

Facing Europe in Crisis: Shakespeare's World and Present Challenges

COORDINATION

Richard Chapman

Florence March

Paola Spinozzi

Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin

Title
Facing Europe in Crisis:
Shakespeare's World and
Present Challenges

Design
Diana Vila Pouca
With the contribution of
Rafaela Rocha

Coordination
Richard Chapman
Florence March
Paola Spinozzi
Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin

Print
Greca Artes Gráficas

ISBN
978-989-746-388-4

Editorial Coordination
Isabel Pacheco,
U.Porto Press

Legal Deposit
540921/24

Editorial Revision
Maria José Cunha
Joana Caetano

Print run
250 copies

Coleção Transversal
N.º 22

1st Edition, Porto,
December 2024
Universidade do Porto
Praça Gomes Teixeira,
4099-002 Porto

<http://up.pt/press>
editup@reit.up.pt

DOI
<https://doi.org/10.21747978-989-746-388-4/fac>

Financed by national funds through FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia,
I.P., under the project UIDB/04097/2020 – CETAPS.

Facing Europe in Crisis: Shakespeare's World and Present Challenges

COORDINATION

Richard Chapman

Florence March

Paola Spinozzi

Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin

Contents

Acknowledgements	11
Notes on contributors	13
Facing Europe in Crisis: Shakespeare's World and Present Challenges	25
Richard Chapman, Florence March, Paola Spinozzi, Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin	
Part 1. Shakespeare's World and Ours	41
1.1. Shakespeare's World and Crisis: Dilemmas of a Scholarly Representation	43
Agnes Matuska	
1.2. The Skin and Film on the Ulcer: Anatomy and the Performance of the Body on the Early Modern and Postmodern Stage	55
Attila Kiss	
1.3. Learned Goths and Roman Exports: <i>Titus Andronicus</i> and Presentism in the 2010s	67
Miguel Ramallete Gomes	
1.4. Restitutional Shakespeare. Past Concerns and Present issues	79
Andreas Mahler	
1.5. Time's Up, Tarquin: <i>The Rape of Lucrece</i> in the Age of #Metoo	91
Juan F. Cerdá	
1.6. Educated Shrews: Shakespeare, Women's Education and Its Backlash	101
Larisa Kocic-Zámbó, Szegedi Tudományegyetem	
1.7. Mrs Shakespeare's New Face(t)s	117
Paola Spinozzi	

1.8. "No. I don't think I am me. Not any more": Sacrificing the Self in Utopia Meegan Louise Clark	139
--	-----

Part 2. Politics and Crisis	155
------------------------------------	------------

2.1. "Tott'ring Fortune / Who at her certain'st reels": Shakespeare's Politics of Chance Mirka Horová	157
---	-----

2.2. The Thane and the Scullery Maid: Making Shakespeare Address the Populist Crisis Paul Franssen	173
--	-----

2.3. From a Corrupt Eden to Bio-power: War and Nature in the Henriad Martin Procházka	185
---	-----

2.4. 'There Is No Alternative': <i>Timon of Athens</i> and Contemporary Economic Crises Imogen Goodman	195
--	-----

2.5. "Dive, thoughts, down to my soul": The Politico-Aesthetic Function of Vice and Machiavel in <i>Richard III</i> and <i>House of Cards</i> Eline Reinhoud	209
---	-----

2.6. Our Inability to Imagine a Utopian Alternative Hannah Goldstein	221
---	-----

Part 3. Intercultural Dialogues and Dialectics	247
---	------------

3.1. Crossing the Mediterranean in Early Modern Drama Sabine Schülting	249
---	-----

3.2. "Wheeling strangers of here and everywhere": Present Issues of Integration and the Early Modern Crisis of Conversion Lieke Stelling	263
---	-----

