometimes quite transformed, to represent a class position that accords with an elitist notion of culture and a ruling-class view of the world" (Margolies 43). Shakespeare in education, claims Allan Sinfield, has been made to speak mainly for the right, and as a literary keystone, becomes incorporated into a system which "adjust[s] young people to an unjust social order" ("Give an Account" 135).

Cultural Materialist subversion/containment theory suggests that even when marginal groups attempt to promote their own views through Shakespeare, their "intervention, (or subversion) is immediately liable to be contained and made to contribute, in turn, to the reproduction of the existing order" (Sinfield "Introduction" 131). Cultural materialists stress history, group identity, difference and conflict. They claim that Shakespeare's plays are nothing more than their ideological appropriations, grist for the mill of competing social groups eager for blood.

Nineteenth century Americans conscious of group exclusion, however, appear to have been searching for common ground rather than group difference. The idea of "difference" was more likely to be promoted by hegemonic groups. The Shakespeare interpretations of subordinated groups highlight social wrongs by referring constantly to the ideal of American society as an egalitarian democracy promoting individual autonomy, and argue for inclusion and equal treatment in this democracy. And although Sinfield embraces the concept of group identity--"since personal subjectivity and agency are, anyway, unlikely sources of dissident identity and action"—he makes an important observation when he concedes that subcultures are not particularly "authentic, or politically pure, or vital....Subcultures may well exhibit racist, sexist and homophobic features" (Faultlines 37, 298). Wilkes, for example, was a radical republican who identified with the working class. Yet like Hudson, White, and many other Shakespeareans, Wilkes' concept of egalitarianism did not include blacks. He opposed slavery overtly on humanitarian grounds, covertly because it gave southern slaveholders an edge on slaveless businessmen (Saxton 209). Wilkes described Othello as "a shocking and repulsive contrast" to Desdemona, and characterized their union as "revolting to modern audiences" due to "the violence it inflicts upon the wholesome laws of breeding" (373). But Shakespeare, "in his abounding and unceasing love for royalty, probably thought he made ample atonement and offset to the prejudice

against colour, by representing his black man as descending from a line of kings" (374).

Wilkes' love of blackface minstrelsy expresses his ambivalent consciousness, which combined a disdain for aristocracy with racist views. Indeed, the use of Shakespeare in minstrel shows and burlesque reveals that "subversive" resistant practices can be regressive. Robert Allen maintains that the minstrel show travesties of Shakespeare allowed white audiences to

> see themselves as both ontologically different and constitutionally superior....minstrel shows implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) sanctioned the ideological precepts underlying slavery and racial oppression.....(They) reinforce(d) the notion that any attempt to "civilize" black males outside of their "native " plantation culture would result in a grotesque travesty of white culture" (169, 170, 173).

But simultaneously, as Allen also points out, blackface minstrelsy was intended to demean elitist pretension. Representations of black attempts at urbanity were modeled on white social types regarded as the antithesis of an egalitarian society, and despised in turn "the overweening, self-centred, wealthy man-about-town, who lived off his family's prosperity, contributed nothing to his community, and whose life revolved around fashion and the pursuit of women" (173).

Burlesque was also practiced by women, as evidenced by the British troupe headed by Lydia Thompson and Pauline Markham, which stormed New York City in 1868 amid praise and censure. Working class dancers took both male and female roles, sang and danced to risqué songs, wore revealing costumes and dyed their hair brassy blonde. Female burlesque became so popular in New York that by the spring of 1869 it was burlesqued as Romeo and Juliet: the Beautiful Blonde who Dyed (Her Hair) for Love (Allen 17). The Shakespearean Richard Grant White was reputedly entranced with Pauline Markham (according to the Library of Congress

he ghostwrote her memoirs), and defended burlesque as an art in the Galaxy (Allen 25, 155-6). Wilkes, in Spirit of the Times denounced burlesque as an "epidemic," and suggested the manager of the Thompson troupe and all other "merchants of nudity...who live by exhibiting half-naked girls upon the stage" should be driven out of New York (cited Allen 131). To an extent, Allen sees burlesque--the cultural production of subordinate, working class women--in terms of inversion, transgression and challenge to officially sanctioned entertainment. But he warns against viewing "resistant forms of cultural production as unproblematically and unambiguously progressive":

> ... "resistant" practices might well be polyvalent, not only directed against those conceived of as "above", but constructing yet another object of subordination. In this process, there is frequently a slide from one register of social power to another—from class to gender, from class to race (33).

This tendency to view all resistant practices as progressive is present in many postmodern accounts of marginal struggle. I will turn first to the theoretical work of Chela Sandoval in order to point out in detail what I see as counterproductive in the postmodern tendency. And in the final sections of this chapter, I will discuss various other theories which contest the concept of rational discourse in Habermas' sense. That is, of an agent deliberating over choices, formulating a position supported by good reasons he then defends in a public forum with the hope of convincing others of his views, or else of modifying his position in the light of a better argument. I will show why I believe Habermas' concept of rational critical debate seems to be the best means of achieving workable solutions to social problems.

POSTMODERN OPPOSTIONAL CONCIOUSNESS

I have chosen Sandoval's "Feminist Forms of Agency and Oppositional Consciousness: US Third World Feminist Criticism" as it has been widely disseminated, represents the problems encountered by diverse oppositional groups, and promotes the solutions the author puts forth as transhistorical and applicable to all subordinated groups.[3] Sandoval maintains that "third world" US women and their specific concerns have been excluded or barely tolerated by white middle class feminists. Consequently, and in the spirit of cooperation, she has outlined a "postmodern" theory of oppositional activity that can align feminists of color with movements for social justice throughout the world (208). Sandoval identifies four "modes of resistance" enacted by subordinated Americans of any race, class, or gender. In the "equal rights" form, subordinate groups claim the differences for which they are penalized are exterior and they work toward public recognition of their right to the same treatment as hegemonic groups. The "revolutionary" mode works toward a social transformation (by force if necessary), which would produce an egalitarian society recognizing what adherents believe are their legitimate differences. "Supremacists" believe their differences grant them a cultural and psychological superiority, which would inspire their leadership with a higher ethical and moral vision. "Separatists" wish to cherish their differences through total separation from the dominant social order.

Sandoval maintains that what "third world" US feminists have done, and what other oppositional groups would profit by doing, is operate interchangeably under all four categories. Rather than choosing one position that corresponds with

---

[3] According to Sandoval's note, an unpublished version of her manuscript was cited in Donna Haraway's "A Manifesto for Cyborgs," Socialist Review 80, 1985; Sandoval presented the this paper at the MLA panel "Writing from the Margins" in 1987; A version appeared in Sub-Versions 1990, and in Genders 10, 1991; It formed the basis for her doctoral dissertation in 1993; The version to which I refer appeared in Provoking Agents, ed. Judith Kegan Gardiner, 1995.

her beliefs, values and self-understanding, the agent simply exchanges positions opportunistically. Feminists of color thus become "women without a line" and the multiple modes of oppositional consciousness are adopted solely as "tactical weaponry." These tactics are related to political skills, by which "women of color are more like urban guerillas trained through everyday battle with the state apparatus." Tactics form a "strategy" which involves deciding on a day to day basis "how we measure and weigh what is to be said and when, what is to be done and how, and to whom" by "women who contradict each other." This form of agency requires a "new," a "tactical" subjectivity, a "subjectivity as masquerade" with the capacity to "de- and re-center" " (218-19)..

Many mainstream feminists would support Sandoval's assertion that white, middle class women have, deplorably, very feebly tolerated the concerns of women of color (Abel, Benstock, Flynn, Spelman). Sandoval's paper also expresses a laudable wish to unite oppositional groups without confining them to a "party line" --a procedure which often seems to encourage the division and isolation of identity politics. There are, however, some problems with Sandoval's theory.

Some of the modes of opposition Sandoval outlines are not, as she maintains, exclusive to subordinate groups. They have often characterized the consciousness of hegemonic groups, and are not necessarily progressive. The idea of supremacy justified slavery and subsequent racist practices, and the concept of separatism characterized Southern whites' antebellum activity. Marginal groups have sometimes been coerced into separatism, as was the case with Indian reservations and the Liberia movement. The vaguely threatening slogan "America: love it or leave it" operates on the principle of separatism, and defines the American social system as fundamentally unchangeable.

In addition, I don't believe that the four modes of oppositional consciousness outlined by Sandoval can be interchanged as fluidly as she

maintains. Each of the four examples rests upon beliefs, values and self-understandings which are unlikely to be easily abandoned or exchanged, since values and beliefs of one mode often radically oppose those of another. Wishing to disregard differences understood as superficial in order to better enjoy rights guaranteed under an existing social order, as in the "equal rights" mode cannot be reconciled with the desire to nurture differences seen as inherent through complete separation from society, encouraged through the "separatist" mode. Further, a mode such as the "supremacist" would be inappropriate if the goal, as Sandoval claims, is "egalitarian social relations" (219). Sandoval, however, appears to insist that each form of consciousness is simply "tactical," "strategic," to be employed only for the sake of efficacy. But the "strategy" for coping with daily existence seems to describe spontaneous decision-making rather than a plan which progresses in stages toward a goal. And it is difficult to envision the realization of an egalitarian society through a cohesive "third world" agency, when the positions, beliefs and goals of each group are subject to persistent changes which have not been discussed, modified and accepted by the larger whole. At the most basic level, it's difficult to understand how groups "without a line" can "contradict each other". Opposing views must be held in order for different parties to accomplish this.

Sandoval's approach appears to be based on a pragmatic outlook which exchanges concepts of truth and knowledge for contingent opinion. Since Richard Rorty is an influential advocate of neopragmatism, and because he has debated with Habermas, I will examine his philosophy in some detail in the next section.

RICHARD RORTY AND THE CONCEPT OF TRUTH

In a recent debate with Habermas, Rorty claimed pragmatism was a counterpart to the European counterenlightenment philosophy initiated by

Nietszche. Seen as a tradition of philosophical thought which Rorty maintains was conceived in the 19th century by Emerson (one of Nietszche's idols), and continued through William James, Dewey, Quine and Davidson, Rorty's neopragmatist claims are particularly pertinent to my discussion when examined alongside Habermas' more idealist, "European" approach.

In the debate with Habermas, Rorty sees pragmatists as replacing the Platonic preoccupation with reason, truth and knowledge with what he calls the "Emersonian" stress on social hope ("Emancipating" 26-27). Traditionally, Platonists have believed that distinguishing permanent forms from temporal events will progressively free humans from menacing contingencies. Rational thought dissolved the belief in the arbitrary threats of a mythical world, and increasingly allows the prediction and control of natural events. Anti-Platonists have seen rational constraints as nothing more than bondage within another arbitrary belief system. They reject Platonist idealism for mistaking local social constructions for timeless universals (Habermas "Coping" 3-5). Rorty suggests that we drop the "vocabulary" of rationality inherited from Plato which attempts to distinguish between knowledge and opinion or appearance and reality, and channel our resources into the creation of a just society ("Emancipating" 34).

In Rorty's view this may be accomplished by replacing old "vocabularies" with new ones. New vocabularies do not come closer to describing a mind-independent reality but simply "redescribe" events or objects in ways which are considered more useful. Rather than discovering facts we simply make changes. Galileo did not make a discovery which more correctly described the physical universe. He rather hit on a vocabulary which worked better than previous vocabularies (Contingency, Irony, Solidarity 19). Along with other types of progress, scientific advancement occurs when private obsessions crystallize in metaphors that "catch on" with the public (Contingency, Irony 37). Seemingly in

the interests of democratic plurality, Rorty claims that "one's aim becomes an expanding repertoire of alternative descriptions rather than the One Right Description" (Contingency, Irony 40). Yet he simultaneously claims that revolutionary achievements occur when someone notices that "two or more of our vocabularies are interfering with each other, and proceeds to invent a new vocabulary to replace both" (Contingency, Irony 12). Yeats more or less replaced Rosetti when the former hit on a new vocabulary which enabled him to write poems which were not variations on his precursors, according to Rorty (Contingency, Irony 20). Language, like evolution, constantly kills off old forms—"not to accomplish a higher purpose, but blindly" (Contingency, Irony 10). On this view, it is difficult to comprehend the enduring popularity of Shakespeare.

What is interesting about Rorty's account is that he sees a progressive liberal society as "poeticized" rather than "rationalized" (Contingency, Irony 53). Not only literary figures, but certain philosophers and scientists fall under the rubric of the "strong poet." As creators of new vocabularies, "strong poets" become "the vanguard of the species" (Contingency, Irony 20). Like Galileo, Freud was an exceptionally strong poet. On Rorty's account, it is through a new vocabulary of terms such as "paranoia" "obsession" "sadism" and "infantile" that Freud enables each individual "to sketch a narrative of our own development" to "generate a self-description" which praises "our success in self-creation, our ability to break free from an idiosyncratic past" (Contingency, Irony 32, 36, 33). By giving everyone a creative unconscious, Freud illustrates human life as a poem. Every human is consciously or subconsciously acting out an idiosyncratic fantasy. What differentiates strong poets from eccentrics, perverts or the dull majority is that in the act of self-creation, their private obsessions result in metaphors that "catch on" with the public (Contingency, Irony 37).

BLOOM, FREUD AND SHAKESPEARE, "STRONGEST POET"

Rorty bases many of his ideas on the work of Harold Bloom. Interestingly, Bloom conceives of Shakespeare as the "strongest" poet ever to exist, and places him at the centre of the literary canon. No one eclipses him. Shakespeare "is the canon. He sets the standards and limits of literature.... [he is] a spirit that permeates everywhere, that cannot be confined....There is no substitute for Shakespeare" (50, 52, 53). According to Bloom, much of Shakespeare's genius lies in his ability to create characters whose capacity for self-reflection allows for creative metamorphosis:

> [They} see themselves as dramatic characters, aesthetic artifices. They thus become free artists of themselves, which means that they are free to write themselves, to will changes in the self. Overhearing their own speeches and pondering those expressions, they change and go on to contemplate an otherness in the self, or the possibility of such otherness" (70).

Following Emerson, who maintained that literature, philosophy and thought have been "Shakespearized," one of Bloom's most startling claims is that Shakespeare's characters changed the way humans perceived self-reflection and the possibility of mutability. All this coheres with Rorty's reading of Bloom and his understanding of the influence a strong poet's new vocabulary might have on a society.

But Bloom further maintains that the process of metamorphosis Shakespeare applied to many of his characters anticipated the psychoanalytic situation in which patients are "compelled to overhear themselves in the context of their transference to their analysts"(392). Bloom claims that Freud suffered an anxiety of influence to the degree that psychoanalysis is "a reductive parody of Shakespeare." Freud dramatized his vision of the internal battle and organization of

the psyche through a number of metaphors—the drives, defense mechanisms, and so on. But Freud, says Bloom, simply " prosified" Shakespeare:

> Freud, as prose-poet of the post-Shakespearean, sails in Shakespeare's wake; and the anxiety of influence has no more distinguished sufferer in our time than the founder of psychoanalysis, who always discovered that Shakespeare had been there before him....Shakespeare is everywhere in Freud far more present when unmentioned than when he is cited.....Freud accepted Shakespeare's ideas even when he denied their source (390-1).

If we concede to Bloom's theory, as Rorty appears to, then it is difficult to grasp just how Freud's vocabulary was a product of his own idiosyncratic fantasies. If "Shakespeare is the inventor of psychoanalysis and Freud its codifier"(Bloom 375), then human mutability through self-analysis is not, as Rorty suggests, Freud's creation. Neither Freud (nor Shakespeare, I would maintain) invented this practice. And since it was observable at least since the sixteenth century, it may hardly be described as a practice which "caught on" because Freud invented new words for it.

What is important about Bloom's observations is that they indicate that reading Shakespeare helped Freud to form hypotheses about human behaviour which he then attempted to verify through his clinical practice. Freud's proponents and detractors both agree that at least parts of the corpus are testable through empirical data generated in either the clinical or laboratory setting (Grunbaum 100-103). In this sense, what Paisley Livingston has termed "literary knowledge" may have implications within the context of modern social science:

> ...in scientific inquiry the hard thing is often not the testing of a hypothesis once we think of it, but the thinking of an original and fruitful hypothesis in the first place. Therefore literature may have immense cognitive value even if it merely suggests new hypotheses about human

> nature or society or the world, and even if only a few of these hypotheses turn out to be verifiable, perhaps after some analysis and refinement (Monroe Beardsley cited Livingston 267).

