Maybe Baby, or Pregnant Possibilities in Medieval and Early Modern Literature  
Bethany Packard, Holly Barbaccia, Jane Wanninger

Workshop Summary:  
This workshop will explore depictions of potentially maternal bodies in medieval and early modern literature and culture and the contingent temporalities they figure. Possibly pregnant or once pregnant bodies and their hypothetical offspring bring together past, present, and future, provoking questions about the intersections of epistemology and embodiment animated by the complexities of time. Was she pregnant? Is she pregnant now, and how can anyone tell? How would maternity shape her social role? What will result from this pregnancy? Our discussion of temporality will intersect with questions about periodicity and teleology and issues of legacy, genealogy, and origins.

Workshop Description:  
Our conversation will probe the intersecting ambiguities of temporality and maternity associated with possible pregnancies through characters like Chaucer’s Criseyde and Wife of Bath and Shakespeare’s Joan la Pucelle and Helena. Helena’s pregnancy at the end of All’s Well That Ends Well, and the future it signifies, illuminates the anxiety-inducing, temporally circuitous possibilities for potentially maternal figures. In the final scene, she seems to return from the dead promising yet more new life. Helena claims that she is pregnant—and pregnancy is a precondition of the play’s happy ending—but in contrast to other pregnant characters on the 17th century stage, like the Duchess of Malfi and Hermione, there are no descriptions of her physical appearance, and pregnancy is here a matter a performance. Her indeterminate status and appearance reflect the impossibility of definitively determining pregnancy in the medieval and early modern periods. Proceeding from the claim that this uncertainty itself matters, we will explore the implications of the varying maternal possibilities enabled by literary texts and proposed in midwifery texts of the time.

The ambiguity of Shakespeare’s conclusion is all the more striking in relation to his medieval source, from Boccaccio via William Painter. There, the birth of twin boys who strongly resemble their father ensures the reunion of their estranged parents. Yet this by no means indicates a dearth of maternally ambiguous medieval bodies. In parallel portraits of Criseyde in Books I and V of Troilus and Criseyde, Chaucer raises questions about her maternal status and age. While in the Filostrato Boccaccio makes it clear that Criseyde has not had children, Chaucer introduces ambiguity in his poem’s final book, claiming his source does not tell him whether Criseyde is a mother. Through the portraits’ physical emphasis and their interpretations, Criseyde’s inscrutable body emerges as an inscrutable text, connected to temporal instability: what has Criseyde been in the past? (How) can the book of her body be read in the present? What might her body’s past and present mean for Troilus’ future? In The Canterbury Tales, Griselda and Constance have legibly postpartum bodies that nonetheless present hermeneutical challenges: Griselda’s old coat will not fit her new body; is she still who she was? Constance may or may not send her son to her husband like a letter to be read; the boy proves legible because of his resemblance to her. Later, she must explicate herself to her father, who may not recognize her. Does a child (reliably) reinscribe in the present a parent’s past, making it available to future readers?
Workshop Questions
In advance of the workshop, participants will propose 1-2 discussion questions for the group based upon the readings and their own areas of interest. The following categories are offered to inspire questions, but they need not be seen as limiting them:

- Inscrutability / unreadability / ambiguity of the potentially maternal body.
- The temporalities of pregnancy: its relation to past, present, and future, assumptions of teleology and linearity, “queering” pregnant time.
- Genre & period: comparative study of embodiment and temporality across the genres and time periods we include.
- Female agency: the performance of maternity, the embodied temporality of pregnancy

This advance input will enable us to form small groups for break-out conversations.

Preliminary Readings

- Selections from Shakespeare’s *All’s Well That Ends Well* (5.3.292-330) and *Henry VI, Part 1* (5.4.1-93)
- Selection from Boccaccio’s *Decameron*, trans. John Florio (9th novel, 3rd day)
- Selections from Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde* (Book I 99-112, 127-133, and 176-182 and Book V 806-826), and *Man of Law’s Tale* (1002-1163)
- Kathryn Moncrief, “‘Show me a child begotten of thy body that I am father to’: Pregnancy, Paternity, and the Problem of Evidence in *All’s Well That Ends Well,*” *Performing Maternity*, Kathryn Moncrief and Kathryn McPherson, eds. (2007).

Suggested Readings

- Shakespeare’s *Love’s Labor’s Lost*, especially 5.2.658-705
- Webster’s *The Duchess of Malfi*, especially 4.2.232-246
- Chaucer’s *Wife of Bath’s Prologue* and *Clerk’s Tale*
- Guillemeau’s *Child-birth, or The Happy Delivery of Women*, especially pp. 2-5 & 13-17.
All's Well That Ends Well (From Act 5, Scene 3)

DIANA
Good mother, fetch my bail. Stay, royal sir:
Exit Widow

The jeweller that owes the ring is sent for,
And he shall surety me. But for this lord,
Who hath abused me, as he knows himself,
Though yet he never harm'd me, here I quit him:
He knows himself my bed he hath defiled;
And at that time he got his wife with child:
Dead though she be, she feels her young one kick:
So there's my riddle: one that's dead is quick:
And now behold the meaning.

Re-enter Widow, with HELENA

KING
Is there no exorcist
Beguiles the truer office of mine eyes?
Is't real that I see?
HELENA
No, my good lord;
'Tis but the shadow of a wife you see,
The name and not the thing.
BERTRAM
Both, both. O, pardon!
HELENA
O my good lord, when I was like this maid,
I found you wondrous kind. There is your ring;
And, look you, here's your letter; this it says:
'When from my finger you can get this ring
And are by me with child,' & c. This is done:
Will you be mine, now you are doubly won?

BERTRAM
If she, my liege, can make me know this clearly,
I'll love her dearly, ever, ever dearly.

HELENA
If it appear not plain and prove untrue,
Deadly divorce step between me and you!
O my dear mother, do I see you living?

LAFEU
Mine eyes smell onions; I shall weep anon:

To PAROLLES
Good Tom Drum, lend me a handkercher: so,
I thank thee: wait on me home, I'll make sport with thee:
Let thy courtesies alone, they are scurvy ones.

KING
Let us from point to point this story know,
To make the even truth in pleasure flow.

To DIANA
If thou be'st yet a fresh uncropped flower,
Choose thou thy husband, and I'll pay thy dower;
For I can guess that by thy honest aid
Thou keep'st a wife herself, thyself a maid.
Of that and all the progress, more or less,
Resolutely more leisure shall express:
All yet seems well; and if it end so meet,
The bitter past, more welcome is the sweet.

Flourish
From Boccaccio’s Decameron (1351), Tras. John Florio (1620)

Not long after, Count Bertrand was recalled home by his people: and he having heard of his wives absence, went to Roussillion so much the more willingly. And the Countesse knowing her husbands departure from Florence, as also his safe arrivall at his owne dwelling, remained still in Florence, untill the time of her deliverance, which was of two goodly Sonnes, lively resembling the lookes of their Father, and all the perfect lineaments of his body. Perswade your selves, she was not a little carefull of their nursing; and when she saw the time answerable to her determination, she tooke her journey (unknowne to any) and arrived with them at Montpellier, where she rested her selfe for divers dayes, after so long and wearisome a journey.

Upon the day of all Saints, the Count kept a solemne Feastivall, for the assembly of his Lords, Knights, Ladies, and Gentlewomen: upon which Joviall day of generall rejoycing, the Countesse attired in her wonted Pilgrimes weed, repaired thither, entring into the great Hall where the Tables were readily covered for dinner. Preassing through the throng of people, with her two children in her armes, s presumed unto the place where the Count sate, and falling on her knees before him, the teares trickling abundantly downe her cheekes, thus she spake. Worthy Lord, I am thy poore, despised, and unfortunate wife; who, that thou mightst returne home, and not be an exile from thine owne abiding, have thus long gone begging through the world. Yet now at length, I hope thou wilt be so honourably-minded, as to performe thine owne too strict imposed conditions, made to the two Knights which I sent unto thee, and which (by thy command) I was enjoyned to do. Behold here in mine armes, not onely one Sonne by thee begotten, but two Twins, and thy Ring beside. High time is it now, if men of honour respect their promises, and after so long and tedious travell, I should at last be welcommed as thy true wife.