3.3. Crisis and Otherness: The Role of Language Richard Chapman	275
--	-----

3.4. LOL and LLL Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin	287
---	-----

3.5. Shakespeare and the Origins of European Culture Wars Jean-Christophe Mayer	297
--	-----

3.6. Shakespeare's Diplomacy: A European Language in Conversation with the World Nathalie Rivere de Carles	309
3.7. Crisis: Meeting the Other and the Philosophy of Dialogue Marta Gibinska	329
Part 4. What Can We Do with Shakespeare? Education, Participation and Civic Engagement	337
4.1. Shakespearean Dreams for a New Prison Mariacristina Cavecchi	339
4.2. Shakespeare in Captivity: The Avignon Festival and Le Pontet Penitentiary. An Interview with Olivier Py Florence March	351
4.3. Shakespearean Explorations in Captivity Ton Hoenselaars	361
4.4. Working with Shakespeare: The Ethics of Community Engagement and Participatory Theatre Janice Valls-Russell	383
4.5. Crises of Our Time in Song of the Goat Theatre's <i>Island</i> Agnieszka Romanowska	403

1.5. Time's Up, Tarquin: *The Rape of Lucrece* in the Age of #MeToo

Juan F. Cerdá
Universidad de Murcia

ABSTRACT

The emergence of cultural materialism in the 1980s provoked a substantial reevaluation of Shakespeare's work, as critics felt the ethical need to renegotiate the values and discourses of early modern culture as they circulated in late Western societies. Certain plays, such as *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Titus Andronicus* and *Measure for Measure*, have received especial scrutiny from the perspective of gender. Instead, inhabiting a rather peripheral space within the Shakespeare canon, his poetry has received little attention as much as its resonances are of similar relevance to the concerns of late gender debates.

This chapter extends this presentist reevaluation of early modern literature by examining the poem *The Rape of Lucrece* in the light of current discussions of feminism and gender violence. Shakespeare's treatment of rape – an otherwise central concern of early modern culture – and of Lucrece – a character that also fascinated Geoffrey Chaucer and John Gower amongst others – is here analysed in relation to (post)modern conceptions of feminine empowerment. Ultimately, the question is whether Lucrece's bravery can be taken on by the brave new worlds, peoples, and women of the twentieth-first century.

The Rape of Lucrece is currently not amongst Shakespeare's most popular works.¹ It can be argued that 1855 lines of iambic pentameter distributed among 265 septets of steady "rhyme royal" (*ababbcc*) is not the most fashionable format in the Netflix-obsessed late-modern cultural climate of 2019. But this wasn't always the case. Together with numerous editions and praising references by fellow poets, in 1598 Gabriel Harvey annotated in the margin of his copy of Chaucer that "[t]he younger sort take much delight in Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*, but his *Lucrece* and his tragedy of *Hamlet Prince of Denmarke*, have it in them to

please the wiser sort" (*apud* Hehmeyer, 2013: 140). This illustrates the intellectual depth and popularity with which the poem was perceived at the time. A high regard which contrasts with the marginal position the poem holds nowadays within the Shakespeare canon. Even specifically, within the specialized circles of Shakespearean scholarship, the poem has not fared too well and, as Katharine Eisaman Maus has suggested, such limited attention can be at least partly attributed to how modern critics have "persistently object[ed] to its elaborate rhetoric" (Eisaman Maus, 1986: 66). This is, I believe, an accurate characterization of much of what has been written about the poem. A line of inquiry that is to a large extent exhausted or, at least, outdated since debates about the rhetorical quality of Shakespeare's works have become rare in a research community that now tends not to evaluate, but to historicize Shakespeare's writing.

However, a different approach has kept the poem alive, that is (what I should broadly term) feminist criticism. It is not a surprise that feminism would have something to say about a poem that re-versifies the semi-historical, semi-mythical account of the rape of Lucrece, the virtuous, chaste and beautiful wife of the nobleman Collatine, at the hands of Tarquin, son of the last Roman king: a poem that provides an extensive and intensive representation of the psychological processes involved in a sexual assault; a poem that ends with Lucrece's suicide, the banishment of Tarquin and the rest of the royal family, and the establishment of the Roman republic. Sustained attention to the motivations, processes and consequences of rape make the poem worth revisiting in 2019, a time in which sexual violence – from the Harvey Weinstein scandal to the Spanish "Wolfpack" / "La Manada", just to name two high-profile cases – has taken up a specially relevant space within the preoccupations of late-modern feminism.