However controversial and dubious many of Freud's theories may appear, surely the concept of change through self-analysis upon which his work is based is a valuable one, with emancipatory potential when applied to both individuals and societies.

FRAMEWORK RELATIVISM AND RATIONAL DISCOURSE

For Rorty, not only social science but natural scientific discovery is simply another form of the Freudian self-creating narrative—"Newton's metaphorical use of gravitates...more plausibly...[was] the result of some odd episodes in infancy (17). Humans create the vocabularies composed of sentences of which truth is a property. Truth is therefore created by humans (21). So-called scientific progress is simply a question of "new vocabularies killing off old ones--not to accomplish a higher purpose, but blindly" (19). Livingston deplores what he terms "framework relativism," which claims that explanations of natural events are determined by changing scientific language (23). He maintains that beliefs are true when they refer to a state of affairs. And a state of affairs is not entirely created by an act of inquiry (63). As Livingston notes, although Rorty claims he would simply prefer that we use new metaphors rather than old, he actually argues that concepts of truth and evidence are useless:

> ...we perceive that the basic attitude these tired metaphors are supposed to express is still alive and at work in the pragmatic hero's own storytelling.....his story asks us to believe that it is correct to think that the metaphors of truth are old hat, truly useless, wrong. What is asserted is that the constitutive desire of philosophy—the

> desire not merely to repeat and obey the dogmas of mere opinion but to search for knowledge—is in fact a hopeless chimera (57).

As Livingston further points out, framework relativists such as Rorty manufacture a false choice when they place "all or nothing stipulations" on truth claims. Natural science's pursuit of truth does not equal scientism—the notion that natural science is a value-free, supreme good which provides a total description of our lives. And neither does social science claim that personal and ideological interests do not distort attempts to explain cultural realities. Yet any truth-seeking inquiry into the issue of distortion presupposes that social research need not always be distorted by other interests; and "that some of the other interests that may motivate the formation of beliefs about social realities are at the same time necessarily linked to the goal of truth, which they may advance, at least in some approximate and partial way, in spite of other priorities" (Livingston 107-8, 192).

In the recent debate with Rorty, Habermas made several similar points. Truth cannot be conflated with a justified belief which may only apply to a local community. Rorty, as Habermas points out, regards truth as warranted assertability. Yet on Rorty's account warranted assertability requires that a person must be ready to defend a claim by appealing to a rationally motivated agreement of other publics (not just her own community), such as experts or those who are "better versions than ourselves". Discussion must be informed by all relevant persons and information; it should exclude propaganda, brainwashing and all other repressive mechanisms. As Habermas points out, this kind of idealized sphere approaches his own version of rational discourse and places Rorty within the domain of Platonist culture ("Coping" 21-2).

"COUNTERPUBLIC" SPHERES

Nancy Fraser objects to assumptions Habermas makes in his formulation of rational discourse within the public sphere. Two of these objections relate to social inequalities. They are thus pertinent to this chapter and I will deal with them simultaneously. [4] Fraser claims it is difficult to bracket status differences and deliberate as if lower status groups were social equals. She also suggests that "counterpublics" constitute alternative public spheres composed of subordinated groups. Fraser maintains that even when formal exclusions have been abolished lower status groups should thematize their inequality. She claims, I think correctly, that social inequalities often intimidate subordinated groups, or weaken their means of self-expression within broader public discussion. Hegemonic groups may devalue or misread their interventions (118-20). Awareness of the ways in which deliberation may be distorted by these elements is a start toward attenuating the dominance of hegemonic groups.

Fraser further maintains, however, that "an adequate conception of the public sphere requires... the elimination of social inequality" (136). I believe this is a self-defeating and somewhat contradictory assertion. This would mean that discussion between socially unequal groups would always be inadequate. Yet by Fraser's own evidence, subordinated groups have developed what she terms "subaltern counterpublics." These groups arrange lectures, conferences and conventions, and establish journals and bookstores in order to express their needs and identities. This group formation and participation allows members to understand themselves as members of a public geared toward self-understanding and eliminating social inequality (Fraser 123). I would suggest that a preoccupation with their social grievances does not render these groups counterpublics, but

[4] Fraser's third objection regarding the sharp delineation Habermas attempts to make between common good and private interests is dealt with in my first chapter.

legitimate elements in a public sphere which encompasses at least some means of participation and self-expression. These "counterpublics" do not exist in a void. They participate in a larger sphere by acknowledging their situation, establishing needs and presenting arguments in a public forum.

Fraser acknowledges this publicist orientation by pointing out the dual nature of subaltern publics—a withdrawal for private deliberation over issues which will be directed toward a wider public. Yet this is similar in principle to the dual nature of the activities characterizing Habermas' "audience-oriented subject," who retires to deliberate privately before presenting the results publicly. Private deliberation is a prerequisite to public discussion, which is a refinement of attitudes and claims through exposure to alternative perspectives. Habermas' theory of communicative action explicitly states that the option to contest norms be considered an essential element of rational discourse.

I am not claiming that social inequalities should not be eradicated. I do maintain that reasonably fair discussion is possible in stratified societies. And Fraser does not consider that even in an egalitarian society, "without classes or gender and racial divisions of labor" inequalities would still exist that would deter participatory parity. Communication may be distorted between individuals of similar socio-economic circumstances. Some individuals, for example, are simply more gregarious, aggressive, outspoken, domineering, intense or intellectually gifted than others.

The activities of subordinated Americans during the latter half of the nineteenth century supports the possibility of access to the public sphere, although this access could not be described as open or effortless. Individuals representing subordinated groups nonetheless based their arguments on ideals promoting egalitarianism and autonomy. Their interpretations of Shakespeare helped

illuminate the racism, sexism and classicism which belied U.S. ideals. As Wiebe maintains:

> the persistent pressure white wage earners, African Americans and white women applied at the margins arose from their assumption of democracy's extendibility. Universalistic language guided that expectation. Advocates of extension declared over and over they were asking for nothing new (110).

The very fact that groups formally excluded from public decision-making were able to make a public case for reform lends credence to the ideal of open access.

Chapter 5 - Professional Shakespeare, Professional Public

In 1908, the secretary of Harvard University's Shakespeare Club occasionally amused himself by preparing the minutes in an eccentric fashion. Some he wrote in French or Latin, and the set for March 27 are in the form of a spoof. Two semi-literate working class men clamber up the wall to peer in and eavesdrop at the open window while the Shakespeare Club discusses A Winter's Tale. Restricted physical access to the university debate is compounded by intellectual impediment, as the two can barely comprehend the discussion and do not recognize the playwright. This caricature nicely illustrates the transformation--initiated toward the end of the nineteenth century—which aimed American Shakespeare study in a more specialized and increasingly academic direction. At the same time, it reveals the patronizing attitude of educated professionals toward workers--a disposition reflected in the well-meaning but officious attempts of reformers to educate the lower classes. Toward the end of the century, this group of professionals revered accreditation, valued utility, and sought to set and maintain standards in several areas of public and private life. This chapter will examine this influential group's approach to domestic life, education, and the public sphere, while drawing parallels with changes in Shakespeare study. I will also be relating my conclusions to the mass consumption attitude which Habermas claims began developing in the late 19th century. This transformation segmented the public into small groups of specialists and a largely uncritical mass of consumers.

SHAKESPEARE SOCIETIES AND THE NEW PROFESSIONALISM

Associated with the ongoing project of editing the New Variorum, Horace Howard Furness perhaps epitomizes the flip from amateur to authority which helped to set a standard for serious Shakespeareans toward the end of the century. As James Gibson notes, Furness went "from a serious but unknown Shakespearean student to an internationally recognized Shakespearean authority. (He was) on intimate terms with scholars from Boston to Bonn, from Cornell to Cambridge, and recipient of

three honorary degrees and universal acclaim for his literary study..." (111). For 19th century Americans, this accomplishment, by a local scholar, printing press and publishing house was evidence of an impressive competence in an area previously monopolized by the British (Gibson 72). Joseph Crosby even claimed Furness "has made his name immortal as the Poet's itself is" ("Letter to Norris" 3 May, 1878, Velz 316).

The New Variorum was inspired by the needs of serious amateurs who wished to do original emendation. With an amateur's raw enthusiasm, Furness embarked on his massive variorum project when he began toiling through different editions in preparation for his Philadelphia Shakespeare Society meetings. Inspired by the needs of serious amateurs, the first volume was dedicated to the Philadelphia Shakespeare Society with subsequent plays dedicated to the Shakespeare Societies of Weimar and London. Although Furness had begun his project to better enable his amateur companions in the Philadelphia Shakespeare Society to do original work, he soon outgrew their scholarly capacities. The disparity between their amateur endeavors and his own pursuits became obvious as early as 1873, when he admitted in a letter to British scholar C.F. Ingleby that "I no longer attend the meetings of the Shakespeare Society....their study is of the smallest and most desultory kind" (cited Gibson 113). By 1880, when Furness decided to use a First Folio rather than the Cambridge (1865) edition as a work-text, he wrote Grant White that "this edition of mine is not for babes; it is for persons who think for themselves, and wish to have all the apparatus for a critical study. With this edition study doesn't end, it begins" (cited Gibson 167).

Furness' variorum project signaled a landmark in the growing trend toward the professionalizing of Shakespeare studies in the United States, as more serious Shakespeareans recognized the gulf between themselves and other amateurs. With the New Variorum, material from scarce and expensive sources had been collected in one volume, and as Crosby remarked:, "what a saving of time & repetition the next generation will have, by being able to get all that is material about any one play in one of Mr. Furness' comprehensive volumes" ("Letter to Norris" 7 July 1875, Velz 88). Serious amateurs were forced to familiarize themselves with the history of

debate over a textual crux before a valid emendation could be suggested. Further, readers saw American editors and commentators appearing alongside British editors such as Pope, Rowe and Warburton, as well as eminent British contemporaries such as C.F. Ingleby and J.O. Halliwell-Phillipps. With the appearance of the Variorum, American Shakespeare scholarship was more firmly established as an estimable process by charting it along a prestigious historical line.

Almost from the beginning of his venture, Furness valued scholarly criticism over what he deemed rather hollow public praise, and as his correspondence with Grant White suggests, he directed his work increasingly to this quarter as the years passed. In 1871, he told White "there is no one in America whose judgment in such matters is more valuable than yours"; in 1873, he thanked White for an extremely critical review, maintaining that "I am tired to death of glittering generalities of praise from men who have read nothing of the book but the preface...I hail all your criticisms and gain much strength and encouragement from them." By 1880, Furness was still thanking White for his critical reviews, which gave him "sincere pleasure. I don't refer to complements, but the discussion of the points that puzzled me." By the time of White's death in 1885, it is evident that Furness had been directing his labors at an increasingly narrow readership of scholars; as he sadly wrote to White's widow "my public, for which I work and to which I look for sympathy has diminished to four or five names and chiefest among them stood his. Without his approving nod or criticizing frown much of the zest is gone." Grant White's death was preceded by Crosby's flight in 1884 and by Hudson's demise in 1886. Within the space of two years, a remarkable trio who actively tried to appeal, in White's words, "not only to the intelligent and observant general reader, but to independent thinkers among my fellow-editors and critics" had dissolved ("Anatomizing" June 832).

Yet although these Shakespeareans had directed their labor to both groups, toward the end of their careers they stressed the inaccessibility of the unedited plays to the general reader, and the fundamental importance of their own role. As Hudson noted in 1881, "beyond this goodly trio (of Furness, Crosby and White), I cannot name a single person in the land who is able to go alone...in any question of textual

criticism or textual correction. For that is what it is to be a Shakespearian" ("How to Use Shakespeare" v). And as Grant White wrote in a review of Furness' Lear :

> Many even of those who read and enjoy Shakespeare talk of being content with "the text" itself without note or comment. But what text?....Merely the text which the speakers have been in the habit of reading. That very text...is the result of the painful labors, through many generations, of the very editors of whom they speak so slightingly....If the text of Shakespeare were put before these captious amateur critics uncorrected by editorial labor and without comment, they would not recognize many parts of it (" King Lear" 186-87).

Furness' Variorum was evidence of the intimidating weight of that labor, and the Variorum project helped to establish Shakespeare study in America as a more specialized, and increasingly academic, area.

Further, Furness' substantial list of public honors in the late 1880s were usually degrees bestowed by universities such as Harvard, Yale and Cambridge, and his contact with the public in the 1890s took place mainly in university and college auditoriums (Gibson 196-206). A project as massive as Furness' Variorum was intimidating not only in the history of opinion it contained, but in physical size, and price. Reputation alone may have convinced a broad public of the validity of the knowledge within, and as the century drew to a close it seemed the handsome volumes were often purchased solely to possess and admire. As Furness remarked 1897 in a letter to his sister, "though the books have a market, they do not appear to have "readers"--I am constantly asked questions which reveal this soothing fact (Jayne 1: 328). Certainly the Variorum volumes might have discouraged all but the most devoted amateur from attempting the "real" work of textual emendation, an attitude reinforced later in the century by scholars themselves.

THE BANKSIDE AND AMATEUR SHAKESPEAREANS

If Furness' editorial endeavour intimidated some amateur Shakespeareans, its scholarly appeal may have inspired others. Although quite different in scope, an

ambitious editorial project, the Bankside Shakespeare, was undertaken in the late 80s by the New York Shakespeare Society. Started in 1885 by a small group of lawyers, bankers and linguists, the society prided itself on the erudition of its members. Educated as a civil engineer, Alvey Adey was a linguist and accomplished scholar of French, Spanish, and German literature. An English professor at Columbia, Thomas Randolph Price graduated from the University of Virginia, studied philology at the Universities of Berlin and Kiel and spent a year at the Sorbonne. Appleton Morgan, the society's president, earned his law degree at Columbia, and wrote several books relating to Shakespeare including one on Warwickshire dialect ("New York" 181-89). Morgan's interest in Shakespeare was kindled when he was researching the history of copyright while at law school, and began to question the concept of a single, authentic author of the plays. As discussed in chapter three, the question became a passion when he entered the Bacon authorship controversy with a series of articles in 1879. He founded the NYSS in order to provide a forum for debate on all aspects of Shakespeare study ("How Did You" 490). In a somewhat academic fashion, the NYSS claimed to be "the only Shakespeare Society in the world which issues in book form, and at short intervals, a series of original publications, papers, and reprints of archaeological dramatic matter for students of Shakespeare and of the drama he founded" ("New York" 181).

In keeping with their philosophy of collaboration and catholicity, the twenty-volume Bankside edition (1888-92) of Shakespeare's plays was jointly edited by Morgan and his eleven colleagues, who worked in "close harmony and consultation" so that "the general credit rests with them all" (Scammon 21). The Bankside was to be "the society's most permanent monument. The introductions are in themselves a record of the lines of study pursued by our members and of the catholic spirit of the society itself" ("Shakespeare Societies" 6: 279). As I have discussed, perhaps the most radical aspect of the edition is its presentation, which included all eighteen of the First Folio plays alongside their extant Quarto versions.

The Bankside speaks eloquently about the changing state of amateur Shakespeare studies toward the end of the century. As I maintain in chapter three, in one sense, it signals the growing independence of the Shakespeare student. Formerly,

contended Bankside co-editor Alvey Adee, "the Shakespearian student...if he be not content to take all his knowledge at second hand...is at each moment driven to ransack the original authorities" in a time-consuming effort (153). And former editors, continued Adee, often dogmatically insisted that the text be "regarded with awe, overlooking that it is often their own...mundane creation." Through these assertions, traditional editors attempted to "forbid the scrutiny of the common scholar" (155). With the Bankside, the independent student "who seeks to compare a disputed phrase or to collate for himself is freed" (163).