The Count hearing this, stoode as confounded with admiration; for full well he knew the Ring: and both the children were so perfectly like him, as he was confirmed to be their Father by generall judgement. Upon his urging by what possible meanes this could be brought to passe: the Countesse in presence of the whole assembly, and unto her eternall commendation, related the whole history, even in such manner as you have formerly heard it. Moreover, she reported the private speeches in bed, uttered betwene herselfe and her, being witnessed more apparently, by the costly jewels there openly shewne. All which infallible proofes, proclaiming his shame, and her most noble carriage to her husband; he confessed, that she had told nothing but the truth in every point which she had reported.

Commending her admirable constancy, exceliency of wit, and sprightly courage, in making such a bold adventure; he kissed the two sweete boyes, and to keepe his promise, whereto he was earnestly importuned, by all his best esteemed friends there present, especially the honourable Ladies, who would have no deniall, but by forgettting his former harsh and uncivill carriage towards her, to accept her for ever as his lawfull wife, folding her in his armes, and sweetly kissing her divers times together, he bad her welcome to him, as his vertuous, loyall, and most loving wife, and so (for ever after) he would acknowledge her. Well knew hee that she had store of better beseeming garments in the house, and therefore requested the Ladies to walke with her to her Chamber, to uncase her of those Pilgrimes weeds, and cloath her in her owne more sumptuous garments, even those which shee wore on her wedding day, because that was not the day of his contentment, but onely this; for now he confessed her to be his wife indeede, and now he would give the king thanks for her, and now was Count Bertrand truly married to the faire Juliet of Narbona.
Henry VI, Part 1 (From Act 5, Scene 4)

*Enter YORK, WARWICK, and others*

**YORK**
Bring forth that sorceress condemn'd to burn.

*Enter JOAN LA PUCELLE, guarded, and a Shepherd*

**Shepherd**
Ah, Joan, this kills thy father's heart outright!
Have I sought every country far and near,
And, now it is my chance to find thee out,
Must I behold thy timeless cruel death?
Ah, Joan, sweet daughter Joan, I'll die with thee!

**JOAN LA PUCELLE**
Decrepit miser! base ignoble wretch!
I am descended of a gentler blood:
Thou art no father nor no friend of mine.

**Shepherd**
Out, out! My lords, an please you, 'tis not so;
I did beget her, all the parish knows:
Her mother liveth yet, can testify
She was the first fruit of my bachelorship.

**WARWICK**
Graceless! wilt thou deny thy parentage?

**YORK**
This argues what her kind of life hath been,
Wicked and vile; and so her death concludes.

**Shepherd**
Fie, Joan, that thou wilt be so obstacle!
God knows thou art a collop of my flesh;
And for thy sake have I shed many a tear:
Deny me not, I prithee, gentle Joan.

**JOAN LA PUCELLE**
Peasant, avaunt! You have suborn'd this man,
Of purpose to obscure my noble birth.

**Shepherd**
'Tis true, I gave a noble to the priest
The morn that I was wedded to her mother.
Kneel down and take my blessing, good my girl.
Wilt thou not stoop? Now cursed be the time
Of thy nativity! I would the milk
Thy mother gave thee when thou suck'dst her breast,
Had been a little ratsbane for thy sake!
Or else, when thou didst keep my lambs a-field,
I wish some ravenous wolf had eaten thee!
Dost thou deny thy father, cursed drab?
O, burn her, burn her! hanging is too good.

*Exit*

**YORK**
Take her away; for she hath lived too long,
To fill the world with vicious qualities.

**JOAN LA PUCELLE**
First, let me tell you whom you have condemn'd:
Not me begotten of a shepherd swain,
But issued from the progeny of kings;
Virtuous and holy; chosen from above,
By inspiration of celestial grace,
To work exceeding miracles on earth.
I never had to do with wicked spirits:
But you, that are polluted with your lusts,
Stain'd with the guiltless blood of innocents,
Corrupt and tainted with a thousand vices,
Because you want the grace that others have,
You judge it straight a thing impossible
To compass wonders but by help of devils.
No, misconceived! Joan of Arc hath been
A virgin from her tender infancy,
Chaste and immaculate in very thought;
Whose maiden blood, thus rigorously effused,
Will cry for vengeance at the gates of heaven.

**YORK**
Ay, ay: away with her to execution!

**WARWICK**
And hark ye, sirs; because she is a maid,
Spare for no faggots, let there be enow:
Place barrels of pitch upon the fatal stake,
That so her torture may be shortened.

**JOAN LA PUCELLE**
Will nothing turn your unrelenting hearts?
Then, Joan, discover thine infirmity,
That warranteth by law to be thy privilege.
I am with child, ye bloody homicides:
Murder not then the fruit within my womb,
Although ye hale me to a violent death.

**YORK**
Now heaven forfend! the holy maid with child!

**WARWICK**
The greatest miracle that e'er ye wrought:
Is all your strict preciseness come to this?

**YORK**
She and the Dauphin have been juggling:
I did imagine what would be her refuge.

**WARWICK**
Well, go to; we'll have no bastards live;
Especially since Charles must father it.

**JOAN LA PUCELLE**
You are deceived; my child is none of his:
It was Alencon that enjoy'd my love.

**YORK**

Alencon! that notorious Machiavel!
It dies, an if it had a thousand lives.

**JOAN LA PUCELLE**
O, give me leave, I have deluded you:
'Twas neither Charles nor yet the duke I named,
But Reignier, king of Naples, that prevail'd.

**WARWICK**
A married man! that's most intolerable.

**YORK**
Why, here's a girl! I think she knows not well,
There were so many, whom she may accuse.

**WARWICK**
It's sign she hath been liberal and free.

**YORK**
And yet, forsooth, she is a virgin pure.
Strumpet, thy words condemn thy brat and thee:
Use no entreaty, for it is in vain.

**JOAN LA PUCELLE**
Then lead me hence; with whom I leave my curse:
May never glorious sun reflex his beams
Upon the country where you make abode;
But darkness and the gloomy shade of death
Environ you, till mischief and despair
Drive you to break your necks or hang yourselves!

*Exit, guarded*
Crisyele was this lady's name al right.

As to my doom,* in al Troies cite

Nas' non so fair, for passyngre* every wight, 6

So aungelik was hire natif beaute,

That lik a thing immortal semed she,

As doth an hevenyssh perfite creature.

That down were sent in scoryngre of nature.

This lady, which that aldaye herd at ere

Hire fadres shame, his falsnesse and tresoun,

Wel neighe* out of hire wit for sorwe and fere,

In widowers habite large of samyt* broun,

On knees she fyl biforn Ector* adown

With pitous vois, and tendrely wepyngre,

His mercy bad,* herselven excusyngre:

And in hire hous she abood* with swich meyne

As til* hire honoure rede was to holde; 110

And whil she was dwellyngre in that cite, 115

Kepte hire estat,* and both of yonge and olde

Ful wel biloved, and wel men of hire tolde.

But whethyr that she childred or noon, 120

I rede* it naught, therfore I late* it goon. 125

As was Crisyde, as folk seyde everichone

That* hire behelde in hire blake wede,*

And yet she stood ful lowe* and stille allone,

By hyndred folk in litle brede,*

And neighe* the dore, ay unde shames drede,*

Simple of ait and debonnaire of chere,*

With ful assured* loylyng and manere.

8. Simple in clothes and inke (or, various) of maintenonce.

"The Man of Law's Tale," 1002 - 1163

Greet cheere doth this n Noble senatour

To kyng Alfa, and he to hym also;

Every of hem dooth oother greet honour.

And so seyde that in a day or two. 1005

This senatour is to kyng Alfa go

To feyn, and happily, if I shal nat lye,

Custances some wene in his compaignye.

Sone men wolde seyn at requere of Custance

This senatour hath lad this child to feyne;

I may nat seyn every circurcement —

Be as be may, ther was he at the meyne.

But soothe is this, that at his moodeles beeste

Bifon Alfa, durynge the metes space,

The child stooed, lookeynge in the kynges face.

This Alfa kyng hath of this child greet wonder,

And to the senatour he seyde anon,

"Whos is that faire child that stondest yonder?"

"I noot," quod he, "by God, and by Seint John! 1015

A moode he hath, but fader he noot. 1020

That I of woort — and shortly, in a stondey, 1025

He tolde Alfa how that this child was founde.

"But God woort," quod this senatour also,

"So verryous a lyvere in my lyf

Ne sough I never as she, ne herde of me, 1030

Of woldly womyn, mayde, ne of wyf.

I dar wel seyn hir hadde levere a knyt

Threghout hir breech, than ben a womman welke.

There is no man knde bryngre hire to that prikk."
Now was this child as kyky unto Custance  
As possible is a creature to be. 1031
This Alla hath the face in remembrance  
Of dame Custance, and thon on muse  
If that the childes moonder were aught she  
That is his wyf, and provyly he sighte. 1035
And spedde hym fro the table that he myghte.