Why Did Lucrece Commit Suicide?

Much of what has been written about the poem has had to do with Lucrece, her reaction to abuse and, especially, the motivations and implications of her final suicide. To frame the debate and establish what I see as the three basic strands of criticism regarding Lucrece, we have to go back in time around eleven centuries prior to the writing of the poem, for it was Saint Augustine who in his influential theological/philosophical/political treaty *The City of God* inaugurated a moralistic evaluation of Lucrece's suicide that has influenced later critical reactions to the poem. If she was chaste, why was she killed, wonders Saint Augustine. In his view,

if women keep a clean mind during the sexual aggression, even when raped, “in the witness of their own conscience, they enjoy the glory of chastity” (Augustine, [426 AD] 1871: 30). This is not the case of Lucrece for Augustine, who finds her actions incoherent and explains that in her suicide Lucrece was excessively eager for honour and covetous of glory. Shakespeare’s poem reactivated the debate in 1594, and as Sasha Roberts has shown, in the 17th century Lucrece is represented through “contradictory images (...) as both an honourable icon and adulterous sinner” (Roberts, 2002: 107), the latter position being articulated through numerous Augustinian-inspired attacks, which include one by Margaret Cavendish.

It is difficult to gauge the contemporary strength of these “Augustinian criticisms” of the poem, but Katharine Eisaman Maus’s article locates the two latest scholarly discussions in the 1960s. It is tempting to assume that Saint Augustine’s views are anachronistic in 2019. But as hard as it is to imagine an Augustinian attack on Lucrece’s suicide within current gender debates, we should not be too quick to assume that Augustinian values are a thing of the past. As that Christian faith is cemented on the idea that “God created man in his own image” (Genesis 1:27), Christianity assumes that human life is sacred from the moment of its inception and any attempt of any kind to end it is unjustifiable. Christian beliefs on the preservation of life go beyond suicide and are intimately linked to current debates on issues such as euthanasia and pregnancy termination. What we could call “pro-life ideology” is rooted in perspectives on human life that we could call Augustinian. In other words, although feminism will quickly oppose this view, it is not difficult to accept that Christian-inflected reactions that deem Lucrece’s suicide as morally reprehensible may be still available now.

The antagonism between pro-life movements and feminism has been constant since the passing of abortion laws in most Western countries in the late 1960s and 70s (UK: 1967 / US: 1973). But, paradoxically, Lucrece’s suicide makes her an uncomfortable heroine for feminism too. Renowned Shakespeareans such as Nancy Vickers (1985) and Coppelia Kahn (1997: 27-45), among others, have expressed their reservations towards Lucrece because of the poem’s “belittling image of feminine passivity” (Hyland, 2003: 119). To put it succinctly, this critical position interprets Lucrece not just as a victim of Tarquin’s abuse, but also as an accomplice of patriarchy in the way she fails to resist male domination. After the Augustinian perspective, this one reads Lucrece’s suicide as an example of victimized, disempowered and inactive femininity. Within this view, it is problematic to regard Lucrece as an icon for the kind of feminism that Vickers and Kahn seem to subscribe to. As Catherine Belsey notes, “critics influenced by

feminism have predominantly seen Shakespeare's Lucrece instead as the victim of patriarchal values, whether the passive object of a struggle between men or in her suicide complicit with masculine misogyny" (Belsey, 2001: 315).