But as I have suggested, in another way late-century editions such as The Bankside and Furness' New Variorum widened the gap between the amateur scholar and the more casual student of Shakespeare. The Bankside in particular, as one reviewer noted of the early volumes, secured a unique advance for American scholarship: "To add one more to the list of "variorum" or "eclectic" editions is in itself only a work of patience and of consultation. But to produce results like the five volumes before us is to work to the credit of American scholarship" ("Review" 491). As I have shown, Shakespeare lecturers, editors, and societies of all levels burgeoned in the second half of the century. But the more casual student of Shakespeare was increasingly disparaged as early as the early nineties, when the amateur scholar developed into the "legitimate" student of Shakespeare. Around that time, as Adee notes in his Bankside explanation, it appears that "the true reader of Shakespeare is rarely of the common classes to whom Hudson addresses himself" (155).

This attitude manifested itself in several ways. By 1890 Shakespeariana, which had been a medium for exchange between Shakespeare societies nationwide appeared to narrow its scope. The cover page to Volume 7 (1890), describes the journal as "a critical and contemporary review of Shakespearean literature." Only the eminent societies appear worthy of note or contribution. New York appears to have become the centre of Shakespeare study: A history of New York Shakespeare Societies since 1779 appeared in one 1891 issue ("Shakespeare Societies in New York City" 175-77); a congress of Shakespeare societies planned for the summer of 1892 was to have taken place in New York ("Miscellany 8: 247); and by 1892 the

Shakespeare Society news section was limited to New York clubs—the Fortnightly, the Avon and the New York Shakespeare Society ("Miscellany" 9:185).

Further, the editors began abusing The Critic's Shakespeare columnist, W.J. Rolfe. A former high school teacher and editor of the so-called "Friendly" edition of Shakespeare (1871-1884) Rolfe in the late 80s filled the gap left by Hudson and White. High schools and amateur Shakespeare clubs favored his edition, and the weekly Shakespeare column written in his retirement generally had a casual and interactive tone. Shakespeariana reported in 1891 that Rolfe had the temerity to criticize the Bankside in his column, an action which apparently initiated the Shakespeariana attacks ("Miscellany" 8:236). Yet the denunciations took the form of undermining Rolfe's credibility as a Shakespeare scholar by presenting him and his correspondents as provincial amateurs.

Shakespeariana asked if there was "anything sillier, more ineffably puerile or driveling than the stuff which Dr. Rolfe says his friends send him ("Miscellany" 10:53). Of the British Shakespearean Furnivall, Shakespeariana doubted that "outside of a few women and Dr. Rolfe of Cambridge, Mass., anybody pays any attention to what he says" ("Miscellany" 9:122). Another issue implied that "Cambridgeport" was a backwater, whereas "other neighborhoods like New York city...which is not exactly in a frontier condition" were too sophisticated for Rolfe's column ("Miscellany" 9:186). The "Friendly" edition also came under fire. Noting that Rolfe used one of Joseph Crosby's notes in his edition of Shrew, the magazine demanded credentials, asking "who is Mr. J. Crosby and why does he think" as he does ("Miscellany" 10: 53). A final attack on Rolfe claimed that "it is curious that so courteous, suave and metropolitan a journal as The Critic should allow one of its pages to be conducted in the style of the curate and the rural pedagogue" ("Miscellany"10:255). Ironically, by 1899 Rolfe declared that most people claiming intimacy with Shakespeare "have only a smattering of this education" and was described by the Dial as "one of the most prominent leaders in this attempt to force special scholarship upon a bewildered public" (Anderson 11).

Starting in the late 1880s, serious amateur Shakespeareans aptly illustrate the tension between the community service ideal and the appeal for peer approval that

Larson has shown characterizes professionalism (226). Larson maintains that professionals are colleague rather than client oriented, yet the ethical standards and codes of conduct they set promote duty over self-interest. Self-regulation ideally results in community transactions by which the duty/service ethic justifies consumer trust. This counteracts the "caveat emptor" stance underlying the laissez faire commodity market (Larson 49). This kind of tension permeated all nineteenth century amateur Shakespeare study to some extent, but I believe the community service aspect remained basic, in varying degrees, to their work. For the most part urban residents, nineteenth century Shakespeareans had to establish credibility among strangers. This group won their reputation by gaining their public's trust rather than by university certification or class affiliation, and the institutions by which they established themselves--the lyceum, print media, and Shakespeare society--were often initiated and enthusiastically supported by the middle and upper classes. Nineteenth century scholars communicated with a largely middle class public who appreciated their work and to an extent helped to form it. These amateurs initially depended quite heavily on this group, and interest in Shakespeare grew within a shared and relatively accessible middle class public culture. But I believe a process becomes visible in the later work of Furness and in the Bankside which American urban historian Thomas Bender has noted of late nineteenth century professional culture in general:

> disciplinary peers, not a diverse urban public, became the only legitimate evaluators of intellectual work....This is not to say that professionalized disciplines...became socially irresponsible. But their contributions to society began to flow from their own self-definitions rather than from a reciprocal engagement with general public discourse (10).

This attitude to Shakespeare study became increasingly prevalent as the plays began to appear more prominently on university curricula.

PROFESSIONAL SHAKESPEARE

It is important to locate the appearance of Shakespeare on the university curriculum within the general upheaval experienced by colleges in the decades following the Civil War. As Graff has shown, until about the latter third of the nineteenth century the traditional American college prepared young upper class men for careers in medicine, law and the ministry. A liberal education, centering on Greek, Latin, mathematics, theology and logic was standard and specialization was not encouraged (Graff 22-6). College administrators began to reorganize in the 1870s, and arranged the new universities into departments representing major subjects. English literature, traditionally viewed as an element of a normal gentleman's upbringing, was introduced gradually as a subject for university study. I will argue in this section that, contrary to Michael Warner's view of university literature studies generally, Shakespeare in the university was an outcome of the prevalent study of the plays in home and club circles, and of the relations these groups had with amateur scholars.

Warner's influential "Professionalization and the Rewards of Literature" argues against the view that 19th century university literary study was a more focused continuation of amateur practices. During the conflict which arose in late 19th century English departments between philologists and belle lettrists, both felt pressured into providing some sort of accreditation. Research-oriented and trained for the most part in German universities, philologists claimed to be scientists, and disparaged the "general society knowledge" of the belle lettrists. The latter in turn claimed a focus on the cold, hard, specialized facts of linguistics emptied the works of their spiritual value. The struggle over which group represented the authentic goals of literary study defined the profession, says Warner. In particular, the philologists' self-proclaimed scientific examination of the literary text in historical and linguistic detail had no precedent in amateur literary studies. This expertise allowed philologists to gain the advantage by the end of the century.

> The work of collating editions, cataloguing documents and variants between documents, reproducing odd spellings, noting the conditions of documents, dating them and drawing conclusions from those dates, distinguishing later corruptions

> from original forms—all activities that the genteel critics would have dismissed as irrelevant pedantry now became activities that determined what the text was and at the same time how it was to be viewed. (12).

Warner makes several claims in order to support his understanding of professionalization as "one of the most telling developments of mature industrial capitalism," a means of securing social position and material reward at others' expense (8). He asserts that English department professional criticism of the 1890s represented a "fundamental break" with the amateur tradition; that university professionals sought a central position of power by supervising the public language of interpretation; and that redefinitions of literature played "a strategic role in securing social positions and material rewards for one group to the exclusion of a competing group" (14, 15). To bolster these claims, Warner asserts the literary profession was not a response to a formed social need. "We have no evidence that...a need for interpretation antedated and somehow called forth the profession of literary criticism....The transformation of literature into...a knowledge subject....is not the satisfaction of a public demand..." (6,11).

Warner overlooks, however, the important area of amateur Shakespeare studies. As I have shown, the dating, collating, comparison, scrutiny of corruption and other niceties of textual examination, were not considered "irrelevant pedantry" but comprised a large part of amateur Shakespeare study from mid-century—not only for editors such as White and Hudson, but for amateurs such as Crosby who simply enjoyed the practice. Several Shakespeare clubs worked on textual emendation, and a glance at an examination for high school students in 1881 indicates that even the rankest amateurs often possessed an elementary understanding of the plays' textual history (Thom). W.J. Rolfe's "Friendly Edition" of Shakespeare, which first appeared in the early 70s, was philology-based and very popular. Many groups interested in cultural history as well as linguistics practiced philology in the broadest sense. And on the other hand, the "belle lettristic" criticism of public Shakespeareans such as Hudson—a response to the beauty of the work and a psychological analysis of the characters—was widely admired and emulated by

amateurs. Those who undertook editorial work also accepted it as a legitimate practice. Contrary to Warner's assertion, the evidence of this dual amateur approach to Shakespeare after mid-century appears to support the idea of academic studies as a continuation of the amateur tradition. Further, the popularity of the published work—both linguistic and belle lettristic—and the lectures of public Shakespeareans, indicates a presence rather than an absence of social need, as Warner maintains. It appears that amateur Shakespeareans traditionally required more qualified help with the plays, and that university professors attempted to meet this need toward the end of the century, replacing knowledgeable, public-oriented amateurs such as White, Hudson and Crosby.

On the other hand, I think Warner is correct in his assertion that a conflict arose over the "true" approach to Shakespeare study during the latter half of the century; but this conflict appears to have occurred outside the university as well, as my discussion of NYSS and the Bankside edition would indicate. Certainly there seemed to be a movement in the serious amateur community toward focussing Shakespeare studies along the lines of scientific research, and amateurs applauded academic attention to the plays. But the serious outcome of this attention lies not in the attempt to render Shakespeare studies more "scientific," in terms of formulating hypotheses and supplying evidence.

Most critically, I think, university attention to Shakespeare changed the spirit of reciprocal exchange which had characterized Shakespeare studies. Throughout the nineteenth century, amateurs' relations, with and among authoritative Shakespeareans, were basically interactive. University attempts at more rigorous methods turned out camps of professionals, as Warner suggests, but more specifically degenerated into a situation where the Shakespeare professor lectured and the students absorbed. To an extent, this pattern appeared to permeate associations with the general public as well. I suspect it left little room for ordinary groups of people, interested in their own interpretations of Shakespeare and relying on their own organizational skills, to set their own agendas without feeling inefficient or unsystematic in an increasingly utilitarian society. This attitude led amateurs to a generally uncritical acceptance of Shakespeare authorities and

reflected the increasingly passive attitude toward public life assumed by large segments of American society. The following section indicates briefly how I think this might have occurred.

SHAKESPEARE IN THE UNIVERSITY

Traditionally, fragments of Shakespearean plays were often used as examples in college rhetoric and oratory courses (Simon 52-58). But the University of Michigan was perhaps one of the earliest to offer a formal Shakespeare course in order to study the plays from a broader perspective. Datus Brooks taught a Shakespeare course from 1861-64 which included the historical dramas and four tragedies "critically examined in connection with Reed's history" (Simon 77). Formal Shakespeare courses were apparently abandoned until thirteen years later, when Moses Coit Tyler began teaching the plays at Michigan in 1877. What is interesting about Tyler's method, when compared to later pedagogical approaches to Shakespeare, is the interaction and initiative required of the students. His approach was similar to, and possibly influenced to some degree by, that adopted by many Shakespeare clubs. His elective course was offered to seniors, and the class was split into groups of 15 who met for two hours each week. One essay was prepared, read and then critiqued each class. Essays focussed on historical sources, different editions, aesthetics, or ethical concerns. Students were expected to be familiar with scholarly criticism, to use the general library which contained about 200 volumes on Shakespeare, and to make formal references to published criticism (Demmon 463-4).

Hiram Corson of Cornell had a quite different approach. Trained in math, Latin and Greek, the young Corson worked as a bibliographer for the Smithsonian and Congressional libraries and studied English, French and German literature in his leisure time. He moved to Philadelphia in 1859, where he lectured on English literature and joined the Philadelphia Shakespeare Society. Princeton awarded him a Masters in Arts in 1864, and after filling a couple of college positions he was appointed to Cornell's chair of Rhetoric and Oratory in 1870. According to a colleague Corson was recognized as one of the great American interpreters of Shakespeare, "a spokesman of the higher interest of the soul... [with] contempt to

the merely material in art and life" (Hewett 44, 39). He opposed Cornell's emphasis on the practical, its "cruder and more aggressive enthusiasms" (Hewett 39). Corson reached a wide public in the 80s by guest lecturing at Johns Hopkins and the University of Wisconsin, delivering courses of lectures, single addresses and readings to the general public, and by publishing many books and magazine articles (Hewett 42).

Corson's forte as a teacher, stated a colleague, "has always been monologue" (Hewett 41). And what he sought from his students was "understanding and sympathy rather than fellow-work" (Hewett 40). Corson essentially read to his students, but bolstered his authority by claiming the proper response from students—the quickening of their spiritual faculties--could only be elicited through the proper voice trained through "systematic and scientific cultivation" (Hewett 45-6). Corson's Introduction to the Study of Shakespeare (1889), encourages his readers to regurgitate his sentiments and those of other approved scholars cited in the book by listing 260 "examination" questions—"What makes Shakespeare the greatest of the world's teachers? What must be the ultimate end of all true art? What is always the business of Shakespeare's dramatic art?"—in its final pages (380, 391, 393).

It appears that by the late century this method--what Graff calls "the pouring-in process"--was evident in much of Shakespeare pedagogy, whether philological or belle-lettrist. The renowned Shakespearean William Lyman Kittredge (Harvard, 1888-1936) was described by one student as "having led his followers by forced marches," while a graduate student claimed Kittredge taught him to "verify my references and to transcribe quoted passages with punctilious accuracy" (Sherman 153); less authoritarian professors would nonetheless drone on—toward the end of a lecture the Shakespearean Thomas Lounsbury (Yale 1871-1906) would tell restless students to be patient as "he had a few more pearls to cast" (French 430). A student's passivity, undergraduate Charles W. Hodell concluded in a Dial article in 1894, was critical to the study of Shakespeare. Show the student "essential worth" of the work and "he will welcome his Shakespeare." But "urge him to give conscious articulation to his opinion, and to dissect his sentiments and the charm of his reading is decreased" (175). Since the student needed to be convinced that literature would be

an "instrument of culture" the professor was expected to be a role model, a "living, cultured personality.... [who] needs natural and manly sentiments and thoughts, not technical apparatus, and these can find their origin only in the essential character" (Hodell 177).

This concept of Shakespeare as a practical instrument of cultivation can be traced to what I have described earlier as part of the middle class justification for Shakespeare societies: cultural accomplishment and references were seen to accompany and justify certain values and habits. A carefully cultivated character distinguished an individual from a working class counterpart who appeared to offer only labor power to an employer (Ohmann 161). As Laurence Veysey notes in his exhaustive study of late nineteenth century American universities, significant numbers of "crude but vital" Americans--those without conspicuous social position--were entering university as a means of warding off downward mobility. Veysey maintains that the university at this stage "connoted a desire to rise competitively in ways which had been strongly stylized by the urban middle class" (440). A rash of articles appearing in the 1890s by university presidents--"The Practical Value of a College Education," "Does College Education Pay?", and "College Men First Among Successful Citizens"--appealed to business-minded students. Not only wealthy individuals, but:

> ...the boy of modest circumstances who was anxious to advance, principally contributed to rising enrollments. Thus the premise of a widely expanding university system (a democratic premise) ensured that there could be no official aloofness from worldly motives. Indeed most believers in practical utility as the goal for higher education deliberately sought to cater to precisely these student ambitions (Veysey 348).

Perhaps partly because Shakespeare appeared to have practical value, in terms of cultivating rough characters, that the plays were incorporated into the university curriculum. But the more transcendent aspects of Shakespeare study, present in the self-understandings of nineteenth century clubs, were also used to justify university study. In the 1890s literary works were taught at Yale "to induce the emotional and

aesthetic faculties as well as the purely intellectual (Cook 39); at Cornell "to know the relations of these works to ...the absolute, to that which is alive evermore (Corson 61); at Chicago "for their beauty" (Tolman 89); at Pennsylvania for their "enormous weight against utilitarianism" (Schelling 141); at Wellesley for the "three-fold spirit" (Bates 141). "Facts leave us", undergraduate Hodell claimed. "Faculties never" (178).

Contrary to Warner's view of literature generally, what is perhaps most interesting about university teaching of Shakespeare is that it appears to have simply been a continuation of the myriad of interests—linguistic, aesthetic, ethical, psychological—pursued earlier in the century by ordinary amateurs who sought help from the publications and lectures of more knowledgeable amateurs. But as Warner suggests, because the lecturer was a professional, a more dictatorial rather than a reciprocal relation developed.