"Parfay," thought he, "fantome is in myn head!  
I oghere deme, of skillful jugement,  
That in the salte see my wyf is deede." 1040
And afterward he made his argument:

"What woot I if that Crist have hyder yent  
My wyf by see, as wel as he hire sente  
To my contree fro thens that she wente?"

And afternoon, boone with the scotrour  
Goth Alla, for to see that wonde chancete. 1046
This senoir doute Alla great honour,  
And hastily he sente after Custance. 1050
But trusteth well, hire hire nat to daunce  
When that she wiste wherefore was that sondre;  
Uneethe upon his feet she myghte stornde. 1055

When Alla saught his wyf, fere he hire grette,  
And weep that it was routhe for to see;  
For at the firste he lok on hire sette  
He knew wel verily that it was she. 1060
And she, for sorwe, as doumb stant as a tree,  
So was his berce shet in his distresse. 1065
When she remembreth his unlykenesse.

Twys she swomeen in his owene sighte;  
He weep, and hym excuseth pitéous. 1070
"Now God," quod he, "and his hawes brighte  
So wilis on my soul as have mercye, 1075
That of yourse harm as giltekeles am 1  
As is Maurice my sone, so lyk your face;  
Ellis the feend me feche out of this place!"

Long was the sobbyng and the bitter pyne,  
Er that his woful hertes myghte cesse; 1084
Greet was the pyte to for to here hem pleyne,

Thurgh whiche pleytens gan his wy savorne.  
I pray yow alle my labour to relese;  
I may nat tell my wy unti so-morowe. 1090
I am so werly for to speke of sorwe.

But finally, when that the sothe is wist  
That Alla gilteles was of his wyf,  
I crouwe an hundred tymes been thay kist. 1095
And swich a blisse is ther birwik hemy two. 1073
That, save the joye that lasteth eueremo,  
Ther is noon lyk that any creature  
Hath seyn or shal, whil that the world may dure.

Tho preyde she hire housbonde merkeley,  
In relie of his longe, pitous pyne. 1090
That he wolde preyhe his fader specially  
That of his mageste he wolde encynye  
Touche sauf som day with hym to dyne. 1095
She preyde hym eek he abode by no wyte  
Unto his fader no word of hire seye.

Som men wolde seyn how that the child  
Maurice  
Doeth this messeage unto this Emperor;  
But, as I gesse, Alla was nat so nyce. 1090
To hym that was of so soveryn honoure  
As he that is of Cristen folk the flower. 1095
Seute any child, but it is bet to deeme  
He wolde hymself, and so it may wel seeme.

This Emperor hath graunted gentilly  
To come so dyner, as he hym bisoughte;  
And wel rede I he looked blyly 1099
Upon this child, and on his doghter thoghte.  
Ala gith to his in, and as hym eghte,  
Arrayd for this festa in every wise  
As ferforth as his konnyng may suffise. 1099

The morwe cam, and Alla gan hym dressye,  
And eked his wyf, this Emperor to meyne;  
And forth they ryde in joye and in gladnesse. 1099
And when she saw that her fader in the scene,  
She lightes down, and falleth hym to fecerye. 1104
"Fader," quod she, "youre yonge child Cus-

tance  
Is now ful cleen out of youre remembrance.

"I am yont drghter Custance," quod she,  
"That whilom ye ha senn unto Surrye. 1110
It am I, fader, that in the salte see  
Was pur alleynne and damped for to dye. 1115
Now, goode fader, mercy I yow crye!  
Sende me namore unto noone hehenesse,  
But thonketh my lord heere of his kyndeness." 1120

Who can the pitour joye telene al  
Birwene hem hire, sye they been thus ynaste? 1125
But of my tale make an ende I shal;  
The day goth faste, I wol no lenger lette. 1130
This glade folk to dyner they hem sette;  
In joye and blisse at mene I leve hem dwelle  
A thousand fowel wel more than I kan telle.

This child Maurice was sitten Emperor  
Maad by the Pope, and lyved cristely;  
To Cristes chruch he dide great honoure. 1135
But I lente al his storie passen by;  
Of Custance is my tale specially. 1140
In the olde Romyn geestes may men fynde  
Maurices lyf; I bere it noght in mynde.

This kyng Alla, when he his tyne saye,  
With his Custance, his hooyle wyf so sweete,  
To Engeland been they come the righte way,  
Wher as they lyve in joye and in quiete. 1145
But litle while it lasteth, yow heete,  
Joye of this world, for tyme wyl nat abyde;  
For day to nyghtg it chandeth as the tyle.

Herez endeeth the tale of the Man of Lawe.
frequently in the art and iconography of the period.\textsuperscript{35} The Duchess, a pregnant twin married to a man rumored to be a hermaphrodite, thus amply and audaciously embodies early modern metaphors of authority.

If it is true that Webster was trained as a lawyer at Middle Temple, he would have been acutely aware of juridical allegorizations of the King’s Two Bodies concept.\textsuperscript{36} Indeed, in The Duchess of Malfi, Webster seems to be testing the political resonances of literal doubled bodies and suggesting alternatives to conventional thinking. All told, Webster makes the Duchess one part of a doubled body in three ways (as a pregnant woman, as a twin and as a wife, one half of her husband), yet she is also two in one – a body natural and body politic and a unified head and body. She is not split by the doubleness, but rather made grander by it. Ultimately, through the Duchess’s pregnancies, Webster suggests that the female body is well-equipped for authority described as double-bodied, and thus he seems to naturalize and legitimize female rule.

As the complexity of his great-bellied character suggests, Webster is refreshingly progressive (and certainly opportunistic) about pregnancy. The Duchess is, as William Rowley notes in the play’s commendatory verses, ‘lively body’d’ (I.26). This multifaceted pregnant character, who is also the head of a duchy, suggests that the maternal body projects a range of meanings, many of which are explicitly political. The Duchess’s pregnant body, we learn, is not monolithic or singularly emblematic. On the contrary, through this extraordinary character, Webster extends the boundaries of conventional thinking, rendering the pregnant woman visible, intricate, redeemed and above all unfixed and heterogeneous – pregnant with possibilities of female sovereignty, participatory government and merit-based inheritance.

Commenting on the controversial ending of Shakespeare’s All’s Well That Ends Well, Susan Snyder concludes, ‘Helena’s claim on Bertram is validated’.\textsuperscript{1} Similarly, Jay Halio writes, ‘There is, of course, no doubt that Helena can settle all Bertram’s suspicions of his being “doubly won”’.\textsuperscript{2} He later asserts, ‘At the end, Helena triumphs’.\textsuperscript{3} But does she? While much critical ink has been devoted to illuminating the play’s notably problematic ending, there has been little attention paid to Helena’s pregnancy as central to interpreting the resolution. Reading popular printed early modern maternity texts, including gynecological manuals and midwifery guides, in relation to Helena’s theatrical presentation of her pregnant body as evidence of her union with Bertram, I explore what difference emphasizing the staging of maternity makes in understanding the ending of the play.

Gail Kern Paster notes, ‘Childbirth is especially invisible in dramatic representations’.\textsuperscript{4} Representations of pregnancy, however, are not. Expectant female characters appear frequently on the early modern English stage and in the Shakespearean canon.\textsuperscript{5} In Shakespeare’s plays alone, from the unfortunate Jaucquenetiana

\footnotesize{35} Axton, 22.

\footnotesize{36} According to Axton, during Elizabethan times, the lawyers at the Inns of Court ‘used fictional or historical play situations much as they would use legal precedents’. 3. Plowden in particular influenced the templars on common law issues. His Reports was one of the major texts studied at the Inns of Court, 20.
to the groaning Juliet, from Helena to Hermione, Tamora to Thaisa, teeming women are numerous. This essay examines some of the cultural and historical discourses constructing the understanding of pregnancy in early modern England in relation to Helena’s performance of pregnancy appearing at the end the play to suggest that Helena’s ‘claim on Bertram’ and her ‘triumph’ may not be as certain as they first appear.

The most common early modern English terms for pregnancy – ‘great-bellied’ and ‘big-bellied’ – suggest that the state of being ‘with child’ was identified by what could be observed; it was a particularly visual phenomenon. Given that early modern women bore approximately eight to ten children (a child every two or two and a half years) during their 20 or so childbearing years, the sight of a pregnancy must have been familiar. The London stage, it would appear, was as populated with pregnant women as the city’s streets must have been.