It is the 2001 article that Catherine Belsey establishes a third position towards Lucrece's suicide somehow closer to later feminist standpoints. According to her, Shakespeare is very clear in presenting the "appalling character" of Tarquin's assault, which "impugns the identity of a faithful wife and eradicates the personal sovereignty of a human subject". But instead of reading Lucrece as a victim of a "forcible bodily violation" (*idem*, 329), Belsey sees her as the source of action and agency, as she is responsible for Tarquin's banishment, for the end of Roman monarchy, and for the beginning of the democratic republic:

Her final victim-ization, rendered by her own hand, is at the same time the ultimate act of self-determination; the object of violence is simultaneously the subject as agent of her own judicial execution (...) By her death Lucrece dissolves her shame, erases the threat of Collatine's lineage, and motivates political action (...) a new political order founded not on possession but on consent. (*idem*, 331)

In her reading of the poem Belsey sides with more recent debates on sexual violence in which feminism is trying to react against the victimization of rape "survivors" (not of rape "victims"). It is an update of the discussion, aspiring to improve the epistemology of rape by emphasizing positive models of female agency and empowerment. Lucrece does not survive but Belsey's reading makes her a martyr for a higher cause. Her death was worthwhile as she is solely responsible for political change, for democracy, for a more equalitarian model of Roman citizenship.

I personally connect better with Belsey's take on the poem, but St. Augustine, Kahn and Belsey share a problem of central importance to late-feminist approaches to rape: their focus on the *evaluation* of the victim's response to the assault, an assessment that is at risk of promoting the hierarchical classification of victims of sexual violence depending on their reaction to the attack. The three perspectives seem to be looking for an answer to the same question: did Lucrece react to Tarquin's assault in the right manner? When it comes to the sexual assault, the poem is very clear and neither St. Augustine, nor Kahn nor Belsey dispute that Lucrece's endurance is exemplary. But the three are judgmental in their approach to Lucrece's response to the assault and perhaps too comfortable in deciding whether her final suicide was the right way to handle the aggression.

From a modern knowledge of post-traumatic disorders, Lucrece's suicide is hardly an enigma, and from this perspective Shakespeare can only be praised for articulating the complexities of a character in such mental distress so richly. But if we can learn anything from a late-modern understanding of sexual violence, it is that, since there is no consent (and not even St. Augustine takes issue with that), whether rape victims fought bravely or froze in terror, or how they carried themselves after the assault should take up a marginal space in the conversation, if any space at all. Thus, my point is that, although in different degrees, Augustinian and feminist readings of the poem (whether they attack or defend Lucrece) have so far provided analyses that tend to perpetuate the scrutiny of the victim. In turn, late feminism advises us not to concentrate on Lucrece, but on the perpetrator.

Why Did Tarquin Rape Lucrece?

In 2019 the question is not anymore "was Lucrece right in killing herself", or "is she a viable model for feminism". Late feminism begs us to go back to the poem and take up Lucrece's question, when she awakes, terrified, as Tarquin has begun the assault, and wonders: "Under what colour he commits this ill" (v. 476). The question then is not "why did Lucrece commit suicide", but "why did Tarquin rape her". In her book of 1998, *Gender and Violence in Contemporary Theory*, Gill Allwood claims that it was around the 1980s that feminist debates about rape started to shift:

Although the emphasis was still on women as survivors of violence, the 1980s also saw a growing (if still limited) interest in men and masculinity. Feminists had begun to consider the violent man and not just the survivor. Attention was drawn to the ordinariness of rapists and men who are violent in the home, and the notion that there is something different about them was slowly being worn away. (Allwood, 1998: 109)

The first sustained discussion of the issue dates to 1975, with the milestone publication of Susan Brownmiller's *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. There she credits Austrian psychologist Wilhelm Reich as being the first to call attention to the "masculine ideology of rape", but her book stands as the seminal feminist contribution that characterized rape not as an individual but

as a systemic problem. As Alison Healicon has recently argued in *The Politics of Sexual Violence* (2016), up until the '80s and '90s, rape had historically been understood as the manifestation of "isolated incidents resulting from individual pathology rather than a pattern within the wider social and political context" (Healicon, 2016: 5). Since then, the literature on the topic has become growingly abundant. Allwood describes rape as an instrument of social control. Anderson and Doherty characterize rape as being socially produced and socially legitimated (2008). The list goes on to paint a picture of what feminism has come to term *rape culture*, that is, the "culture in which sexual violence is a normalized phenomenon, in which male-dominant environments (...) encourage and sometimes depend on violence against women" (Projanski, 2001: 9). Such claim has gained especial relevance in the last couple of years with the Harvey Weinstein scandal and the resulting proliferation of incidents disclosed by the #metoo movement. Within this perspective of "rape culture", Allwood lists the three "most commonly held beliefs" rejected by feminism: "that rape is due to men's sudden and uncontrollable sexual urges; that rape is always committed by strangers; and that rapists are "mad" or in some way marginal to "normal" society" (Allwood, 1998: 125).