The public, serious amateurs included, appeared to equate all university Shakespeare study with high erudition, and to regard it on the curriculum as a triumph. Shakespeariana trumpeted the University of Michigan's systematic study of Shakespeare in 1883 ("Miscellany" 1: 32); Professor McElroy's Shakespeare class at the University of Pennsylvania in 1884 ("Miscellany" 1: 160); Corson's lectures on Shakespeare at Johns Hopkins in 1884 and at Cornell in 1886 ("Miscellany" 1: 264; 3: 370); and Vanderbilt's three hour per week course in 1887 ("Miscellany" 4: 141). W.J. Rolfe in the Popular Educator in 1887 noted approvingly that "most leading colleges now require one or more plays of Shakespeare as part of preparation in English. Harvard requires Julius Caesar and Twelfth Night for 1888....requirements are the same at Amherst, Dartmouth, Trinity, Tufts, Brown, and Wesleyan Universities. Probably Boston University will follow Harvard in this respect as in former years" (cited "A School of Shakespeare" 4: 313-14). In 1887 Shakespeariana approvingly quoted James Russell Lowell: "I never open my Shakespeare that I do not find myself wishing that there might be professorships established for the expanding of his works as there used to be for those of Dante in Italy" (4: 509). Public support was sometimes manifested in monetary contributions. In the early 1880s, James MacMillan presented the University of Michigan with $6,500 to found

a 2000 volume Shakespeare library. In 1888, Mrs. A.C. Barnes donated a sum to Cornell University, the interest from which provided an annual $60 prize for the best Shakespeare essay written by a Cornell student. This would provide, Mrs. Barnes claimed, stimulus for further work in "a study unsurpassed in its power to quicken thought, [and] enlarge the mental vision" ("Miscellany" 1: 32; 5: 165).

Further, Warner does not consider that the public's relation with Shakespeare and with amateur scholars throughout the nineteenth century might have contributed to the embrace, at the university level, of literary studies in general. At least one influential scholar saw a full year's study of Renaissance literature as the appropriate preparation for the study of Shakespeare. At the first MLA meeting in 1883, James Morgan Hart, Professor of Modern Languages at the University of Cincinnati, asserted:

> I do not believe that the great dramatist is rightly studied. He is isolated too much. We put our students into reading him before they are prepared....What we need is two volumes of selections, of equal size...one giving the quintessence of the best pieces prior to Shakespeare...the other treating in like manner Ben Jonson and the others down to the reign of Charles I (37).

Once Shakespeare had been established on most university curricula, the university began to promote its methods within the general community. The Shakespearean Richard Moulton developed the university extension movement, begun in the early 90s, to a significant degree. An MA from Cambridge, Moulton lectured in 1890 for the American Society for University Extension, an organization composed of professors and trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. In 1892 he was appointed as University Extension Professor of English Literature by the University of Chicago, helping it to become one of the leaders in the extension movement.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

University extension was initiated in a democratic spirit, created so that any individual unable to attend university could nonetheless follow courses, sharpen the

intellect, develop a taste for more challenging books and become better citizens. The extension movement recognized the efforts of literary and other clubs, but claimed these attempts accomplished little, and insisted that popular lectures were simply entertainment ("University Extension" 218-19). What was needed, claimed extension advocates at the University of Chicago, was scholarly leadership:

> We have the beginning of great things in literary clubs, lecture associations....Too often the literary clubs, composed of members seeking broader culture and an ever widening intellectual horizon, accomplish little because lacking systematic and intelligent leadership....What is needed is an accomplished scholar, an intellectual leader, a ready speaker, who through a series of lectures arranged in logical and educational sequence, will arouse an interest in a definite subject, and along that line wisely direct the reading of the community for a period of weeks. Here is the opportunity of the University Extension lecturer ("University Extension" 219-20).

By 1900, the extension movement was serving 128,000 people annually, delivering 95 courses of lectures in 65 centres ("University" 226). Given Richard Moulton's important role in extension, perhaps it may be assumed that Shakespeare courses constituted a cornerstone of the movement. In the nine-year period from 1892-1901, Moulton delivered 175 courses of lectures, and was "so much in demand that in order to secure an assignment, it is necessary that centres make applications several months in advance ("University" 239-40). Of the four literary courses offered in the town of Davenport in 1895-96, for example, Moulton's lectures on Shakespeare's tragedies were by far the best attended ("University" 231). And not only individuals, but also literary clubs "repeatedly petitioned" the University of Chicago for help. Societies such as the Shakespeare Club of Freeport, Ill., and the Shakespeare Club of Beaumont, Texas received outlines containing selected reading and paper topics in 1899-1900, for example, ensuring their efforts were "systematically directed to a definite end" ("University" 224). "Not one man in twenty thousand can read Shakespere intelligently" claimed the World's Work in

1902. "Shakespeare in the ordinary American home is used chiefly to fill bookshelf space" ("Why Shakespeare" 3249). But hope loomed in the form of "modern scientific scholarship equipped by recent research to tell us to the full just what Shakespeare conveys" (3251).

Thus the university pattern, where a scholar set the agenda and lectured and the students absorbed, permeated associations with the general public as well. Close supervision accompanied more egalitarian access to the "scientific," university approach to Shakespeare. This attitude perhaps bespoke an anxiety related to setting and maintaining standards which accompanied the attempt to create a superior citizenry.

Moulton called his approach to the plays inductive science, distancing it from what he described as the "judicial criticism" of taste. Renaissance imitators of Roman and Greek philosophy and poetry applied classical standards to their imitations, Moulton asserted, and the idea of testing against a standard to determine its superiority or inferiority remains the basis of judicial criticism. Inductive criticism, on the other hand, is based on a "scientific hypothesis, the truth of which is tested by the degree of completeness with which it explains the details of the literary work as they actually stand" (Shakespeare 25). Rather than describing the rapture elicited by the work, Moulton explained the plays and their appeal in terms of what he understood to be concrete literary facts. His Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist and the Moral System of Shakespeare are intelligently conceived studies on dramatic form, psychology and morality, well supported with textual examples. Moulton's approach to Shakespeare, although he called it inductive science, was not especially new. Public Shakespeareans such as Henry Joseph Ruggles (The Method of Shakespeare as an Artist, 1870) and Denton Snider (The System of Shakespearean Drama, 1877) had written similar analytic works dedicated to close reading. Richard Grant White had been stressing the importance of textual evidence in support of claims since mid-century. But Moulton's view of inductive reasoning left little room for individual differences in interpretation of literary fact, or sense of the text as

having places of indeterminacy to be filled in by each reader, and his attitude reflected the positivist view of science prevalent at the time. [5]

PROGRESSIVE ERA AND THE PROFESSIONAL MANAGERIAL CLASS

It is difficult to determine who attended extension courses. The Chicago University Record states rather coyly that extension was for everyone, with classes "made up entirely of the very poor; of the poor; of the poor, and those who are not rich; and of these and the well-to-do" ("University" 209). It seems reasonable to conclude that extension was influenced at least in part by the general aims of the Progressive Era's (1890-1920) upper and middle class reformers to create a "scientific citizenry". The moral idealism of an urban middle class trained to self-help, hard work and, I would suggest, audience-oriented subjectivity led to the desire to reform society. By using methods gleaned from science and business, Progressives increasingly believed that they could reform the political system, aid exploited workers and the poor, and impose a more uniform cultural standard on an increasingly diverse immigrant population. Throughout the 90s, they gathered and analyzed data extensively, documented problems and attempted to solve them by educating the public. Influenced by corporate models which effectively organized and directed thousands of people, they tried to alter attitudes, behavior and environmental conditions (Chambers 140-2). Large numbers of Progressives, and other interventionists, believed in collective action in the private sector as a means of directing change. They supplied voluntary associations with boards of directors, experts and a hierarchical order. (Chambers 151). Many reformers were a part of what Richard Ohmann calls the "Professional Managerial Class." Ohmann suggests they inherited the self-help culture of the middle class which had dwelt in lyceums, reading clubs and the refining and elevating home. They were influenced as well by an increasingly elitist view of culture which framed art as difficult, purged it of amateurism and widened the gap between creators and audiences (221). But in addition, says Ohmann, the PMC identified itself with progress and the modern:

[5] See chapter 4 for my discussion of positivist science.

> Most subscribed to an ideal of the efficient, rational, planned society, in partial opposition to the untrammeled energies of capital. Most shared an allegiance to organized knowledge, with science itself as a kind of ideal, which the new university physically embodied, as well as giving a home to the multiplying "schools" that guarded and enlarged professional knowledge and credentialed new aspirants (220).

PROGRESSIVES AND DOMESTIC SPACE

In keeping with their attempt to influence environment, the spirit of efficiency and expertise permeated reformers concept of domestic space. By 1890 reformers' critique of Victorian extravagance and internal clutter was gaining momentum. Housing styles abandoned the eclectic and picturesque, and adopted austere lines and plain materials. The tendency indoors was toward openness and simplicity. Parlour and sitting room fused into one large living area in order to avoid the wasted space of a "best, public, room." Bedrooms remained separate, but were fewer. Domestic reformers became obsessed with efficiency and health. Housekeeping was elevated to a science and reformers, in their interactions with the poor and working class, promoted hygienic wood floors, bare windows and plain furniture over dust-ridden carpets, drapes, upholstery and ornaments. Increasingly for reformers and those they influenced, the idea of a practical way of life necessitated timesaving mass-produced goods. These were found in the emerging modern department store of the 1890s, which combined access to goods with leisure and cultural services such as tearooms, art galleries and clubhouses. Bargain basements split clients into classes. Consumption was increasingly associated with both the exercise of domestic competence and the casual social event (Ohmann 140, 146, 157)

When they couldn't penetrate the homes of the poor, reformers brought the poor into a Progressive conception of the ideal environment. The settlement house--which advised, educated and cared for the immigrant poor in urban areas--was an important example of the attempt to improve environments and provide the

education that would allow for a rational, self-reliant citizenry. In 1889 perhaps the best-known settlement house--Jane Addams' Hull House—was established in Chicago. Hull House, not surprisingly, had a Shakespeare club. Referring to the brutal behaviour which provided role models for the working class in sensationalist newspapers and in life, Addams maintained that Hull House placed

> increasing emphasis upon the great inspirations and solaces of literature....The Shakespeare Club has lived a continuous existence at Hull-House for sixteen years during which time its members have heard the leading interpreters of Shakespeare, both among scholars and players. I recall that one of its earliest members said that her mind was peopled with Shakespeare characters during her long hours of sewing in a shop, that she couldn't remember what she thought about before she joined the club, and concluded that she hadn't thought about anything at all. To feed the mind of the worker, to lift it above the monotony of his task, and to connect it with the larger world, outside his immediate surroundings, has always been the object of art, perhaps never more nobly fulfilled than by the great English bard (Addams 435).

It is noteworthy that Addams makes no mention of discussion or interpretation of the plays by the group, but believes that club members benefited from leading interpreters of Shakespeare. Indeed, the isolated worker Addams refers to *thinks* about Shakespeare's characters while sewing, but the work of connecting to "the larger world" is all done by the great playwright and the experts.

SHAKESPEARE, ANTIDOTE TO MASS CULTURE

Addams' employment of Shakespeare expertly interpreted as a means of uplifting the worker was part of a movement among late century reformers and other intellectuals who were alarmed by the expansion of mass entertainment. Each week dance halls, vaudeville shows and amusement parks attracted thousands of customers, and workingmen's saloons lured as many as half the population of big cities daily (Gorman 15). Paul Gorman has shown that reformers promoted higher art

as contributing to moral uplift and a rational, enlightened citizenry, and denounced popular culture as a direct threat to the social order. It worked, as Addams declared "to incite that which should be controlled, to degrade that which should be exalted, to make sensuous that which might be lifted into the realm of the higher imagination" (cited Gorman 46). Addams blamed unchecked capitalist greed for the problem: "...quite as one set of men have organized the young people into industrial enterprises in order to profit from their toil, so another set of men...have entered the neglected field of recreation and have organized enterprises which make profit out of their invincible love of pleasure" (cited Gorman 40).

Reformers viewed the mass public as numbed, incapacitated victims, who needed guidance in order to adopt reformers' tastes as their own. Reformers assumed that taste was based on graded, universal standards, rather than shaped through individual and social situation. People rose to consecutively higher levels as they developed ethically and intellectually, and reformers promoted endless programs designed to steer the public through these levels (Gorman 28, 31).

Interestingly, as David Glassberg has shown, reformers adopted folk culture drawn from leisure traditions of Elizabethan England as their model of recreation. Progressive Era intellectuals saw the folk dance, drama, children's games and pageantry of this period as the authentic play tradition of America's Puritan ancestors, before the demands of the New World eradicated such activities. They felt a revival of these traditions would offer a wholesome alternative to mass entertainments. More interestingly, Glassberg claims they "saw Shakespeare's artistic achievement as a product of the hearty folk play of his age, and hoped that a twentieth-century resurgence of the Anglo-American folk spirit would produce a similar "dramatic renaissance" (362). In other words, they felt that leisure time properly spent might produce American Shakespeares. In any event, the promotion of these traditions appears to have been a blatant use of the figure of Shakespeare in what Glassberg calls an aggressive attempt to use the past to shape [mass] culture" (367).

William Wells Newell co-founded the American Folklore Society with the Harvard Shakespearean Francis Child in 1888. He maintained in Games and Songs

of American Children (1883) that children's tunes and ring-dances were expressions of the "customs which belonged to courtiers and noble ladies in the time of Shakespeare" (cited Glassberg, 355). English folk dances were believed to be wholesome, and Maypole festivals were close enough to Shakespeare's birthday that the two celebrations were often combined. The 1916 Shakespeare tercentenary celebrations were initiated by several national recreation associations and overseen by a Northwestern University physical education instructor. Glassberg points out the Shakespeare tercentenary was more a promotion of Elizabethan leisure activities than a celebration of Shakespearean drama. The New York Public library's guidebook featured Maypole dancers on its cover and contained considerably more information on Elizabethan games than on Shakespeare. New York settlement houses presented an English fair to honour Shakespeare, and thousands of public school students in several cities performed folk dances (Glassberg 362). A lavish New York production of "Caliban by the Yellow Sands," was successful "in the appeal to the eye." The piece essentially borrowed The Tempest's principle characters to create " a frigid and vague allegory" which was "more of a pageant and less of anything else" according to the press (Woodbridge 22).

This reduction of Shakespearean drama to a glitzy promotion for wholesome recreation has several implications, two of which Glassberg points out. The most obvious are the racist undertones accompanying attempts to homogenize multifarious cultural expressions--identifying English folk dances, for example, as "moral, social and aesthetic forces, condensed expressions of ancestral and racial traits" (cited Glassberg 359)--and the disparity between the playful, patriotic first of May celebrations and the May Day of European socialist workers.

But further, I think these celebrations illustrate the conflicted nature of Progessives' attempts to use Shakespeare as an instrument of reform by elevating mass taste. On one hand, the wish to encourage a regard for art is expressed in the initiation of mass celebrations on the artist's birthday. On the other, the close supervision and paucity of any significant discussion, enactment or reading of Shakespearean drama insulates the art from the interpretations of the ignorant. Increasingly, as Gorman maintains, cultural facilities in general became "temples of

art, places to pay homage to proclaimed totems, than workshops where people could learn about the forms and make personal assessments of their value" (31).

At least one theatre manager believed Shakespeare was one such unquestioned emblem of culture. Reformers complained about coarse theatre fare, and Boston theatre manager Lorin Deland grumbled in 1908 that "a certain public" blamed his profession for promoting "lowbrow" spectacles. Arguing he had to fill seats, Deland maintained that minority audiences with "Bad" or "Good" taste (lower and upper class respectively) were easy to target and satisfy. But the majority "no-taste" spectators were difficult to please. When full houses attended six Shakespeare productions one season, Leland nonetheless suggested that the Progressive spirit had induced the audience's passive acceptance of the plays:

> This widespread acceptance of the great dramatist is a strong argument with those who claim the possibility of higher dramatic education for the masses....(but) the average theatregoer accepts a Shakespearean play as he would accept a theory of creation. He neither apprehends its merit nor comprehends its construction. He simply admires because every one tells him he ought to admire." (496).