The early modern English stage is not alone in its assiduous interest in the display of the pregnant female body. While no examples of pregnant women appear in Dutch portraiture of the same period, they are frequent in English painting of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, most dating from the 1580s through the 1630s, with many of the portraits showing women who are in the late stages of gestation. In the portraits – many of them beautiful and intricately detailed – the swollen belly is often emphasized by, among other things, elaborate embroidery, spectacular jewelry or the placement of hand to draw attention to the prominent bulge (Figure 3.1)

Karen Hearn notes that the production of a pregnancy portrait serves specific functions: it acts as a confirmation of lineage and functions to celebrate dynastic achievement. The vogue for English pregnancy portraits, coinciding as it does with the height of early modern stage activity, along with the increasing number of illustrated popular texts devoted to the subject of pregnancy and childbirth published from the mid-sixteenth century and into the seventeenth century, attests to heightened early modern interest in and awareness of the implications of visual signifiers related to maternity.

While gynecological guides and midwifery manuals, like conduct books and marriage manuals, attempt to describe as well as regulate maternal appearance and behavior, they also worry, in particular, over how to read and interpret the information available in the physical body itself. The emphasis in each is on scrutinizing the pregnant body, on interpreting physical signs to yield information. The same concern James Gilemours, in Child-birth or the Happy Deliverie of Women, expresses over the difficulty of interpreting the signs to know whether a woman be with childe,

---


8 Hearn, 41–2.
or no is ubiquitous throughout the medical texts and midwifery manuals. The prescriptive texts assume both the availability and veracity of physical evidence at the same time they reveal their anxiety about it. Guillemeau, for example, begins his guide for midwives with cautionary words:

A chirurgeon must bee very circumspect, in determining whether a woman be conceived, or no; because many have prejudiced their knowledge, and discretion, by judging rashly hereof. So that a Chirurgeon being called to give his opinion of the conception of a woman, whether it be in a judiciall, or a private case, must be very warie and circumspect what judgement he gives herein.

He places heavy emphasis on careful attention, as opposed to rash judgment, when attempting to ascertain conception and the presence of a viable pregnancy. He continues, warning that despite careful observation:

ther is nothing more ridiculous, than to assure a woman that she is with child; and afterward, that her naturall sicknesses, or store of water should come from her: and instead of a childe, some windie matter should break from her, as so her belly fall, and grow flat again: which hath hapned unto many men, that have beene well esteemed, both for their learning, and experience.

His admonitions stress the potentially deceptive nature of the swollen female body; even the trained practitioner might misinterpret or make mistakes when attempting to judge the physical evidence.

Only after advising the person attempting to discern a true pregnancy to use great caution does Guillemeau then provide a long list of physical signs. It consists of those that might initially appear unambiguous (‘her belly swells and grows bigger, her hips and raienes are enlarged; her courses appeare not’) as well as more subtle cues (‘their eyes be more hollow, and sunke inward; and the white is turned bluish’). He also includes maternal behavior and perceptions: ‘if at the same time she hath a kind of yawnning, and stretching, and feels within her a shaking or quivering’ and ‘if within few days she falles a vomiting, and spitting’. While many of these signs are familiar, even the most seemingly obvious indicators of pregnancy (a swollen belly, the absence of a menstrual period, nausea, fetal movement) are not decisive.

16 Guillemeau, 6.
17 Guillemeau, 16.
18 One prominent example is Queen Mary I’s false pregnancy of 1558. Mary believed herself pregnant and exhibited symptoms. See Christopher Hibbert, The Virgin Queen: Elizabeth I, Genius of the Golden Age (Reading, Pennsylvania: Addison-Wesley, 1991), 55. See also David Starkey, Elizabeth: The Struggle for the Throne (New York: Perennial, 2001), 219 who notes that Mary made her will on the belief that she was pregnant and that she would die in childbirth.
19 Guillemeau, Child-birth or the Happy Deliverie of Women, 2.
21 Ruff, 181.
22 Ruff, 182.
23 Ruff, 183.
The pregnant body, then, is both obvious and obfuscating in its heavy state. Laura Gowing writes, 'the signs of conception were subjective and sometimes unreliable ... the pregnant belly remained in many ways an opaque mystery, truly transparent only in the vision of God'. Its seeming availability is revealing at the same time it is deceptive for it also masks other important information, not only whether or not conception has taken place but the sex of the unborn child (the prescriptive texts also contain long lists of signs to use in sex determination) and, perhaps most importantly, the identity of the child's father. In an economic culture predicated on patrilineal inheritance, anxieties about legitimate paternity are rampant. The stress on reading the signs available in the body, and the problems inherent in attempting to do so apparent across the printed guides also surface tantalizingly on stage.

It comes as no surprise that Shakespeare capitalizes on both the visible and uncertain nature of pregnancy that appears in prescriptive literature and that he makes use of early modern efforts to understand and interpret the pregnant body. The pregnant female body as disconcerting evidence emerges repeatedly in the late plays, not only All's Well That Ends Well, but also Measure for Measure and The Winter's Tale. The legibility — and potential illegibility — of the pregnant female body, both what it reveals and what it might hide, lies at the heart of all three.

In Measure for Measure, Laura Gowing's observation that '[T]he state of being pregnant was an irrevocably public one' proves useful, since the public nature of the consequences of sexual activity is what animates the play. Infused with references to and images of conception, pregnancy and birth, it is Claudio's imprisonment 'for getting Madam Julietta with child' (1.2.72–3) that sets in motion the near-tragic events of the rest of the drama. On stage Juliet's gravid body, weighty as 'she's very near her hour' (2.2.16), is an obvious visual focus. Its conspicuous visibility invites commentary. Claudio's reference to her pregnant state emphasizes both her physical appearance and the shared guilt of their sexual liaison: 'The stealth of our most mutual entertainment/With character too gross is writ on Juliet' (1.2.143–4). His description calls attention to the private sexual act and its public revelation through her pregnancy. Lucio, who himself has impregnated a woman out of wedlock, remarks on the visibility of her state: '... her plenteous womb/Expresseth his full tilth and husbandry' (1.4.40–44). In both instances, Juliet's body becomes the manifestation of his (acknowledged) paternity. Further, it is a potent visual representation of illicit sexual activity and exposes the immense anxiety about appropriate sexuality and procreation circulating in the play.

Two other pregnancies, those of Mrs. Elbow who is 'with child, and being great-bellied, and longing ... for prunes' (2.1.98–9) and Kate Keepdown, the whore who Lucio deserts at marrying, are mentioned but never appear on stage; still, they work to multiply the significance of pregnancy as a sign of community excess and disorder. As a result, Juliet's pregnant body — the only one that actually appears on stage — is troublingly connected with illicit sexuality in a decaying city. It becomes the central representation of the uncontrolled sexual activity abundant throughout the city as well as a visible sign of unlawful disorder.

Where Juliet's pregnancy is too visible, so is Hermione's. The Winter's Tale begins with the play's most perplexing problem — Leontes' jealousy and ensuing cruelty toward his wife, behavior that leaves many critics puzzled, unable adequately to explain its origin or ferocity. It is, however, Hermione's pregnant body that ignites Leontes' irrational fears of infidelity. Her pregnancy, though never mentioned in the scene must, when staged, be a prominent visual focus. A strikingly visual description by her lady-in-waiting, 'She is spread of late into a goodly bulk' (2.1.19–20), is an explicit clue to her appearance. Unnerved by what he has observed — his heavily pregnant wife speaking intimately with his friend — Leontes misreads the interaction, both the verbal intercourse and Hermione's gesture of offering Polixenes her hand. In this context, Polixenes's nine-month visit and Hermione's gravid presence take on added significance, working to fuel Leontes's paranoid fantasies of his wife's sexual transgression.

Rather than allowing Hermione's pregnant body to signal his own impending fatherhood and to affirm his connection to her, Leontes reads it as evidence of her faithlessness: '[L]et her sport herself/With that she big with, for 'tis Polixenes/ Has made thee swell thus' (2.1.60–62). He implores the assembled company to read her pregnant body, 'Look on her, mark her well' (2.1.65), and recognize in her physical state, as he has, that 'She's an adult’ress' (2.1.78.) Hermione’s visually prominent body nullifies her attempts to defend herself against his accusations. She can offer no convincing evidence — verbal or physical — to convince him, as he accepts neither her body nor her words as trustworthy. Repeatedly, the interpretation of bodily evidence...