If we look at Shakespeare's poem from a late feminist approach to rape, the result is problematic. From this perspective, the problem is not, as Kahn suggested, that Lucrece is too passive, but that Tarquin's abuse is represented as a case of lustful insanity. As Belsey reminds us, "in accordance with a metaphoric commonplace of the period, passion enslaves the desiring Tarquin" (Belsey, 2001: 323). And the problem is not just that the rhetoric of the impassioned slave is recurrent in the poem, but that throughout the over 700 lines that Shakespeare dedicates to Tarquin and his inner process, the poem provides a picture of an out-of-line sociopath, unable to control his sexual urges: "My will is strong", Tarquin says, "past reason's weak removing" (v. 243). Within this perspective, the poem facilitates a psychoanalytical reading, as Belsey has remarked:

The poem's image of Tarquin beside himself, slave to an insatiable desire beyond the reach of Law, is strangely Lacanian three hundred and fifty years *avant la lettre*. In a manner that closely resembles Jacques Lacan's doomed, desiring subject, in command of everything but its own desire (...), the king's son, dissatisfied with what he already possesses, wants precisely what, because it is forbidden, will destroy him and all he already has. (Belsey 2001: 323)

A psychoanalytical reading of the poem, like this one, can be disappointing for feminism because a Lacanian interpretation would attribute Tarquin's abuse to the *nature* of the human psyche and would fail to frame the poem within the bigger picture of the *culture* of rape, its ideological motivations and political ramifications. As French sociologist Welzer-Lang argues, "the fact that men choose exactly when and whom they hit demonstrates that their behaviour is both intentional and conditioned and that violence is not due to a loss of control" (*apud* Allwood, 1998 121), but Shakespeare's portrayal of Tarquin, inflamed with Lucrece's beauty, falls within the stereotype of the uncontrollably mad rapist that feminism has been resisting in the last few decades. A reading of Tarquin as prey to his untameable passion shuts down the social and institutional dimension of rape. And if we give credibility to Tarquin's explanations of his motives and passions, as Shakespeare's rhetoric promotes, we give in to the individualization of the problem, which disconnects Tarquin's violence from the larger patriarchal culture that feminism demands us to inspect. Perhaps at this point we can take on again the old attack against the poem's rhetoric. But from a feminist perspective, the complaint would not be that the lines are too elaborate but that they are misdirected. To give an example, that instead of making Lucrece blame Tarquin's assault on the "Night", "Opportunity" and "Time" for almost two hundred lines, Shakespeare could have dedicated those long rhetorical passages to exploring the social mechanisms that provoked the attack and led to her suicide.

Before I close my discussion, it is important to acknowledge that, if we look past the sociopathic portrayal of Tarquin, the poem offers plenty of opportunities to comment on the larger patriarchal system that Shakespeare depicts. For example, the poem assumes that the essential physical and mental weakness of women are gender-related; through mercantile rhetoric and metaphors of possession Lucrece is continuously objectified and subdued to an ownership power-struggle between her father, her husband and, ultimately, her aggressor; and both Belsey and Hyland have provided convincing arguments on how at the end of the poem Brutus, who will become a leader of the Republic, takes political advantage of Lucrece's suicide. Still, I contend that the portrayal of Tarquin is problematic in the way it erases the ideological foundations of rape. In a late feminist perspective, *The Rape of Lucrece* understands rape as an isolated, extraordinary incident, characterized by contingent and deranged passion, and not as the endemic social, political, and cultural problem that the #metoo scandals are a clear example of.