In other ways reformers' promotion of Shakespeare as wholesome backfired, profiting the very commercial interests they denounced. As Richard Halpern has shown, many prose summaries of Shakespeare's plays were marketed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The New Home Sewing Machine's Shakespeare Boiled Down (1890) was one attempt which associated the playwright with a product. The cover shows Shakespeare simmering in a pot, and as Halpern suggests

> thus literalizes the pamphlet's effects by converting the plays into objects of (alimentary) consumption, here allied with the mass marketing of sewing machines for the home. In addition, the image suggests a fundamental cultural ambivalence in which reading Shakespeare's works is viewed as being at once "good for you" (i.e. figuratively "nutritious" like a soup or stew), and a chore which one tries to make as effortless and painless as possible. This cultural

> ambivalence finds its expression in the "boiling down" of the great man—that is to say, reducing his stature so as to fit more comfortably into a democratized and massified culture (57).

As I have shown, a reading middle class public had sought and obtained guidance in their study of Shakespeare since the 1840s. The most popular texts, such as Hudson's family edition, were bowdlerized and heavily annotated. But the plays were viewed, at least by a middle class readership, as comprehensible, debatable and enjoyable, as well as elevating. Toward the end of the century, an increasing emphasis on their difficulty and on the expertise required for comprehension drove an aspiring middle class toward a more superficial grasp of Shakespeare. The plays were consumed in the form of crude prose condensations, in the purchase of "valuable," decorations such as Furness' Variorum, in the largely unquestioned interpretations of academics, and in the performances of experts. These elements had been part of Shakespeare culture from mid-century, but I am suggesting they were predominant by the beginning of the twentieth. They became the major means by which a mass American public received, rather than contributed to, its understanding of Shakespeare. Thus an increasingly polarized Shakespearean public consisted on one side of specialists who characterized access to Shakespeare as requiring a long apprenticeship through the university or qualified public experts. On the other side was a mass public trained to desire at least a semblance of cultivation, yet drawn to entertainment which seemed within their intellectual realm. Between these extremes were commercial interests, which promoted Shakespeare as an elevating necessity, while seeming to provide an effortless mode of assimilation.

This slip into passivity was reflected in public life. Despite efforts to create a "scientific citizenry," increasing political apathy was reflected in election turnouts around the turn of the century. Extraordinary expressions of widespread political activity which had characterized the American public throughout the 19th century faded. In South Carolina the eighty percent turnouts of the 80s dropped to eighteen per cent in 1900. By 1904, the level had fallen to below thirty per cent in the Southern states. In national elections turnouts dropped from eighty per cent of eligible voters in 1896 to under fifty per cent in 1924 (Wiebe 134).

Very broadly, some reasons for voter apathy can be linked to attempts to create rational, enlightened and knowledgeable citizens. For all their commendable efforts, historians agree that Progressives "overcorrected" in this area. First, their ambitious proposals for public welfare directed public perception to a stunted, unskilled, immigrant slum dweller in a world apart (Wiebe 128). Armed with their concept of voter competence, Progressives played a large role in disenfranchising lower income people—largely blacks and Hispanic, Asian, and European immigrants. The emphasis they placed on personalities and issues was ineffective in mobilizing vast blocks of loyal voters along party lines. And measures such as the initiative and referendum that they introduced were most successfully employed by the profusion of well-financed and organized special-interest groups they helped create (Chambers 286-7). But perhaps more critically, the climate of expertise alienated the mass public, according to Wiebe.

> The more specialized the groups or boards that managed progressive reforms, the more specialized the language obscuring these issues from ordinary citizens. The weaker the public grasp of issues, the more reformers relied on administrative solutions (165).

Second, Progressives affiliated utilitarian consumption with ideas of sanitary, progressive, domestic efficiency. Advertisers, another group of specialists, picked up on this, and spoke to faceless masses by promoting what Jean Christophe Agnew calls "the commodity aesthetic...a way of seeing the world in general, and the self and society in particular, as so much raw space to be furnished with mobile detachable and transactionable goods" (cited Ohmann 149). Given these pressures and the austere aura increasingly surrounding Shakespeare interpretation, it is understandable that the work came to be accepted by many as primarily a fashion statement—the creation of specialists, consumed for decorative purposes.

Conclusion

Shakespeare is implicitly understood as the revered entity in Henry James " The Birthplace." In that tale, Shakespeare's childhood home is a tourist trap designated "the Mecca of the English-speaking race." A middle-aged couple, the Gedges, are awestruck when they are appointed keepers and hosts of the Birthplace. When his wonder subsides, Gedge realizes that the allure surrounding the playwright and his life has been largely manufactured in order to profit from a credulous public. A disillusioned Gedge begins to relay only hard facts to Birthplace visitors, but their disappointment is palpable. Public interest in the Birthplace declines, and Gedge realizes he must adhere to the standard patter when his superior threatens to fire him. Profits surge, however, when Gedge begins to outrageously embroider his act. His pay is doubled and he is proclaimed a success.

Adorno coined the term "culture industry" several decades after James wrote his story. Yet " The Birthplace" seems to express an understanding of this concept in relation, at least in part, to the dissemination of Shakespeare beginning around the turn of the century. The playwright's mystique is enhanced and employed to extract money from the gullible masses. This passive public gains little. It consumes "culture" but does limited interpretive work. It does not read the plays and receives false information which reinforces an already distorted picture of the playwright and the work. Yet annoyed by mundane truths, people visit the Birthplace only when the myth is embellished. James' story also illustrates how individuals may detect the duplicity propelling mass culture, yet nonetheless feel themselves forced to participate in its transmission while attempting to add an empowering dimension to the experience. Gedge fears losing his job and doesn't believe what he transmits, but his private parody allows him to stretch the credulity of his audience to the limit. His performance produces feelings of intellectual superiority over them as well as material rewards from the system he helps to perpetuate.

An understanding of the large-scale appropriation of Shakespeare by the American culture industry at the beginning of the twentieth century is beyond the scope of this thesis. But I think civic behaviour around the turn of the century deserves some elaboration with respect to Habermas' contentions about commercialized mass culture during this period. To recapitulate, Habermas blames increasing state intervention in the private sphere for reducing cultural activity from rational critical debate to passive consumption. Pressured by the masses, the government forced commodity owners to exchange self-regulation for state protection. The state increasingly controlled education and many areas related to personal risk, so that the family lost a fair degree of autonomy and the exclusive power to shape the conduct of its members. Rather than associating cultural activity with rational critical debate oriented to self-understanding and preservation of privacy and autonomy, culture became a means of diversion for a mass public. Standards were lowered to appeal to a wide market. Intellectuals interpreted culture in a specialized milieu that discouraged widespread public interaction. Eventually, public opinion was more easily formed by manipulative state publicity rather than through public debate. This led to an increasingly state-administered society, where many people lost their interest in and capacity for rational critical debate.

Habermas' theory, however, underplays two critical elements in the American experience. The first is the important role middle class rational critical debate played in encouraging state intervention in private life. As I have shown, lyceums, reading clubs and the refining and elevating home developed an idealistic, public-oriented urban middle class. Their moral idealism led to the desire to reform society. Partly in response to unbridled capitalism, Progressives believed that they could amend the political system, and help exploited workers and the poor through rational means such as public debate and ameliorating environments.

Second, bourgeois influence contradictorily helped to alienate a broad public from cultural and civic activity. They developed an increasingly elitist view of culture which promoted art as difficult and frowned on amateurism. Habermas has characterized this behaviour, I think correctly, as a protective response to commercialized culture. But this climate of expertise helped alienate ordinary

citizens in civic life as well. As the public grasp of issues weakened, reformers developed the concept of voter competence, and played a large role in disenfranchising lower income people.

These actions illustrate, I think, that the rational critical thought, public debate and moral sensibilities of citizens motivated by honorable intentions do not always form the best solutions. By its simplest definition, democracy allows every individual the right to vote, as a means of conducting common affairs. Curtailing this right in any way, even in the worthwhile attempt to develop an informed, deliberative electorate, destroys the concept. As I have shown, the capacity for rational critical debate developed in conjunction with its effectiveness. Imposing a standard which weeds out less intelligible, articulate or informed participation denies excluded groups or individuals the chance to develop these skills, and to generate alternative agendas. The fact that informed, rational groups attempted to do this underscores the Habermasian idea of debate as inclusive and ongoing. Decisions arrived at through informed argument should be nonetheless potential candidates for skepticism and review.

Finally, Habermas' understanding of commercialized mass culture leaves no room for the idea of active, enlightened, interpretation of this phenomenon and its many manifestations. Popular cultural theorists have demonstrated the myriad ways in which critical analysis and social resistance develop out of exposure to commercial mass culture.[6] We need the hope that everyday citizens can transform a communicative lifeworld invaded by economic and state interests into a forum for critical social analysis. We might otherwise be doomed, like Gedge, to transmit and perpetuate cultural duplicity in the service of individual and Big Time greed.

---

[6] See for example Jessica Munns & Gita Rajan eds., A Cultural Studies Reader: History, Theory, Practice, London and New York: Longman, 1995; also Mass culture and Everyday Life, Peter Gibian ed., New York and London : Routledge, 1997 for the ways in which television and radio can provide new forums for public discourse.

Works Cited

Introduction and Chapter One

Allen, Robert C. Horrible Prettiness: Burlesque and American Culture. Chapel Hill; London: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Bender, Thomas. Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of American Intellectuals in the United States. Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1993.

Bledstein, Burton. The Culture of Professionalism. New York: W. W. Norton, 1976.

Blumin, Stuart. The Emergence of the Middle Class. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989.

Bristol, Michael D. Shakespeare's America America's Shakespeare. London & New York: Routledge, 1990.

Calhoun, Craig, ed. Habermas and the Public Sphere. Cambridge: MIT, 1994.

Cayton, Mary Kupiec. "The Making of An American Prophet: Emerson, His Audiences, and the Rise of the Culture Industry in Nineteenth-Century America." American Historical Review 92 (June, 1987): 597-620.

Robbins, Bruce, ed. The Phantom Public Sphere. Minneapolis MN: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Clark, Clifford E. The American Family Home: 1800-1960. Chapel Hill: Univ. of N. Carolina Press, 1986.

Curtis, George. "Editor's Easy Chair." Harper's New Monthly 24 (1861): 264-66.

---. " Editor's Easy Chair." Harper's 28 (1863): 130-33.

De Tocqueville, Alexis. Democracy in America. 2 vols. Ed. Phillips Bradley. New York: Vintage Books, 1945.

Dickens, Charles. American Notes for General Circulation. London, Chapman and Hall, 1850.

Dollimore, Jonathan. Radical Tragedy. 2nd ed. Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1993.

Dunn, Esther. Shakespeare in America. New York: MacMillan & Co., 1939.

Foster, George. New York by Gaslight and Other Urban Sketches. Ed. Stuart Blumin. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1991.

Fraser, Nancy. "Struggle Over Needs." Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory. Cambridge, Eng.: Polity Press, 1989. 161-187.

Geuss, Raymond. The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981.

Habermas, Jurgen. Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.

---. "Reconciliation Through the Public Use of Reason: Remarks on John Rawl's Political Liberalism." Journal of Philosophy 92 (1995): 109-131.

Hawkes, Terrence. Meaning By Shakespeare. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Higginson, Thomas. "The American Lecture System." Macmillans's Magazine 18 (1868): 48-56.

Hjort, Mette. The Strategy of Letters. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993.

Holland, J.G.. "The Popular Lecture." Atlantic Monthly 15 (1865): 362-71.

Kalra, Paul. America's Class System: Divide and Rule. Pleasant Hill Ca.: Antenna Publishing Co., 1995.

Kerbo, Harold. Social Stratification and Inequality: Class Conflict in Historical and Comparative Perspective. New York: McGraw Hill, 1991.

Larson, Magali Sarfatti. The Rise of Professionalism. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: Univ. California Press, 1977.

Lauck, John Hampton. Reception and Teaching of Shakespeare in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century America. Diss. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1991.

Levine, Lawrence. High Brow/Low Brow. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1988.

Margolies, David. "Teaching the Handsaw to Fly." The Shakespeare Myth. Ed. Graham Holderness. Manchester; New York: Manchester Univ. Press; St. Martin's Press, 1988. 42-53.

McCarthy, Thomas. "Practical Discourse: On the Relation of Morality to Politics." Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge: MIT, 1994. 51-72.

Mott, Frank. History of American Magazines. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ Press, 1938.

Ohmann, Richard. Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century. New York: Verso, 1996.

"Places of Public Amusement." Putnam's Monthly. (1854): 141-51.

Rapoport, Anatol. Fights Games and Debates. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1960.

Ryan, Mary. "Gender and Public Access: Women's Politics in 19th Century America." Habermas and the Public Sphere. Craig Calhoun ed. Cambridge: MIT, 1994. 259-288.

Schudson, Michael. "Was There Ever a Public Sphere?" Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge: MIT, 1994. 143-63.

Schwartz, Lillian. "The Art Historian's Computer." Scientific American (April 1995): 106-111.

Scott, Donald. "The Popular Lecture and the Creation of a Public in Mid-Nineeteenth Century America." Journal of American History 66 (1980): 791-810.

Shaksper. Online. LISTSERV@WS.BOWIESTATE..EDU

Sinfield, Alan. Faultlines. Berkley; Los Angeles; London: Univ. of California Press, 1992.

"The Public Lecture." Atlantic Monthly 15 (1865): 362-71.

Tomlins, Christopher L. Law, Labor, and Ideology in the Early American Republic. Cambridge, Eng.: 1993.

Trollope, Francis. Domestic Manners of the Americans. Reprinted from the 5th ed. New York: Dodd Mead, 1927.

Turner. Frederick. "The Significance of the Frontier in American History." The Frontier in American History. New York: Henry Holt & co., 1920. 1-38.

Wadsworth, Frank. The Poacher From Stratford. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. California Press, 1958.

Warner, Michael. The Letters of the Republic. Cambridge, Mass; London: Harvard Univ. Press, 1990.

---. "Professionalization and the Rewards of Literature: 1875-1900." Criticism 27 (1985) 1-28.

Wiebe, Robert. Self Rule: a Cultural History of American Democracy. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1995.

Wolff, Janet. "Art as Ideology." The Social Production of Art. London: MacMillan, 1981. 49-70.

Works Cited
Chapter Two

Bristol, Michael D. Big Time Shakespeare. London and New York: Routledge: 1996.

---. Shakespeare's America, America's Shakespeare. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Crosby, Joseph. Letter to H.H. Furness. 9 Feb, 1879. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to C.F. Ingleby. 16 July, 1882. Folger Library.

---. Letter to Richard Grant White. 2 Sept. 1874. Richard Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

---. Letter to J.P. Norris. 3 Dec. 1874. (Forwarded to Furness.) Furness Memorial Library.

---.Letter to J.P. Norris. 9 March, 1877. One Touch of Shakespeare. Ed. John Velz and Francis Teague. Washington D.C.: Folger Books, 1986. # 171, 223.

---. Letter to J.P. Norris. 30 July, 1875. Velz and Teague. # 69, 93.

---. Letter to J.P. Norris. 31 January 1875. Velz and Teague. #19, 39-40.

Dunn, Esther Cloudman. Shakespeare in America. New York: MacMillan Co., 1939.

Fraser, Nancy. "Struggle Over Needs." Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory. Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 1989. 161-187.

Furness, Horace Howard, ed. Appendix: "Othello's Color." A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Othello 2nd ed., Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1886: 389-396.

---. Letter to Richard Grant White. 15 June, 1880. Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

Genzmer, George Harvey. "Richard Grant White." Dictionary of American Biography 20 (1936): 113-114.

George, A.J., ed. Introduction. Essays on English Studies. By Henry Hudson. Boston; New York: Ginn, 1906. iii-xxii

Gibson, James M. The Philadelphia Shakespeare Story. New York: AMS Press, 1990.

Ginn, Heath & Co.'s Publications. (Advertisement.) Essays on Education, English and Shakespeare. By Henry Hudson. Boston: Ginn and Heath, 1881. 6-33.