25 See David Hillman, 'Visceral Knowledge: Shakespeare, Skepticism, and the Interior of the Early Modern Body', in The Body in Parts: Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe, ed. David Hillman and Carla Mazzio (New York: Routledge, 1997), 82 who notes that 'The idea that important truths lie hidden in the body ... would have seemed entirely reasonable in this period'.
26 Gowing, Common Bodies, 122.
27 See Mary Thomas Crane, 'Male Pregnancy and Cognitive Permeability in Measure for Measure', Shakespeare Quarterly 49.2 (1998), 269–92 who examines the use of the word pregnant in the play in an investigation of the humoral body.
28 All references to Shakespeare's plays are from The Riverside Shakespeare, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1974).
29 See Mario Digangi, 'Pleasure and Danger: Measuring Female Sexuality in Measure for Measure', ELH 60.3 (1993), 589–609 who reads examines female sexual desire and the way male anxiety constructs the Juliet's pregnant body as well as the bodies of Isabel and Mistress Overdone.
- notoriously uncertain business as the popular printed materials on pregnancy also make clear – takes on heightened significance.

*All's Well That Ends Well* is similarly full images of procreation and birth. Examples are numerous: The opening line of the play, 'In delivering a son from me, I bury a second husband' (1.1.1–2) contains an explicit reference to childbirth. Given her choice of young courtiers, Helena rejects one who is 'too young, too happy, and too good,' to make yourself a son out of my blood' (2.3.96–7). Bertram and Helena's speedy marriage contract is a 'new-born-brief' (2.3.179). Ultimately, pregnancy and its problems are central to understanding the play as its conclusion turns on the issue. It is Helena's pregnancy (and Bertram's troubled response to it) and, by extension, a stable resolution for the play that are in doubt.

*All's Well That Ends Well* begins and, I argue, ends with Helena's unrelenting desire for Bertram and his overwhelming disdain for her; the action derives primarily from her attempts to win his affection and attention and his efforts to avoid her. When the King awards the clever Helena, for curing his illness, her choice of husband, she is wed to the unwilling Bertram who must, against his own desires, accept the marriage, though he freely admits, 'I cannot love her, nor will strive to do't' (2.3.145). Can Bertram, whose objections to Helena's low social status may seem petty, be forced (by the King, his mother and Helena) to love someone, virtuous and deserving though she may be, in whom he has no interest? Should he be? His plea to 'use/The help of mine own eyes' (2.3.107–8) in the choice of a wife ignored by the King, Bertram's options are few. His initial submission quickly turns to open refusal as he rejects Helena's wish to consummate the marriage, which she does not hesitate to remind him, 'What law does vouch mine own' (2.5.82). Instead, he abandons her, swearing he has not 'bedded her' (3.2.21) and never will. Finding himself in what he feels is an untenable situation, he leaves her with what he hopes are impossible tasks for her to accomplish. He demands:

> When thou canst get the ring upon my finger, which never shall come off, and show me a child begotten of thy body that I am father to, then call me husband; but in such a 'then' I write a 'never' (3.2.57–60).

His response to her is the early modern equivalent of 'when hell freezes over'. His specific conditions are important symbolically as he refuses to recognize the marriage as valid. His ring, firmly on his own finger, functions as a wedding band that he will not present to her and a child, the literal and physical embodiment of the act of consummation that he denies her. His unwillingness to consummate the marriage is a refusal to validate her legal claim or to participate in a union he despises. 'Till I have no wife, I have nothing in France' (3.2.74–5) he writes in his parting letter.

---


---

Given his contempt for her, and the distance he places between them when he leaves the country, both tasks seem insurmountable. What Bertram assumes are obstacles to protect him from ever having to honor a marriage he never wanted, Helena accepts, however, as real challenges she is willing to attempt in order to have him. Diana's observation upon hearing of Helena's plight that 'Tis a hard bondage to become the wife/Of a detesting lord' (3.5.64–5) seems never to occur to Helena herself. The play progresses to demonstrate her resourcefulness and determination in her single-minded pursuit of Bertram. Her earlier declaration, 'Our remedies oft in ourselves do lie/Which we ascribe to heaven' (1.1.216–7), as she clearly articulates her goal of winning Bertram, 'my intents are fix'd, and will not leave me' (1.1.229), applies here as well. Undeterred by Bertram's unusual demands, his desertion of her or her recovery of his pursuit of another woman, she wastes no time in engineering her acquisition of both the ring and a child. In the final act, she confronts Bertram with her evidence: his ring and her body. The play concludes with the inference that Helena might display her pregnant body in answer to Bertram's mandate that she be with child by him to claim him as her husband. Even if Helena is not staged as heavily pregnant, a gesture might suffice to indicate as much. 32 However, like the early modern midwifery manuals, the play is uncertain about the nature of the evidence she presents to prove her success and, in its final moments, rehearses the same anxieties about how to read the pregnant body that are prevalent in popular guides.

The state of Helena's body, what can or cannot be seen, is significant. Helena's self-presentation, her performance of pregnancy, is important. What is actually visible, however, is open to debate, as the play provides no concrete details about her physical state or exactly how much time has passed since her sexual encounter with Bertram. It offers no vivid physical description, like that of Hermione who is 'spread of late/Into a goodly bulk' (*The Winter's Tale*, 2.1.19–20) or Juliet whose 'plenteous womb/Expresseth his full tilth and husbandry' (*Measure for Measure* 1.4.43–4). While there is no account of her actual appearance, Diana's report of Helena's body immediately after her cryptic reference to Bertram and the famous 'bed-trick' might offer a clue:

> He knows himself my bed he had defil'd
> And at the same time he got his wife with child.
> Dead though she be, she feels her young one kick.
> So there's my riddle: one that's dead is quick
> And now behold my meaning. (5.3.300–304)

Her riddle, and her belief that Helena is 'with child', depends upon Helena's report of fetal movement. Diana focuses on Helena's account of the state of her body

---

32 Karen Hearn, in *Marcus Gheeraerts II: Elizabethan Art in Focus* (London: Tate Publishing, 2003), 48 notices that in English 'pregnancy portraits', a hand on the 'bump' is a traditional and often observed signifier.
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and what she says she is feeling. She does not claim to feel the kicks herself (consider the urge many people have to touch the belly of a pregnant woman) but puts her faith in Helena's report of her bodily sensations. Her riddle relies on maternal report and plays with the idea of quickness – Helena's ability to feel the baby's movement, a 'quickening' that typically occurs in the fourth month. The fourth month is also the time a woman's pregnant state begins to become externally evident: at this point, she usually begins 'to show'. If Helena can feel the baby kick, it is possible, though not certain, that the pregnancy is visible to others.33

Even more striking are Helena's own public declarations and the actions that must accompany them. 'There is your ring/And look you, here's your letter' (5.3.310–311). What she does when she makes this declaration must necessarily be an exhibition of the ring and the letter. She continues:

This it says:
'When from my finger you can get this ring,
And [are] by me with child, etc.' This is done. (5.3.310–312)

Helena confidently asserts that she has accomplished the designated tasks, including, most importantly, the acquisition of a child. Her report that 'This is done' and, presumably, her staged display of his ring and of her body itself are, she believes, adequate proof that she has, in fact, succeeded in meeting his demands. So strong is her belief that Bertram's answer can only be 'yes', she then asks, almost rhetorically, 'Will you be mine now that you are doubly won?' (5.3.313). At this point, Helena plays with the idea of doubling, and seems to relish her victory. She has presented double evidence – his ring and her body. She has twice succeeded in winning her choice of husband, first in receiving Bertram in reward for healing the King's illness, and now, a second time, in response to Bertram's own rules. She has, she reminds him, 'won' him again. Further, she structures her claim linguistically; the purposeful rhyming of 'done' and 'won' both emphasizes and foregrounds her conclusion.

The situation, however, is not as clear-cut as it might initially appear. It is important to recognize that Helena's interpretation of Bertram's letter differs noticeably from the conditions he actually set. Where he required Helena to 'Show me a child begotten of thy body ...' (3.2.58), she cleverly redefines as '[Are] ... with child', (5.3.313), a challenge she believes she has met. The second half of Bertram's demand for a child, '... that I am father to', Helena omits in her response, offering only a quick 'etc' (5.3.313). The change is minor, even easy to overlook, but noteworthy, as a pregnant body is not, in fact, the same as the presentation of a child. Further, her reference to Bertram as 'doubly won' has additional implications for the scene. 'Doubling' is both 'a multiplication by two', as a pregnancy would be (and as she presents herself), and 'a deceitful or tricky action',24 as the bed-trick and manipulations necessary to win Bertram might be characterized (and as he might interpret them).