I believe that many of the feminist perspectives I have presented in the discussion are to a large extent complementary and that, rather than excluding each other, together they constitute a crucial body of contributions within the

critical history of the poem. But, in 2019, in the age of #metoo, late-modern feminism is especially sensitive to de-politicised understandings of rape, which are still very much in circulation. So, let me close the discussion with an anecdote. In the recent Spanish presidential race, a news comment by Cayetana Álvarez de Toledo, congressional candidate of the Partido Popular illustrates my point. She said:

Enough with instrumentalizing the pain of victims and women. Conjugal violence is not a political crime. There is no macho organization devoted to killing women. There is no ideology behind conjugal violence. There is no organization that says “let’s kill women”. (Álvarez de Toledo, 2019)

[Basta ya de instrumentalizar el dolor de las víctimas y de las mujeres. La violencia de pareja no es un crimen político. No hay una organización de machos que se dedique a matar a mujeres. No hay ideología tras la violencia de pareja. No hay una organización que diga ‘matemos a las mujeres’” (my translation)].

This paper explores how *The Rape of Lucrece* has provided problematic responses, even within feminist criticism, by evaluating and overemphasizing Lucrece’s suicide. And then I have shifted the debate towards Tarquin and warned that Shakespeare’s treatment of rape may portray a de-politicised understanding of gender violence, a perspective that would promote views like the one expressed by Cayetana Álvarez. Feminism, I am sure, will continue to shape and be shaped by Shakespeare’s works and, in the case of this congresswoman, I am not too worried, as I do not think her ideology welcomes much debate, just as I do not think she reads much Shakespeare.

Notes

1. This work is part of research project PGC2018-094427-B-I00, funded by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades (MICINN) and FEDER and project PID2022-139809NB-I00, funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and FEDER, UE.

Works cited

- Allwood, Gil (1998), *French Feminisms: Gender and Violence in Contemporary Theory*, London, UCL Press.
- Álvarez de Toledo, Cayetana (2019). "Álvarez de Toledo acusa a Sánchez de instrumentalizar el dolor de las mujeres", *La Vanguardia*, 25 April 2019.
- Anderson, Irina / Kathy Doherty (2008), *Accounting for Rape: Psychology, Feminism and Discourse Analysis in the Study of Sexual Violence*, London, Routledge.
- Augustine, Aurelius (1871), *The Works of Aurelius Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, Vol. 1., The City of God*, Edinburgh, T&T Clark.
- Belsey, Catherine (2001), "Tarquin Dispossessed: Expropriation and Consent in 'The Rape of Lucrece'", *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 52, nr. 3, pp. 315-335.
- Brownmiller, Susan (1975), *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*, New York, Fawcett Columbine.
- Eisaman Maus, Katharine (1986), "Taking Tropes Seriously: Language and Violence in Shakespeare's *Rape of Lucrece*", *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 37, nr. 1, pp. 66-82.
- Healicon, Allison (2016), *The Politics of Sexual Violence: Race, Identity and Feminism*, London, Palgrave.
- Hehmeyer, Jeffrey Paxton (2013), "Heralding the Commonplace: Authorship, Voice, and the Commonplace in Shakespeare's 'Rape of Lucrece'", *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 64, nr. 2, pp. 139-164.
- Hyland, Peter (2003), *An Introduction to Shakespeare's Poems*, London, Palgrave.
- Kahn, Coppélia (1997), *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women*, London, Routledge.
- Projanski, Sarah (2001), *Watching Rape: Film and Television in Postfeminist Culture*, New York, New York UP.
- Roberts, Sasha (2002), *Reading Shakespeare's Poems in Early Modern England*, London, Palgrave.
- Shakespeare, William (2002), *Complete Sonnets and Poems*, ed. Collin Burrow, London, Penguin.
- Vickers, Nancy (1985), "'The Blazon of Sweet Beauty's Best': Shakespeare's *Lucrece*", in Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman (ed.), *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, London, Routledge.