Habermas, Jurgen. Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society. Cambridge: Polity, 1989.

Halliwell-Phillips, J. O. Letter to Richard Grant White. 8 March, 1854. Richard Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

Hjort, Mette. "The Interests of Critical Editorial Practice." Poetics 15 (1986): 259-77.

"How Did You Become a Shakespeare Student?" Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 437-44.

Hudson, Henry. "English in Schools." Essays on Education English and Shakespeare. Boston: Ginn and Heath, 1882. 3-36.

---. "How to Use Shakespeare in School." Essays on Education, English and Shakespeare Studies. Boston: Ginn and Heath, 1882. iii-xxvi.

---. Lectures on Shakespeare. 2 vols. New York: Baker & Scribner, 1848.

---. Shakespeare: His Life, Art and Characters 4th ed. 2 vols. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1902.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 28 Feb. 1871. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 27 Sept. 1873. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 4 Jan. 1875. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 3 March, 1876. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 24 Dec. 1877. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 21 April, 1879. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 29 April, 1879. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 29 April 1885. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to J. P. Norris. 19 April, 1879. Furness Memorial Library.

Ioppolo, Grace. Revising Shakespeare. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1991.

Larson, Magali Sarfatti. The Rise of Professionalism. Berkley; Los Angeles; London: Univ. of California Press, 1977.

Lowell, James Russell. "White's Shakespeare." Atlantic Monthly 3 (1859): 241-60.

Marcus, Leah. Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton. London; New York: Routledge, 1996.

McCarthy, Thomas. "Practical Discourse: on the Relation of Morality to Politics." Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge: MIT, 1994. 51-72.

Middlebury College. Place in Letters of Henry Norman Hudson. Vermont: Middlebury College, 1915.

"Reviews of Shakespeare's Scholar." New York Evening Courier. 5 Dec, 1854. Richard Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

Poe, Edgar Allan."Editorial Miscellany." Broadway Journal II 13 Dec. 1845: 359.

"Henry Hudson and the Whig Use of Shakespeare." John Stafford. PMLA 66 (1951): 652n.

"Restoration of the Text of Shakespeare." North American Review. (April 1854): 371-423.

"Reviews: 'Studies in Shakespeare'." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): 139.

Root, Robert. "Henry Hudson." Dictionary of American Biography. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936. IX: 340-1.

Shertzer, Jane. "American Editions of Shakespeare: 1753-1866." PMLA 22 (1907): 633-96.

Simon, Henry. The Reading of Shakespeare in American Schools and Colleges. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1932.

Sinfield, Alan. Faultlines. Berkley, Los Angeles, London: Univ. of California Press, 1992.

Taylor, Charles. "Atomism." Philosophical Papers II: Philosophy and the Human Sciences. Cambridge; Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985. 187-210.

---. "What is Human Agency?" Philosophical Papers I: Human Agency and Language. Cambride: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985. 15-44.

---. "Foucault on Freedom and Truth." Philosophical Papers I: Human Agency. 152-184.

Velz, John and Francis Teague. One Touch of Shakespeare. Washington: Folger Books, 1986.

Westfal, Alfred van. American Shakespeare Criticism: 1607-1865. New York: H.W. Wilson Co., 1939.

White, Richard Grant. Studies in Shakespeare. Boston and New York; Houghton Mifflin: 1886.

---. England Without and Within. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1881.

---. American View of the Copyright Question. London and New York: Routledge, 1880.

---. The Works of William Shakespeare. 12 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, 1865-72. Vol 1.

---. Introduction. The Confessons of William Henry Ireland, Containing the Particulars of His Fabrication of the Shakespeare Manuscripts. New York: Bouton, 1874.

---. Shakespeare's Scholar. New York: Appleton, 1854.

---. "Anatomizing of William Shakespeare." 4 parts. Atlantic Monthly 53 (May, June, Aug, Sept., 1884): 595-612; 815-837; 257-67; 313-26.

---."On Reading Shakespeare." 3 parts. Studies in Shakespeare. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1886. 3: 38-57.

---. "King Lear: the Text." Studies in Shakespeare. 183-210.

---. "The Florentine Arithmetician." Studies in Shakespeare. 101-126.

---. Letter to William A. Whiteman (apparently unsent). 10 June, 1858. Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

---. Unaddressed letter (apparently unsent). 20 May, 1868. Richard Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 7 June, 1877. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 6 April, 1880. Furness Memorial Library.

Works Cited
Chapter Three

Addams, Jane. Twenty years at Hull House. New York: MacMillan, 1938.

Adee, Alvey. "The Bankside reference Canon of the Shakespeare Plays: A Pleas for its Adoption for all the Plays." Shakespeariana 10 (1893): 153-176.

"A Quiz Upon the Tempest." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 123-25.

"A School of Shakespeare." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): 455-65.

Bacon, Theodore. Delia Bacon: A Biographical Sketch. Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1888.

Bate, Jonathan. "Shakespeare and Original Genius." Genius: History of an Idea. Ed. Penelope Murry. Oxford, New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989. 76-97.

Benton, Myron B."Shakespeare and the Musical Glasses." Appleton's Journal. (1879): 336-344. Bibliography of the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy. Ed. W. H. Wyman. Cincinnati: Peter G. Thomson, 1884. 62-63.

Bernstein, Melvin H. "Charlotte Endymion Porter." Notable American Women: 1607-1950. 3 vols. Ed. T. James. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1971. 1:83-85.

Blair, Karen. The Clubwoman as Feminist. NY, London: Holmes & Meier, 1980.

---. The Torchbearers. Bloomington & Indiana: Indiana Univ Press, 1994.

Blumin, Stuart. Emergence of the Middle Class. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989.

Brady, Marilyn Dell. "Kansas Federation of Colored Women's Clubs: 1900-1930." Kansas History 9 (1986): 19-30.

Christie, W.J. "The Women's Clubs of Montana." Rocky Mountain Magazine 2 (1901): 579-591.

Croly, Jane. History of the Women's Club Movement. NY Henry G Allen and Co., 1898.

Crosby, Joseph. Letter to C.F. Ingleby. 17 June, 1881. Folger Library.

DeGrazia, Marguerita. Shakespeare Verbatim: the Reproduction of Authenticity and the 1790 Apparatus. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, 1991.

De Tocqueville, Alexis. Democracy in America. 2 vols. Phillips Bradley ed., New York: Vintage Books, 1945.

Gilmore, J. H. "Did Shakespeare Write Shakespeare?" Chicago Standard. (31 Jan. 1884). Wyman Bibliography 117.

Griffiths, L.M. Evenings With Shakspere. Bristol: J.W. Arrowsmith, 1889.

Gutman, Herbert. "Work, Culture and Society." American Historical Review 78 (1973): 564-85.

Holmes, Nathaniel. "The Shakespearean Myth." St. Louis Globe Democrat 17 November 1881. Wyman Bibliography 80-81.

Hooper, Henry. "Shakespeare as a Myth." Cincinnati Commercial Gazette (April 29, 1883). Wyman Bibliography 108.

Hopkins, Vivian. Prodigal Puritan: a Biographical Sketch of Delia Bacon. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959.

Hudson, Henry. "How to Use Shakespeare in School." Essays in Education, English Studies and Shakespeare. Boston: Ginn & Heath, 1881. iii-xxvi.

James, Henry. Letter to Violet Hunt. 11 Aug. 1903. Henry James. 4 vols. Ed. Leon Edel. London: MacMillan of London Ltd, 1974. 4: 281.

Knupfer, Anne Meis. "Toward a Tenderer Humanity and a Nobler Womanhood: African-American Women's Clubs in Chicago, 1890-1920." Journal of Women's History 7 (1995): 58-75.

Leighton, William Jr. "Who Was Shakespeare?" Address at Shakespeare Club Banquet, Wheeling. Sunday Register. (29 April 1883). Wyman Bibliography 109.

"List of Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 88-92.

Mallery, Garrick and R.L. Ashhurst. Shakspere Society of Philadelphia: Histories:1851-1879. 1880.

Melville, Herman. Letter to Evert Duyckinck. 14 Nov. 1848. The Melville Log. 10 vols. Ed. Jay Leyda. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1951. 1: 282-3.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 1 (1884): 264.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 2 (1885): 404.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 8 (1891): 247.

Morgan, Appleton. The Shakespearean Myth. 2nd ed. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke and Co., 1881.

"Mr. Richard Grant White's Opinion." New York Herald 8 Sept. 1874. 3.

Murray, Penelope. Genius: History of an Idea. Oxford, New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

"Outline of a Scheme for a Course of Shakespeare Study." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): 516-17.

O'Connor, William D. Mr. Donnelly's Reviewers. Chicago, New York, San Francisco: Belford, Clarke & Co., 1889.

---. Harrington: a Story of True Love. Boston: Thayer & Eldridge, 1860.

Parsons, Katherine Barrette. History of Fifty Years: Ladies' Literary Club, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1877-1927. Arrow Press, 1927.

Porter, Charlotte Endymion. Letter to H.H. Furness. 19 Dec. 1905. Furness Memorial Library.

Porter, Dorothy. "The Organized Activities of Negro Literary Societies." Journal of Negro Education 5 (1936): 555-76.

Pyle, J. Gilpin. The Little Cryptogram. St. Paul: Pioneer Press Co., 1888.

Records of the Shakespeare Society of New York: 1852-3.

Ryan, Mary. "Gender and Public Access: Women's Politics in Nineteenth-Century America." Habermas and the Public Sphere Ed.Craig Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass: MIT, 1992. 259-288.

Scammon, F. J. "Completion of the Bankside Shakespeare." Shakespeariana 10 (1893): 21-27.

Scott, Anne Firor. Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History. Urbana; Chicago: Univ. Illinois Press, 1991.

"Shakespeare Societies of America," Shakespeariana 2 (1885): 480-488.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 1 (1883): 29.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 1 (1883): 59-60.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 1 (1884): 159.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 2 (1885): 48-49.

"Shakespeare Societies," Shakespeariana 4 (1887): 320-30.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 30.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 263-66.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 311-15.

"Shakespeare Societes." Shakespeariana 6 (1889): 286.

Shoemaker, W.L. "To Certain Theorists: A Sonnet." Literary World 24 Feb. 1883. Wyman Bibliography 99.

Story, Ronald. "Class and Culture in Boston." American Quarterly 27 (1975): 179-199.

Teague, Francis. "A Nineteenth Century Shakespeare Reading Club." Shakespeare Newsletter 27 (1977): 20.

"To You." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): ii.

Twain Mark. Is Shakespeare Dead? New York: Harper, 1909.

Wadsworth, Frank. The Poacher From Stratford. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. California Press, 1958.

Weld, Theodore T. "Shakespeare in the Classroom." Shakespeariana 3 (1886) 437-450.

White, Richard Grant. "The Bacon-Shakespeare Craze." Studies in Shakespeare. Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1886.151-182.

Whitman, Walt. "Bacon/Shakespeare Cipher." Leaves of Grass. Eds. Bradley Sculley and Harold W. Blodgett. NewYork: W.W. Norton, 1973. 544.

Wilkes, George. Shakespeare from an American Point of View. New York: Appleton & Co., 1877.

Winter, Alice Ames. The Business of Women's Clubs. New York: Century, 1925.

Wyman, W. H. Bibliography of the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy. Cincinnati: Peter G.Thomson, 1884.

Works Cited
Chapter Four

Abel, Elizabeth, ed. Introduction. Writing and Sexual Difference. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1982.

Allen, Robert. Horrible Prettiness: Burlesque and American Culture. Chapel Hill: Univ. of N. Carolina Press, 1991.

Andresen-Thom, Martha. "Shrew-taming and Other Rituals of Aggression." Women's Studies 9 (1982): 121-43.

Benstock, Shari, ed. Introduction. Feminist Issues in Literary Scholarship. Bloomington; Indianapolis: Indiana Univ. Press, 1987.

Blassingame, John W. Frederick Douglass Papers Series One: Speeches, Debates and Interviews. 5 vols. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1991.

---. Index: Shakespeare references. Frederick Douglass Papers. 2: 604; 3:670; 4:655; 5:693.

Bloom, Harold. The Western Canon. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1994.

Bond, Frederick. The Negro and the Drama. Washington: Associated Publishers Inc., 1940.

Buechler, Steven M. Transformation of the Woman Suffrage Movement: Case of Illinois, 1850-1920. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1986.

Crosby, Joseph. Letter to J.P. Norris. 20 April 1875. One Touch of Shakespeare. Eds. John Velz and Francis Teague. Washington D.C.: Folger Books, 1986: # 42 63.

Deutsch, Morton. "Conflicts: Productive and Destructive." Conflict Resolution Through Communication. Ed. Fred E. Jandt. New York: Harper and Row, 1973. 155-197.

Douglass, Frederick. "Skin Aristocracy of America." 2 Feb. 1847. Blassingame. Frederick Douglass Papers. 2:3-8.

---. "Pioneers in a Holy Cause." 2 Aug. 1847. Blassingame. 2:69-84.

---. "Slavery and the Slave Power." 8 Dec. 1850. Blassingame. 2:249-260.

---. "Persecution on Account of Faith, Persecution on Account of Color." 26 Jan. 1851. Blassingame 2:291-310.

---. "Great Britain's Example is Noble and Grand." 6 Aug. 1885. Blassingame. 5: 192-212.

DuBois, Ellen Carol, ed. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony: Correspondence, Writing, Speeches. New York: Schoken Books, 1981.

Engle, Gary D. This Grotesque Essence: Plays From the Minstrel Stage. Baton Rouge: Lousiana State Univ. Press, 1978.

Flynn, Elizabeth and Patrocinio P. Schweickart, eds. Introduction. Gender and Reading: Essays on Readers, Texts and Contexts. Baltimore ; London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press: 1986.

Fortune, T. Thomas. "The Sage of Anacostia: an Interview Given in Washington D.C. Cleveland Gazette. 10 Sept 1892. Frederick Douglass Papers. Ed. Blassingame. 5: 497-501.

Franchot, Jenny. "The Punishment of Esther: Frederick Douglass and the Construction of the Feminine." Frederick Douglass: New Literary and Historical Essays. Ed. Eric J. Sunquist. New York: Cambridge Univ Press, 1990. 66-83.

Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere." Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass; London: MIT, 1992. 109-142.

Gates, Henry Louis. "The Trope of the New Negro and the Reconstruction of the Image of the Black." Representations 24 (1988): 129-55.

Grunbaum. Adolph The Foundations of Psychoanalysis. Berkley; Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1984.

Habermas, Jurgen. "Coping With Contingencies: the Return of Historicism." Debating the State of Philosophy: Habermas, Rorty and Kolakowski. Eds. Jozef Niznik and John T. Sanders. Westport, CT.: Praeger, 1996, 1-23.

---. "Historical Materialism and the Development of Normative Structures." Communication and the Evolution of Society. Trans. Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1976: 95-129.

Hall, Jonathan. Anxious Pleasures. London: Associated Univ Presses, 1995.

Hjort, Mette. The Strategy of Letters. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993.

Livingston, Paisley. Literary Knowledge. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1988.

Margolies, David. "Teaching the Handsaw to Fly." The Shakespeare Myth. Ed. Graham Holderness. Manchester; New York: Manchester Univ. Press; St. Martin's Press, 1988. 42-53.

Jacobs, Henry E. and Claudia D. Johnsson, eds. Annotated Bibliography of Shakespeare Burlesques, Travesties and Parodies. New York; London: Garfield Publishing, 1976.

Markham, Pauline with Richard Grant White. The Life of Pauline Markham, Written by Herself. 1871.

Martin, Waldo E. The Mind of Frederick Douglass. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1984.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 1 (1884): 264.

Moses, Wilson J. " Writing Freely? Frederick Douglass and the Constraints of Racialized Writing." Frederick Douglass: New Literary and Historical Essays. Ed. Eric J. Sunquist. New York: Cambridge Univ Press, New York, 1990.66-83.

Novy, Marianne. Love's Argument: Gender Relations in Shakespeare. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolin Press, 1984. 53-60.

Rorty, Richard. "Emancipating Our Culture." Debating the State of Philosphy. Eds. Jozef Niznik and John T. Sanders. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996. 24-30.

---. Contingency, Irony Solidarity. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989.