The scene itself – her dramatic entrance, her unexpected revelation that she is alive and she, not Diana, was in Bertram's bed and her confident assertion that she has met the seemingly impossible conditions – is highly theatricalized. She uses her words (a clever interpretation of Bertram's letter) and the performance of pregnancy as evidence. Her body and her speech, however, are considerably problematic. Laura Gowing's observation that 'pregnancy carried great political, social and cultural weight and women's words were not always enough'25 is relevant here. Read in light of early modern maternity manuals (like Guillemeau's Child-birth or the Happy Deliverie of Women) that complicate the certainty of both physical evidence and maternal report, Helena's claims are even more potentially troublesome.

While Helena assumes that she has presented enough evidence to satisfy Bertram's demands, his response is much less sure. Where Diana unequivocally accepts Helena's word, Bertram does not. He responds, not directly to Helena but – in a telling appeal to authority – to the King. He resists Helena's construction of him as 'doubly won' when he replies, 'If she, my liege, can make me know this clearly I'll love her dearly, ever, ever dearly' (5.3.315–16). His declarative 'if' demonstrates his doubt of both her word and body as sufficient evidence. He continues to place conditions on their union, despite what Helena has just said, and the possibility that she appears before him showing an evident pregnancy, as he demands that she 'make me know this'. What he still wants to know may be the same kinds of questions a pregnancy would have aroused in the minds of an early modern audience familiar with the perils (including maternal and infant mortality) and uncertainties of pregnancy. Is the pregnancy true? Is it viable? Will she and the child survive the birth? And, perhaps more disquieting, how is Bertram to be sure the child is his? How, other than Helena's contention, might pregnancy, with no actual child to show, be confirmed? A pregnancy is not the guarantee Helena asserts with 'This is done'. A pregnancy, especially one in its early stages, might ultimately raise more questions than it resolves. Even his ring, something Helena presents as certain evidence that she has been in his bed, is only a substitute for something he cannot see. As a result, it proves little.

While Bertram had demanded of Helena a 'child begotten of thy body that I am father to', – both a child and evidence of his paternity – she has presented no such thing. As if to heighten the ambivalent and problematic nature of the evidence Helena presents, it is useful to note that here Shakespeare diverges significantly from his source material, Boccaccio's 'Giletta of Narbona'. Boccaccio's Giletta confronts
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33 See Caroline Bicks, 'Planned Parenthood: Minding the Quick Woman in All's Well', Modern Philology 103.3 (2006) 332–33 who argues that a quickened pregnancy did not necessarily show.

34 Oxford English Dictionary Online (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 'Doubling'.

Beltramo with twin sons who look exactly like him. 36 Had Helena, like Giletta, appeared with a child or two who bore his own image, Bertram would have had less cause to object. Without a child, his reluctance is more understandable, though not necessarily admirable. The fact that Shakespeare stops short of providing the key evidence that proves definitive in the source material is significant. In the absence of a child, the early modern understanding of the indeterminate nature of pregnancy becomes central to comprehending the play.

In foregrounding pregnancy, it is then possible to see Bertram’s skepticism as entrenched in early modern cultural attitudes about pregnancy and not as an individual failing or – as he is frequently read – as a product of him simply being ‘a cad’, 37 unwilling to recognize Helena’s merits and the success of her endeavors, obvious though they are to everyone else around him, including his mother. As definitive as Helena’s belief that she has met Bertram’s conditions might, upon first glance, seem, when read up against pregnancy guides and midwife manuals that urge caution and detail the risks inherent in making hasty judgments, even when the physical evidence – like a swollen belly – appears quite decisive, Bertram’s caution is more justifiable. Instead of being a poor observer (he does fail properly to apprehend Helena’s character and that of Parolles) he might be, in this case, a wary observer of indeterminate evidence who looks more prudent than heartless.

Helena, then, is still left with an impossible task, her desire continuing to run in opposition to Bertram’s. Her assertions, both the existence of a viable pregnancy that will result in a live birth and Bertram’s paternity, may well be entirely truthful but her body itself, at this point, provides Bertram no truly authoritative evidence of either. The lack of a child (as Bertram had demanded of her) and the crucial departure from the source material serves to highlight the problems inherent in her claim, particularly in using her verbal declaration and her body/belly as evidence rather than the child itself. Despite what Helena knows, or believes, there is a gap between her knowledge and Bertram’s and what he can be forced to accept on sight and report alone. While Bertram never specifically accuses Helena of lying when she confronts him (as he does Diana), and he does seem to accept the possibility that he slept with her and what that might mean, neither does he unequivocally welcome her. Her task,


37 See Susan Synder, “The King’s not here”: Displacement and Deferral in All’s Well That Ends Well, Shakespeare Quarterly 43.1 (1992), 30, for whom Bertram attracts ‘wholesale condemnation’. She writes, ‘in no other play do the fictive characters themselves raise such questions and point so insistently to the hero’s defects’. She See also Peggy Muñoz Simonds, ‘Sacred and Sexual Motifs in All’s Well That Ends Well’, Renaissance Quarterly 42.1 (1989), 38 who concludes ‘Bertram’s social snobbery and subsequent dash for freedom … reveal him to be a spoiled adolescent unworthy of our sympathy’.

as truthful as her claims may be, when Bertram rejects the only evidence she can provide, is still a difficult one. Helena’s plight is not yet complete for conceiving, carrying the child to term, and successfully giving birth to a healthy infant … were viewed as stages on a hazardous journey, fraught with obstacles and dangers from beginning to end. 38 At the very least, supposing her pregnancy and the subsequent birth are successful, her triumph is delayed. 39

As a result, Helena is left to resort to more of the same verbal strategies she first employed. In her final speech of the play she echoes Bertram’s use of the word ‘if’ and in doing so, challenges it as well as his new demand that she make him know this ‘clearly’. She announces, dismissively (perhaps gesturing to her belly), ‘If it appear not plain and prove untrue / Deadly divorce step between me and you!’ (5.3.317–18). She defies Bertram’s continued rejection with a threat of her own, attempting verbally to gain control of the floundering situation. What, exactly, Helena expects to appear ‘plain’, however, is unclear, whether it be her pregnancy itself, the presumed delivery of a healthy child, or the child’s assumed likeness to the father. However, while a pregnancy would, in time, become more visible, the identity of the father might never be plain. Louis Montrose observes:

That seminal and menstrual fluids are related to generation, that people have both a father and a mother, are hardly novel notions, but in Shakespeare’s age they remained merely notions. Although maternity was apparent, paternity was a cultural construct for which oculiar proof was unattainable. 40

All’s Well stages the interrelated issues of pregnancy, paternity and physical evidence. It concludes, unsettlingly, without resolving the matter – Helena’s production of Bertram’s child and an unequivocal affirmation from Bertram of his acceptance of his wife and child – upon which an orderly conclusion depends. Bertram looks like his own father – the Kings greets him with, ‘Youth, thou bear’st thy father’s face/Frank Nature rather curious than in haste/Hath well comp’st thee’ (1.2.19–29) – but the question of his own reproduction is, at the end of the play, still undetermined. Ultimately, Helena’s words and body, without the presence of a child, cannot force Bertram to believe in something he cannot see or to accept a woman he does not want. Her pregnancy remains, at the end, a contested sign that does not signal the regenerative ending necessary given the generic expectations of comedy but serves rather to emphasize its own ambiguity. It does not, as many critics

39 Susan Synder, “‘The King’s not here”: Displacement and Deferral in All’s Well That Ends Well’, Shakespeare Quarterly 43.1 (1992), 29 recognizes that ‘Helena’s pregnancy’ has not yet met Bertram’s demand but it will, in the future, ‘be realized’.
of the play believe, finally, symbolize Bertram’s transformation and his acceptance of Helena. Neither does it represent a ‘ rebirth’ of the shattered marital relationship, as pregnancy might, but serves instead to highlight uncertainty. The play lacks the expected comic conclusion as it ends, not with the couple’s joyous reunion and solidification of their marriage vows, but with a continued standoff between opposed parties with probably irreconcilable agendas.

The play does not, however, valorize Bertram’s skepticism and its own lack of a miraculous reunion. Instead, it mourns them. Lafaw’s melancholy speech, lamenting things lost, is instructive and may be considered the true center of gravity in the play:

They say miracles are past, and we have our philosophical persons, to make modern and familiar, things supernatural and causeless. Hence is it that we make trifles of terrors, ensconcing ourselves with seeming knowledge, when we should submit to an unknown fear (2.3.1–6).