Ryan, Mary. "Gender and Public Access: Women's Politics in Nineteenth-Century America." Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge, Mass: MIT, 1992.

Sandoval, Chela. "Feminist Forms of Agency and Oppositional Conscious: Us Third World Feminist Criticism." Provoking Agents: Gender and Agency in Theory and Practice. Ed. Judith Kegan Gardiner. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1995. 208-226.

Saxton, Alexander. The Rise and Fall of the White Republic: Class Politics and Mass Culture in Nineteenth Century America. London & New York: Verso, 1990.

Schudson, Michael. "Was There Ever a Public Sphere?" Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge: MIT, 1994. 143-163.

Simmons, William J. "Ira Aldrige." Men of Mark. New York: Arno Press and The New York Times, 1968. 733-41.

Sinfield, Alan. "Give an Account of Shakespeare and Education." Political Shakespeare: New Essays on Cultural Materialism. Eds. Sinfield and Jonathan Dollimore. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1985.135-55.

---."Introduction." Political Shakespeare. 130-33.

---. Faultlines. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: Univ. of California Press, 1992.

Skolnick, Arlene. Embattled Paradise: the American Family in an Age of Uncertainty. New York: Basic Books, 1991.

Spelman, Elizabeth. "Now You See Her, Now You Don't." Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought. Boston: Beacon Press, 1988: 160-87.

Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. Eighty Years and More. New York: European Publishing Co., 1898.

Velz, John and Francis Teague. One Touch of Shakespeare. Washington, D.C.: Folger Books, 1986.

Wayne, Valerie. " Refashioning the Shrew." Shakespeare Studies 17 (1985): 159-87.

Wells, Stanley. Nineteenth Century Shakespeare Burlesques 5. London: Diploma Press, 1978.

Wiebe, Robert. Self Rule. A Cultural History of American Democracy. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1995.

Wilkes, George. Shakespeare From an American Point of View. New York: Appleton & Co., 1877.

Works Cited
Chapter Five

"A Quiz Upon the Tempest." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 123-25.

"A School of Shakespeare." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): 455-65.

"A School of Shakespeare." Shakespeariana 4 (1887): 313-16.

Addams, Jane. Twenty Years at Hull House. New York: MacMillan, 1938.

Adee, Alvey. "The Bankside Reference Canon of the Shakespeare Plays." Shakespeariana 10 (1893): 153-76.

Anderson, Melville B. "Some Recent Illustrations of Shakespeare." Dial 26 (1899): 11-15.

Bates, Katharine Lee. "English at Wellesley College." English in American Universities. Ed. William Morton Payne. Boston: d.C. Heath & Co., 1895. 141-148.

Bender, Thomas. Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of American Intellectuals in the United States. Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1993.

Chambers, John Whiteclay. The Tyranny of Change: America in the Progressive Era 1890-1920. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Cook, Albert S. "English at Yale University." Morton English in American Universities. 29-39.

Corson, Hiram. "English at Cornell University." Morton English. 60-64.

---. An Introduction to the Study of Shakespeare. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1889.

Crosby, Joseph. Letter to J.P. Norris. 7 July 1875. One Touch of Shakespeare. Eds. John Velz and Francis Teague. Washington, D.C.: Folger Books, 1986. #64 88.

---. Letter to J.P. Norris. 3 May, 1878. Velz and Teague #244 316.

Deland, Loran F. "A Plea for the Theatrical Manager." Atlantic Monthly 102 (Oct. 1908): 492-500.

Demmon, Isaac. "Shakespeare Course at the University of Michigan." Shakespeariana 4 (1887): 463-5.

French, Robert D. "Thomas Raynesford Lounsbury." Dictionary of American Biography 11 (1933): 430.

Furness, Horace Howard. Letter to R.G. White. 11 June, 1871. Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

---. Letter to R.G. White 2 June, 1873. Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

---. Letter to Mrs. R.G. White. 5 December, 1885. Grant White papers. New York Historical Society, New York City.

---. Letter to R.G. White. 15 June, 1880. Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

---. Letter to Annis Lee. 25 July 1897. Letters of H.H. Furness. 2 vols. Ed. Horace Horward Furness Jayne. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1922. 1: 328.

Gibson, James M. The Philadelphia Shakespeare Story. New York: AMS Press, 1990.

Glassberg, David. "Restoring a 'Forgotten Childhood': American Play and the Progressive Era's Elizabethan Past." American Quarterly 32 (1980): 351-368.

Gorman, Paul. Left Intellectuals and Popular Culture in Twentieth Century America. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Graff, Gerald. Professing Literature: An Institutional History. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1987.

Hart, James Morgan. "The College Course in English Literature, How it May be Improved." PMLA (1884-5). Origins of Literary Studies. Eds.Gerald Graff and Michael Warren. New York & London: Routledge, 1989. 28-33.

Harvard University Shakespeare Club. Minutes. 27 March, 1908. Houghton Library, Harvard University.

Halpern, Richard. Shakespeare Among the Moderns. Ithaca, New York; London: Cornell Univ. Press, 1997.

Hewett, Thomas Waterman. Cornell University: A History. 4 vols. New York: University Publishing Society, 1905. Vol 2.

Hodell, Charles W. "English Literature from the Standpoint of the Student." English in American Universities. Ed. William Morton Payne. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co.: 1895: 175-82.

"How Did You Become a Shakespeare Student?" Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 485-93.

"How Did You Become a Shakespeare Student?" Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 437-44.

Hudson, Henry. "How to Use Shakespeare in School." Essays on Education, English Studies and Shakespeare. Boston: Ginn and Heath, 1882. iii-xxvi.

Larson, Magalli. The Rise of Professionalism. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: Univ. of California Press, 1977.

"List of Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 88-92.

Lowell, James Russell. "Shakespeare Professorships." Shakespeariana 4 (1887): 509.

"Miscellany." Shakespearian 1 (1883): 32.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 1 (1884): 160

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 1 (1884): 264.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 2 (1885): 403-5.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): 370.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 4 (1887): 141-42.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 165.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 8 (1891): 247.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 9 (1892): 122.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 9 (1892): 185-186.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 10 (1893): 53.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 10 (1893): 255.

Moulton, Richard. Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist: a Popular Illustration of the Principles of Scientific Criticism. 3rd edition. New York: Dover, 1966.

"New York Shakespeare Society and it Officers." Shakespeariana 7 (1890):181-89.

Ohmann, Richard. Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets and Class at the Turn of the Century. London; New York: Verso, 1996.

Payne, William Morton. English in American Universities. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., 1895.

"Review of The Bankside Shakespeare." The Christian Union, Oct. 3, 1889. Reprinted Shakespeariana 6 (1889): 483-491.

Scammon, F.J. "The Completion of the Bankside Shakespeare." Shakespeariana 10 (1893): 21-27.

"Shakespeare Societies in New York City." Shakespeariana 8 (1891): 175-77.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 1 (1883): 59-60.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 1 (1884): 159.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 1 (1883): 29.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 2 (1885): 48-9.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 4 (1887): 320-30.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 263-66.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 311-15.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 6 (1889): 275-286.

Sherman, Stuart P. "Professor Kittredge and the Teaching of English." Origin of Literary Studies. Gerald Graff and Michael Warner eds. New York & London: Routledge, 1989.

Simon, Henry. The Reading of Shakespeare in American Schools and Colleges. New York: Simon & Shuster Inc., 1932.

Thom, William Taylor. Two Shakespeare Examinations with Some Remarks on the Classroom Study of Shakespeare. Boston: Ginn, Heath and Co., 1883.

Thomas Lounsbury. Dictionary of American Biography 11. 430.

"To You." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): ii.

"University Extension Issue." University Record 26. 27 September, 1901. 205-45.

Velz, John and Francis Teague. One Touch of Shakespeare. Washington, D.C.: Folger Books, 1986.

Veysey, Laurence. Emergence of the American University. Chicago; London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1965.

Warner, Michael. "Professionalization and the Rewards of Literature: 1875-1900." Criticism 27 (1985) 1-28.

White, Richard Grant. "Anatomising of William Shakespeare." Atlantic Monthly 53 (June, 1884): 815-837.

---. Studies in Shakespeare. Boston; New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1886.

---. "King Lear: the Text." Studies in Shakespeare. 183-210.

"Why Shakespeare is not Understood." World's Work 5 (1902-3): 3249-3251).

Wiebe, Robert. Self Rule: A Cultural History of American Democracy. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1995.

Woodbridge, Homer E. "Two Shakespeare Tercentenary Plays." Dial 61 (1916): 22.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Quiz Upon the Tempest." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 123-25.

"A School of Shakespeare." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): 455-65.

"A School of Shakespeare." Shakespeariana 4 (1887): 313-16.

Abel, Elizabeth, ed. Introduction. Writing and Sexual Difference. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1982.

Addams, Jane. Twenty years at Hull House. New York: MacMillan, 1938.

Adee, Alvey. "The Bankside Reference Canon of the Shakespeare Plays." Shakespeariana 10 (1893): 153-76.

Allen, Robert. Horrible Prettiness: Burlesque and American Culture. Chapel Hill: Univ. of N. Carolina Press, 1991.

Anderson, Melville B. "Some Recent Illustrations of Shakespeare." Dial 26 (1899): 11-15.

Andresen-Thom, Martha. "Shrew-taming and Other Rituals of Aggression." Women's Studies 9 (1982): 121-43.

Bacon, Theodore. Delia Bacon: A Biographical Sketch. Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1888.

Bate, Jonathan. "Shakespeare and Original Genius." Genius: History of an Idea. Ed. Penelope Murry. Oxford, New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989. 76-97.

Bender, Thomas. Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of American Intellectuals in the United States. Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1993.

Benstock, Shari, ed. Introduction. Feminist Issues in Literary Scholarship. Bloomington; Indianapolis: Indiana Univ. Press, 1987.

Bernstein, Melvin H. "Charlotte Endymion Porter." Notable American Women: 1607-1950. 3 vols. Ed. T. James. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1971. 1:83-85.

Blair, Karen. The Clubwoman as Feminist. NY, London: Holmes & Meier, 1980.

---. The Torchbearers. Bloomington & Indiana: Indiana Univ Press, 1994.

Blassingame, John W. Frederick Douglass Papers Series One: Speeches, Debates and Interviews. 5 vols. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1991.

Bledstein, Burton. The Culture of Professionalism. New York: W. W. Norton, 1976.

Bloom, Harold. The Western Canon. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1994.

Blumin, Stuart. Emergence of the Middle Class. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989.

Bond, Frederick. The Negro and the Drama. Washington: Associated Publishers Inc., 1940.

Brady, Marilyn Dell. "Kansas Federation of Colored Women's Clubs: 1900-1930." Kansas History 9 (1986): 19-30.

Bristol, Michael D. Big Time Shakespeare. London and New York: Routledge: 1996.

---. Shakespeare's America, America's Shakespeare. London & New York: Routledge, 1990.

Buechler, Steven M. Transformation of the Woman Suffrage Movement: Case of Illinois, 1850-1920. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1986.

Calhoun, Craig, ed. Habermas and the Public Sphere. Cambridge: MIT, 1994.

Cayton, Mary Kupiec. "The Making of An American Prophet: Emerson, His Audiences, and the Rise of the Culture Industry in Nineteenth-Century America." American Historical Review 92 (June, 1987): 597-620.

Chambers, John Whiteclay. The Tyranny of Change: America in the Progressive Era 1890-1920. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Christie, W.J. "The Women's Clubs of Montana." Rocky Mountain Magazine 2 (1901): 579-591.

Clark, Clifford E. The American Family Home: 1800-1960. Chapel Hill: Univ. of N. Carolina Press, 1986.

Corson, Hiram. An Introduction to the Study of Shakespeare. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1889.

Croly, Jane. History of the Women's Club Movement. NY Henry G Allen and Co., 1898.

Crosby, Joseph.. One Touch of Shakespeare: Letters of Joseph Crosby to Joseph Parker Norris. Ed. John Velz and Francis Teague. Washington D.C.: Folger Books, 1986.

---. Letter to C.F. Ingleby. 17 June, 1881. Folger Library.

---. Letter to C.F. Ingleby. 16 July, 1882. Folger Library.

---. Letter to J.P. Norris. 3 Dec. 1874. (Forwarded to Furness.) Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to Richard Grant White. 2 Sept. 1874. Richard Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 9 Feb, 1879. Furness Memorial Library.

Curtis, George. "Editor's Easy Chair." Harper's New Monthly 24 (1861): 264-66.

---. " Editor's Easy Chair." Harper's 28 (1863): 130-33.

DeGrazia, Marguerita. Shakespeare Verbatim: the Reproduction of Authenticity and the 1790 Apparatus. Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press, 1991.

De Tocqueville, Alexis. Democracy in America. 2 vols. Ed. Phillips Bradley. New York: Vintage Books, 1945.

Deland, Loran F. "A Plea for the Theatrical Manager." Atlantic Monthly 102 (Oct. 1908): 492-500.

Demmon, Isaac. "Shakespeare Course at the University of Michigan." Shakespeariana 4 (1887): 463-5.

Deutsch, Morton. "Conflicts: Productive and Destructive." Conflict Resolution Through Communication. Ed. Fred E. Jandt. New York: Harper and Row, 1973. 155-197.

Dickens, Charles. American Notes for General Circulation. London, Chapman and Hall, 1850.

Dollimore, Jonathan. Radical Tragedy. 2nd ed. Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1993.

Douglass, Frederick. Frederick Douglass Papers Series One: Speeches, Debates and Interviews. 5 vols. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1991.

DuBois, Ellen Carol, ed. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony: Correspondence, Writing, Speeches. New York: Schoken Books, 1981.

Dunn, Esther Cloudman. Shakespeare in America. New York: MacMillan Co., 1939.

Engle, Gary D. This Grotesque Essence: Plays From the Minstrel Stage. Baton Rouge: Lousiana State Univ. Press, 1978.

Flynn, Elizabeth and Patrocinio P. Schweickart, eds. Introduction. Gender and Reading: Essays on Readers, Texts and Contexts. Baltimore ; London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press: 1986.

Fortune, T. Thomas. "The Sage of Anacostia: an Interview Given in Washington D.C. Cleveland Gazette. 10 Sept 1892. Frederick Douglass Papers. Ed. Blassingame. 5: 497-501.

Foster, George. New York by Gaslight and Other Urban Sketches. Ed. Stuart Blumin. Berkeley; Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1991.

Franchot, Jenny. "The Punishment of Esther: Frederick Douglass and the Construction of the Feminine." Frederick Douglass: New Literary and Historical Essays. Ed. Eric J. Sunquist. New York: Cambridge Univ Press, 1990. 66-83.

Fraser, Nancy. "Struggle Over Needs." Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory. Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 1989. 161-187.

---. "Rethinking the Public Sphere." Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge; London: MIT, 1992.

French, Robert D. "Thomas Raynesford Lounsbury." Dictionary of American Biography 11. (1933): 430.

Furness, Horace Howard, ed. Appendix: "Othello's Color." A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: Othello 2nd ed. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1886: 389-396.

---.Letter to R.G. White. 11 June, 1871. Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

---. Letter to R.G. White 2 June, 1873. Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

---. Letter to R.G. White. 15 June, 1880. Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

---. Letter to Mrs. R.G. White. 5 December, 1885. Grant White papers. New York Historical Society, New York City.

---. Letter to Annis Lee. 25 July 1897. Letters of H.H. Furness. 2 vols. Ed. Horace Horward Furness Jayne. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1922. 1: 328.

Gates, Henry Louis. "The Trope of the New Negro and the Reconstruction of the Image of the Black." Representations 24 (1988): 129-55.

Genzmer, George Harvey. "Richard Grant White." Dictionary of American Biography 20 (1936): 113-114.

George, A.J., ed. Introduction. Essays on English Studies. By Henry Hudson. Boston; New York: Ginn, 1906. iii-xxii

Geuss, Raymond. The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1981.

Gibson, James M. The Philadelphia Shakespeare Story. New York: AMS Press, 1990.

Ginn, Heath & Co.'s Publications." (Advertisement.) Essays on Education, English and Shakespeare. By Henry Hudson. Boston: Ginn and Heath, 1881. 6-33.