The juxtaposition of the ‘familiar’ and the ‘supernatural’, of ‘seeming knowledge’ and surrendering to ‘unknown fear’, is exactly where the play ends, unable satisfactorily to resolve the tension between the opposed pairs. Faith and doubt remain at odds, Bertram unable to believe in what he cannot know without more concrete evidence.

The unstable ending of All’s Well That Ends Well is further underscored by the King’s final act in which he replicates his initial interaction with Helena and Bertram. In the last moments of the play, he bestows on Diana for her service, as he did on Helena, the ability to select a mate, saying: ‘If thou beest yet a fresh uncropped flower/Choos thy husband, and I’ll pay thy dower’ (5.3.327–9, emphasis mine). His word choice may be read as another conditional moment, another ‘if’. As such, it works to undercut any sense of closure but instead thrusts the play back to the beginning of its uneasy plot. The King’s reward depends upon Diana’s chaste and honorable status as ‘a fresh uncropped flower’. Her task is as potentially difficult as the one Helena confronted and, despite her efforts, still faces at the end of the play. Like Helena’s quest to show Bertram a child that he is father to, definitive evidence of chastity is hard to come by. Further, one can’t help but wonder, will Diana also find herself in a similar marital limbo if she exercises the option of choice that the king offers her?

The play ends where it began, Helena no closer to uniting with Bertram than she was at the beginning, crying over his ‘bright radiance’ (1.1.88) and her unrequited love for him, Bertram no closer to expressing the genuine love for her that she hoped to gain. Shakespeare emphasizes not a tidy conclusion, but, through the specific staging of pregnancy, foregrounds not the play’s resolution but its problems. Finally, the king’s concluding lines do not repeat the play’s hopeful title; he says not ‘all’s well’ but ‘All yet seems well’ (5.3.333). ‘Is’ and ‘seems’ are not, as the play emphasizes in its staging of pregnancy, necessarily the same. The king continues, ‘and if it end so meet, The bitter past, more welcome is the sweet’ (5.3.333–4, emphasis mine). Even in the epilogue, the play’s title and its advertised happy ending cannot be stabilized as ‘if’, not ‘is’, remains the operative word:

The king’s a beggar now, the play is done
All is well ended, if this suit be won,
That you express content; which we will pay,
With strife to please you, day exceeding day (Epilogue 1–4, emphasis mine).

Just how content anyone is at the close of the play is questionable. When viewed through the lens of pregnancy and its ambiguities, the neat conclusion upon which the title of the play depends remains elusive – the promised happy ending that Helena and the audience desire still to be delivered.

41 See Jay Halio, ‘All’s Well That Ends Well’, Shakespeare Quarterly 15.1 (1964), 38 who writes, ‘Helena’s effect upon Bertram, like her effect on the King, is restorative’. Barbara Hodgson, The Making of Virgins and Mothers: Sexual Signs, Substitute Scenes and Doubled Presences in All’s Well That Ends Well, Philological Quarterly 66 (1987), 68 reads the ‘conditional ifs’, suggesting that ‘(t)his close celebrates compromise, the text’s final realizing of romance’.
Foreword

The History of the Future, 1350–2000

Peter Burke

I should like to offer here a general survey of post-medieval European visions of the future, or attitudes to the future, or imagined histories of the future—stories which people tell others or tell themselves—from the Portuguese Jesuit António Vieira’s *História do futuro*, written in the mid-seventeenth century and published in 1718, to contemporary science fiction. I shall focus on a comparison and contrast between attitudes to the future in two periods of European history, 1500–1800 and 1800–2000.¹

THE KOSELLECK-HÖLSCHER THESIS

To some readers the concern with early modern Europe in this context may seem odd, because some scholars claim that before the late eighteenth century, a sense of the future was lacking. The thesis is argued most systematically in a study by Lucian Hölscher, a professor at Bochum, which appeared in 1999, just in time for the millennium, and is entitled—in homage to the book by H. G. Wells, published in 1902—*Die Entdeckung der Zukunft* (The Discovery of the Future). Discussing the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Hölscher employs concepts such as the *Zukunftsroman* (the novel set in the future) and the *Zukunftstaat* (the state that plans for change and is therefore organized around calculations of the future). He dates the discovery of the future to the period 1770–1830, followed by three more periods: ‘Outbreak’, 1830–1890; ‘High Point’, 1890–1950; and finally ‘Decline’, from 1950 onwards.

What Hölscher has argued in the form of an inevitably simple general survey is much like what his master, the late Reinhart Koselleck, suggested—with considerably more subtlety—in a series of essays published from 1960s onwards, collected in 1979 in a book with the intriguing title of *Vergangene Zukunft* (Past Futures). In these essays, as elsewhere in his work, Koselleck emphasizes parallel changes in attitudes to the future and to the past in the years around 1800, which he saw as a watershed or, to employ his own metaphor, a *Sattelzeit*. 
According to Koselleck, there was an ‘inversion in the horizon of expectations’ in the late eighteenth century (the echo of the language of Martin Heidegger is no accident: Koselleck was a follower of his). After the French Revolution, the examples of the past and the Ciceronian idea of *historia magistra vitae* no longer seemed relevant. The end of the world appeared to recede, to be replaced by a sense of living in a new age, indeed the new age, ‘modernity’ (*Neuzeit*). Prophecies of the inevitable were replaced by prognoses of the possible. The future now appeared unstable, open to every possibility, subject to human manipulation or, as Koselleck describes it, ‘constructible’ (*verfügbar*). There was a shift from a passive acceptance of change, for better or worse, to a will to make changes, from determinism to voluntarism.

These profound changes of attitude were registered by significant shifts in the meaning of a number of concepts, discussed in detail in the historical encyclopaedia of concepts compiled by Koselleck and his colleagues, the seven massive volumes (not counting the index) of the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (1972–1992) exemplifying a new approach to the history of ideas known as ‘conceptual history’ (*Begriffsgeschichte*). 2 ‘Revolution’, for example, a term which had originally implied an analogy between the world of history and the world of nature (with events moving in cycles like the stars and perhaps under their influence), came to be associated with the sense of an unknown future as well as with the plans of ‘revolutionaries’. Again, the traditional German term for history (*Historie*) was replaced at the beginning of the nineteenth century by the new word *Geschichte*, the plural form helping to indicate what Koselleck called the convergence between ‘the process of events and their apprehension in consciousness’ (*Futures Past* 27).

**CRITIQUE**

If Koselleck and Hölscher were right, there would be little for historians of early modern Europe to say on this subject. This chapter is intended as a challenge. All the same, it will not argue that these two scholars are completely mistaken.

The idea of a late eighteenth-century discovery of the future embodies important insights into politics and literature. The French Revolution was indeed associated with new attitudes to the future, with the sense that there could be no going back to the old regime, with the sense of a new beginning expressed in the revolutionary calendar, the year 1792 being redefined as Year One.

In literature, utopia was transplanted from a remote place (or ‘nowhere’) to a new age, as in the famous case of the novel by the French journalist Louis-Sébastien Mercier, a novel set in the reign of Louis XXXIV, *L’An 2440* (1771), which had been reprinted twenty-four times by 1789. It has also been argued, notably by the Italian critic Franco Moretti in his *Il Romano di formazione*, that the rise of the Bildungsroman in the late eighteenth century—Goethe’s *Wilhelm Meister*, for example—was another reaction, at the level of the individual this time, to the new sense of the future as unstable and of human power to shape it.

Despite its value, however, the Koselleck-Hölscher thesis is open to criticism on various counts. I am sure that I am not the only reader to find Hölscher’s idea of a ‘decline’ of interest in the future around the year 1950 to be an extremely odd one, given the rise of concern with the future of the global environment and the increasingly popularity of books and films set in the future.

Again, Koselleck and Hölscher appear to ignore the persistence of traditional attitudes, such as millenarianism, into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Eugene Weber’s study *Apocalypses: Prophecies, Cults and Millennial Beliefs through the Ages*—another book that was published just in time for the millennium—offers many such examples. Marxism is a secular version of the idea of an inevitable future. If it did not dissuade its adherents from working to realize their vision of the future, the same point might be made about early modern Calvinists, or even some Catholics.