Glassberg, David. "Restoring a 'Forgotten Childhood': American Play and the Progressive Era's Elizabethan Past." American Quarterly 32 (1980): 351-368.

Gorman, Paul. Left Intellectuals and Popular Culture in Twentieth Century America. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Graff, Gerald. Professing Literature: An Institutional History. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1987.

Griffiths, L.M. Evenings With Shakspere. Bristol: J.W. Arrowsmith, 1889.

Grunbaum. Adolph The Foundations of Psychoanalysis. Berkley; Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1984.

Gutman, Herbert. "Work, Culture and Society." American Historical Review 78 (1973): 564-85.

Habermas, Jurgen. "Coping With Contingencies: the Return of Historicism." Debating the State of Philosophy: Habermas, Rorty and Kolakowski. Eds. Jozef Niznik and John T. Sanders. Westport, CT.: Praeger, 1996, 1-23.

---. "Reconciliation Through the Public Use of Reason: Remarks on John Rawl's Political Liberalism." Journal of Philosophy 92 (1995): 109-131.

---. Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: an Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society. Cambridge: Polity, 1989.

---. "Historical Materialism and the Development of Normative Structures." Communication and the Evolution of Society. Trans. Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1976: 95-129.

Hall, Jonathan. Anxious Pleasures. London: Associated Univ Presses, 1995.

Halliwell-Phillips, J. O. Letter to Richard Grant White. 8 March, 1854. Richard Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

Halpern, Richard. Shakespeare Among the Moderns. Ithaca, New York; London: Cornell Univ. Press, 1997.

Hart, James Morgan. "The College Course in English Literature, How it May be Improved." PMLA (1884-5). Origins of Literary Studies. Eds.Gerald Graff and Michael Warren. New York & London: Routledge, 1989. 28-33.

Harvard University Shakespeare Club. Minutes. 27 March, 1908. Houghton Library, Harvard University.

Hawkes, Terence. Meaning By Shakespeare. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Hewett, Thomas Waterman. Cornell University: A History. 4 vols. New York: University Publishing Society, 1905. Vol 2.

Higginson, Thomas. "The American Lecture System." Macmillans's Magazine 18 (1868): 48-56.

Hjort, Mette. "The Interests of Critical Editorial Practice." Poetics 15 (1986): 259-77.

---. The Strategy of Letters. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993.

Hodell, Charles W. "English Literature from the Standpoint of the Student." English in American Universities. Ed. William Morton Payne. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co.: 1895: 175-82.

Holland, J.G.. "The Popular Lecture." Atlantic Monthly 15 (1865): 362-71.

Hopkins, Vivian. Prodigal Puritan: a Biographical Sketch of Delia Bacon. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959.

How Did You Become a Shakespeare Student?" Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 485-93.

How Did You Become a Shakespeare Student?" Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 437-44.

Hudson, Henry. "How to Use Shakespeare in School." Essays in Education, English Studies and Shakespeare. Boston: Ginn & Heath, 1881. iii-xxvi.

---. "English in Schools." Essays on Education English and Shakespeare. Boston: Ginn and Heath, 1882. 3-36.

---. Lectures on Shakespeare. 2 vols. New York: Baker & Scribner, 1848.

---. Shakespeare: His Life, Art and Characters 4th ed. 2 vols. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1902.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 21 April, 1879. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 24 Dec. 1877. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 27 Sept. 1873. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 28 Feb. 1871. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 29 April 1885. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 29 April, 1879. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 3 March, 1876. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 4 Jan. 1875. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to J. P. Norris. 19 April, 1879. Furness Memorial Library.

Shaksper. listserv@ws.Bowiestate.edu

Ioppolo, Grace. Revising Shakespeare. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1991.

Jacobs, Henry E. and Claudia D. Johnsson, eds. Annotated Bibliography of Shakespeare Burlesques, Travesties and Parodies. New York; London: Garfield Publishing, 1976.

James, Henry. Letter to Violet Hunt. 11 Aug. 1903. Henry James. 4 vols. Ed. Leon Edel. London: MacMillan of London Ltd, 1974. 4: 281.

---. The Altar of the Dead; The Beast in the Jungle; The Birthplace and Other Tales. London: MacMillan: 1922.

Kalra, Paul. America's Class System: Divide and Rule. Pleasant Hill Ca.:Antenna Publishing Co., 1995.

Kerbo, Harold. Social Stratification and Inequality: Class Conflict in Historical and Comparative Perspective. New York: McGraw Hill, 1991.

Knupfer, Anne Meis. "Toward a Tenderer Humanity and a Nobler Womanhood: African-American Women's Clubs in Chicago, 1890-1920." Journal of Women's History 7 (1995): 58-75.

Larson, Magali Sarfatti. The Rise of Professionalism. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: Univ. California Press, 1977.

Lauck, John Hampton. Reception and Teaching of Shakespeare in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century America. Diss. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1991.

Levine, Lawrence. High Brow/Low Brow. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1988.

"List of Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 88-92.

Livingston, Paisley. Literary Knowledge. Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1988.

Lowell, James Russell. "Shakespeare Professorships." Shakespeariana 4 (1887): 509.

Lowell, James Russell. "White's Shakespeare." Atlantic Monthly 3 (1859): 241-60.

Mallery, Garrick and R.L. Ashhurst. Shakspere Society of Philadelphia: Histories:1851-1879. 1880.

Marcus, Leah. Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton. London; New York: Routledge, 1996.

Margolies, David. "Teaching the Handsaw to Fly." The Shakespeare Myth. Ed. Graham Holderness. Manchester; New York: Manchester Univ. Press; St. Martin's Press, 1988. 42-53.

Markham, Pauline with Richard Grant White. The Life of Pauline Markham, Written by Herself. 1871.

Martin, Waldo E. The Mind of Frederick Douglass. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1984.

McCarthy, Thomas. "Practical Discourse: on the Relation of Morality to Politics." Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge: MIT, 1994. 51-72.

Melville, Herman. Letter to Evert Duyckinck. 14 Nov. 1848. The Melville Log. 10 vols. Ed. Jay Leyda. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1951. 1: 282-3.

Middlebury College. Place in Letters of Henry Norman Hudson. Vermont: Middlebury College, 1915.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 1 (1883): 32.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 1 (1884): 160.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 1 (1884): 264.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 1 (1884): 264.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 2 (1885): 403-5.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): 370.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 4 (1887): 141-42.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 165.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 8 (1891): 247.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 9 (1892): 122.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 9 (1892): 185-186.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 10 (1893): 53.

"Miscellany." Shakespeariana 10 (1893): 255.

Morgan, Appleton. The Shakespearean Myth. 2nd ed. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke and Co., 1881.

Moses, Wilson J. "Writing Freely? Frederick Douglass and the Constraints of Racialized Writing." Frederick Douglass: New Literary and Historical Essays. Ed. Eric J. Sunquist. New York: Cambridge Univ Press, New York, 1990.66-83.

Mott, Frank. History of American Magazines. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ Press, 1938.

Moulton, Richard. Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist: a Popular Illustration of the Principles of Scientific Criticism. 3rd edition. New York: Dover, 1966.

"Mr. Richard Grant White's Opinion." New York Herald 8 Sept. 1874. 3.

Murray, Penelope. Genius: History of an Idea. Oxford, New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Novy, Marianne. Love's Argument: Gender Relations in Shakespeare. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolin Press, 1984. 53-60.

"New York Shakespeare Society and it Officers." Shakespeariana 7 (1890): 181-89.

O'Connor, William D. Mr. Donnelly's Reviewers. Chicago, New York, San Francisco: Belford, Clarke & Co., 1889.

---. Harrington: a Story of True Love. Boston: Thayer & Eldridge, 1860.

Ohmann, Richard. Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets and Class at the Turn of the Century. London; New York: Verso, 1996.

"Outline of a Scheme for a Course of Shakespeare Study." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): 516-17.

Parsons, Katherine Barrette. History of Fifty Years: Ladies' Literary Club, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1877-1927. Arrow Press, 1927.

Payne, William Morton. English in American Universities. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., 1895.

"Places of Public Amusement." Putnam's Monthly. (1854): 141-51.

Poe, Edgar Allan."Editorial Miscellany." Broadway Journal II 13 Dec. 1845: 359.

"Henry Hudson and the Whig Use of Shakespeare." John Stafford. PMLA 66 (1951): 652n.

Porter, Charlotte Endymion. Letter to H.H. Furness. 19 Dec. 1905. Furness Memorial Library.

Porter, Dorothy. "The Organized Activities of Negro Literary Societies." Journal of Negro Education 5 (1936): 555-76.

Pyle, J. Gilpin. The Little Cryptogram. St. Paul: Pioneer Press Co., 1888.

Rapoport, Anatol. Fights Games and Debates. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1960.

Records of the Shakespeare Society of New York: 1852-3.

"Restoration of the Text of Shakespeare." North American Review. (April 1854): 371-423.

"Review of The Bankside Shakespeare." The Christian Union, Oct. 3, 1889. Reprinted Shakespeariana 6 (1889): 483-491.

"Reviews of Shakespeare's Scholar." New York Evening Courier. 5 Dec, 1854. Richard Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

"Reviews: 'Studies in Shakespeare'." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): 139.

Robbins, Bruce, ed. The Phantom Public Sphere. Minneapolis MN: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Root, Robert. "Henry Hudson." Dictionary of American Biography. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936. IX: 340-1.

Rorty, Richard. "Emancipating Our Culture." Debating the State of Philosphy. Eds. Jozef Niznik and John T. Sanders. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996. 24-30.

---. Contingency, Irony Solidarity. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989.

Ryan, Mary. "Gender and Public Access: Women's Politics in 19th Century America." Habermas and the Public Sphere. Craig Calhoun ed. Cambridge: MIT, 1994. 259-288.

Sandoval, Chela. "Feminist Forms of Agency and Oppositional Conscious: Us Third World Feminist Criticism." Provoking Agents: Gender and Agency in Theory and Practice. Ed. Judith Kegan Gardiner. Urbana and Chicago: 1995. 208-226.

Saxton, Alexander. The Rise and Fall of the White Republic: Class Politics and Mass Culture in Nineteenth Century America. London & New York: Verso, 1990.

Scammon, F. J. "Completion of the Bankside Shakespeare." Shakespeariana 10 (1893): 21-27.

Schudson, Michael. "Was There Ever a Public Sphere?" Habermas and the Public Sphere. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge: MIT, 1994. 143-163.

Schwartz, Lillian. "The Art Historian's Computer." Scientific American. (April 1995): 106-111.

Scott, Anne Firor. Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History. Urbana; Chicago: Univ. Illinois Press, 1991.

Scott, Donald. "The Popular Lecture and the Creation of a Public in Mid-Nineeteenth Century America." Journal of American History 66 (1980): 791-810.

"Shakespeare Societies in New York City." Shakespeariana 8 (1891): 175-77.

"Shakespeare Societies of America," Shakespeariana 2 (1885): 480-488.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 1 (1883): 29.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 1 (1883): 59-60.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 1 (1884): 159.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 2 (1885): 48-9.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 4 (1887): 320-30.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 30.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 263-66.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 5 (1888): 311-15.

"Shakespeare Societies." Shakespeariana 6 (1889): 275-286.

Sherman, Stuart P. "Professor Kittredge and the Teaching of English." Origin of Literary Studies. Gerald Graff and Michael Warner eds. New York & London: Routledge, 1989.

Shertzer, Jane. "American Editions of Shakespeare: 1753-1866." PMLA 22 (1907): 633-96.

Simmons, William J. "Ira Aldrige." Men of Mark. New York: Arno Press and The New York Times, 1968. 733-41.

Simon, Henry. The Reading of Shakespeare in American Schools and Colleges. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1932.

Sinfield, Alan. Faultlines. Berkley, Los Angeles, London: Univ. of California Press, 1992.

---. "Give an Account of Shakespeare and Education." Political Shakespeare: New Essays on Cultural Materialism. Eds. Sinfield and Jonathan Dollimore. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1985. 135-55.

---.Introduction. Political Shakespeare. 130-33.

Skolnick, Arlene. Embattled Paradise: the American Family in an Age of Uncertainty. New York: Basic Books, 1991.

Spelman, Elizabeth. "Now You See Her, Now You Don't." Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought. Boston: Beacon Press, 1988: 160-87.

Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. Eighty Years and More. New York: European Publishing Co., 1898.

Story, Ronald. "Class and Culture in Boston," American Quarterly 27 (1975). 179-99.

Taylor, Charles. "Atomism." Philosophical Papers II: Philosophy and the Human Sciences. Cambridge; Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985. 187-210.

---. "Foucault on Freedom and Truth." Philosophical Papers I: Human Agency. 152-184.

---. "What is Human Agency?" Philosophical Papers I: Human Agency and Language. Cambride: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985. 15-44.

Teague, Francis. "A Nineteenth Century Shakespeare Reading Club." Shakespeare Newsletter 27 (1977): 20.

"The Public Lecture." Atlantic Monthly 15 (1865): 362-71.

Thom, William Taylor. Two Shakespeare Examinations with Some Remarks on the Classroom Study of Shakespeare. Boston: Ginn, Heath and Co., 1883.

"To You." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): ii.

Tomlins, Christopher L. Law, Labor, and Ideology in the Early American Republic. Cambridge, Eng.: 1993.

Trollope, Francis. Domestic Manners of the Americans. Reprinted from the 5th ed. New York: Dodd Mead, 1927.

Turner, Frederick. "The Significance of the Frontier in American History." The Frontier in American History. New York: Henry Holt & co., 1920. 1-38.

Twain Mark. Is Shakespeare Dead? New York: Harper, 1909.

"University Extension." University Record 26. 27 September, 1901. 205-45.

Veysey, Laurence. Emergence of the American University. Chicago; London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1965.

Wadsworth, Frank. The Poacher From Stratford. Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. California Press, 1958.

Warner, Michael. The Letters of the Republic. Cambridge, Mass; London: Harvard Univ. Press, 1990.

---. "Professionalization and the Rewards of Literature: 1875-1900." Criticism 27 (1985) 1-28.

Wayne, Valerie. " Refashioning the Shrew." Shakespeare Studies 17 (1985): 159-87.

Weld, Theodore T. "Shakespeare in the Classroom." Shakespeariana 3 (1886): 437-450.

Wells, Stanley. Nineteenth Century Shakespeare Burlesques 5. London: Diploma Press, 1978.

Westfal, Alfred van. American Shakespeare Criticism: 1607-1865. New York: H.W. Wilson Co., 1939.

White Richard Grant. Shakespeare's Scholar. New York: Appleton, 1854.

---. The Works of William Shakespeare. 12 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, 1865-72. Vol 1.

---. American View of the Copyright Question. London and New York: Routledge, 1880.

---. England Without and Within. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1881.

---. Studies in Shakespeare. Boston and New York; Houghton Mifflin: 1886.

---. Introduction. The Confessions of William Henry Ireland, Containing the Particulars of his Fabrication of the Shakespeare Manuscripts. New York: Bouton, 1874.

---. "Anatomizing of William Shakespeare." 4 parts. Atlantic Monthly 53 (May, June, Aug, Sept., 1884): 595-612; 815-837; 257-67; 313-26.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 6 April, 1880. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to H.H. Furness. 7 June, 1877. Furness Memorial Library.

---. Letter to William A. Whiteman. 10 June, 1858. Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

---. Unaddressed letter. 20 May, 1868. Richard Grant White Papers. New York Historical Society.

Whitman, Walt. "Bacon/Shakespeare Cipher." Leaves of Grass. Eds. Bradley Sculley and Harold W. Blodgett. NewYork: W.W. Norton, 1973. 544.

"Why Shakespeare is not Understood." World's Work 5 (1902-3): 3249-3251.

Wiebe, Robert. Self Rule: a Cultural History of American Democracy. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1995.

Wilkes, George. Shakespeare From An American Point of View. New York: Appleton & Co., 1877.

Winter Alice Ames. The Business of Women's Clubs. New York: Century, 1925.

Wolff, Janet. "Art as Ideology." The Social Production of Art. 2nd ed. London: MacMillan, 1993.

Woodbridge, Homer E. "Two Shakespeare Tercentenary Plays." Dial 61 (1916): 22.

Wyman, W. H. Bibliography of the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy. Cincinnati: Peter G. Thomson, 1884.