In the context of this collection, however, two other criticisms of the thesis are particularly relevant. In the first place, it presents early modern Europe almost entirely in terms of deficit, emphasizing the lack of any view of the future (if we take Hölscher literally), or at least the lack of any view of the future as constructible. It is worth remembering that Michel de Montaigne actually thought that people were too much concerned with the future in his time and condemned what he called ‘la force naturelle de l’âme’ (‘the mad curiosity of our nature which wastes time trying to seize hold of the future’) (*Complete Essays* 42).

There is a paradox here of which Koselleck is aware but one that plays little part in his discussion. The paradox is that his eighteenth-century ‘moderns’ (Diderot, for example) themselves dated the beginning of modernity to the years around 1500, to the Renaissance, the invention of printing and the Reformation. That is why we speak of an ‘early modern’ period today, comparing the first modernity with the second one ushered in by the French and Industrial Revolutions.

In the second place, Hölscher and Koselleck appear to ignore what is often called the social history of ideas, including not only the social diffusion of new ideas but also the social function of ideas at the everyday level, in particular assumptions about the future that were linked to social practices. These assumptions or ‘horizons of expectation’ focussed on the near future, whereas Hölscher and Koselleck are more concerned with the distant future. All the same, views of these different futures interacted and so deserve to be discussed together.
THE LANGUAGE OF FUTURES IN EARLY MODERN EUROPE

This examination of attitudes might begin, like Koselleck, with the vocabulary employed in this period to discuss the future. The medieval language of prophecy (as in the case of Vieira’s already mentioned *História do futuro*) remained important in this period, at different cultural levels, both elite and popular, even if it was gradually declining over the long term, from the middle of the seventeenth century if not before. Like prophecy, astrology was taken seriously at different cultural and social levels, elite and popular, and although it was increasingly criticized after the middle of the seventeenth century, this intellectual system does not seem to have lost its hold on the almanac-reading public until the late eighteenth century at the earliest.

However, discussions of the future were not limited to ‘destiny’ or ‘prophecy’ but extended to more secular and pragmatic forms of ‘prediction’, ‘prognostication’ or ‘forecast’.

Take the case of the term ‘decline’, for instance. It is true that the discussions of the old age or the decay of the world may not be incompatible with the Koselleck thesis, because this decay was considered to be inevitable. On the other hand, some of the discussions of the decline of states, such as René de Lucinge’s *Naissance, durée et chute des états* (The Beginning, Continuance and Decay of Estates [1588]) and Claude Durét’s *Discours de la vérité des causes et effets des decadences, conversions et ruines des monarques, empires, royaumes et républiques* (Discourse on the True Causes and Effects of the Decadence, Mutation and Ruin of Monarchies, Empires, Kingdoms and Republics [1595]), seem to imply a view of the future as malleable or ‘constructible’.

In the early modern period, the word ‘decline’ often carried astrological overtones. This did not mean that decline was necessarily considered to be inevitable, because it was often claimed that the stars ‘inclined’ but did not ‘compel’. In any case, more worldly explanations were offered in the literature on the ‘decline’ (declinación) of Spain in particular. This literature begins to proliferate from around 1600 onwards. It was the work of the so-called arbitristas, a word that might be translated as ‘projectors’—a term first recorded in English in 1596.

The emergence of these words and the groups to which they refer in both Spanish and English tells us something about changing attitudes to the future. Projectors are concerned not only with future trends but also with the ways in which these trends may be avoided or remedied, the implication being that the future may be influenced by human action. In similar fashion, the early modern utopias written by Thomas More, Tommaso Campanella, Francis Bacon and others, even if they were not set in the future, were intended to stimulate critical reflections on the present that would lead to changes.

Discussions of ‘renaissance’ and ‘reform’ had similar implications concerning the malleability of the future. The Renaissance idea of itself was that of a ‘rebirth’ of the literature, philosophy and art of classical antiquity, and so the movement was backward-looking. However, it was also forward-looking in the sense of rejecting what humanists called the ‘Gothic’ barbarism of the ‘Dark’ or ‘Middle’ Ages and expecting a glorious future that would differ from the present.

In similar fashion, the reform of the church was already under discussion as early as the age of the church fathers and also in the later Middle Ages (as in the case of Dietrich von Niem’s *De modis uniendo et reformandi ecclesiam* [1410]), before Martin Luther turned reform into Reformation. To be more exact, Luther himself used the term ‘Reformation’ only occasionally, and in the general sense of ‘reform’, but the idea of the Reformation as a major event was established by 1617, when Lutheran Germany celebrated the centenary of Luther’s protest. Following Luther, the Calvinists called themselves followers of the ‘reformed’ religion. In all these cases, ‘reform’ meant re-form, going back to the past, but this also meant working for a future that would be unlike the present (Ladner, Wolgast).

Political reform was also under discussion in the early modern period. The Italian Cola di Rienzo (c. 1313–1354) wrote of 1347 as ‘Year 1’ of the restored Roman Republic, a remarkable anticipation of the French Revolutionary calendar: it is thanks to Cola that the early modern period discussed in this chapter begins c. 1350 (see Piuri). In the fifteenth century, the reform of the Holy Roman Empire was advocated in a document called the *Reformatio Sigismundi*—Sigismund had been emperor from 1433 to 1437 (see Dohna). Again, the English Civil War was among other things a conflict over the possible reform of the political system.

There were also movements for what participants called the reform of the law, or natural philosophy. The work of Francis Bacon in particular has been studied from this point of view, despite Bacon’s ambivalence about innovation. In the domain of law, Bacon wanted ‘amendment’, to ‘correct’, ‘purge out’, ‘recall’ or ‘repeal’ bad laws. He supported the ‘new’ philosophy (what we call ‘science’), arguing for the ‘purging’ of the old in this domain too.

There was even a movement, in some European circles around 1600, for the ‘reform of the world’ or ‘general’ or ‘universal’ reformation ‘of both divine and human things’, put forward in documents such as the *Fama Fraternitatis* (1614), which claimed to be the mouthpiece of the Rosicrucian Order. It is certainly significant that one man associated with the Rosicrucian group at this time (whether an ‘order’ or not), the Lutheran pastor Johann Valentinus Andreae (1586–1654), was the author of a utopia,
Christianopolis (1619). Even if they are not explicitly set in the future, utopias both express and encourage a sense of possible alternatives to the present. Hence Thomas More's Utopia (1516), Tommaso Campanella's City of the Sun (1602) and Bacon's New Atlantis (1622) might all be cited as examples of a future seen as 'constructible' (Minois 417–55).

Turning to literature, we find that Mercier's famous 2440 was not the first story set in the future. It had been preceded by Jacques Gutin's Epigone, histoire du siècle futur (Epigone, or History of the Future Century [1659]), by Samuel Madden's Memoirs of the Twentieth Century (1733) and by the anonymous Reign of George VI (1763), predicting the time of George's reign, with tolerable accuracy, as lasting from 1900 to 1925, and presenting him as a hero-king who conquers France and defeats the Russians, both in England and at the gates of Vienna. In other words, the Zukunftroman followed on the heels of what a recent critic has termed 'futuristic fiction' in the sense of 'prose narratives explicitly set in future time' (Alkon 3).10

DOMAINS OF A PRAGMATIC FUTUROLOGY

This brief discussion of vocabulary has already evoked social and cultural practices, but I should now like to go further in this direction. As the American political scientist Harold Lasswell once remarked, 'When we act [...] we are influenced by our expectation of what the world has in store for us' (Lasswell and Blumenstock iii). In this sense it is impossible not to have a sense of the future, whether it is viewed with confidence or with anxiety, whether it is seen as more or less the same as the present or as different (perhaps worse, perhaps better).

What most deserves emphasis here is the rise in the early modern period of a number of pragmatic approaches to the future, reinforcing the idea of a secularization of thought in this period. 'Secularization', he it said, not in the strong sense of the replacement of religious by secular ideas but in the weaker sense of the coexistence of religious attitudes with an increasing variety of secular ones.

Early modern Europeans certainly took an interest in posterity. This concern with the future is obvious enough at the family level in wills and in memoirs, often written for the benefit of children and grandchildren. In some parts of Europe, from Venice to Geneva, among the upper classes at least, attempts at family planning can be identified, whether by means of coitus interruptus or by using the leather sheath whose invention was attributed to Dr. Gabriele Falloppio of Padua (1523–1562), primarily as a defence against venereal disease.

At a national level the concern with future generations is visible in histories: the famous history of the English Civil War by Edward Hyde, Lord Clarendon, begins with the phrase, 'That posterity may not be deceived, by the prosperous wickedness of those times' (1). In the reign of Louis XIV, coins and newspapers were buried in the foundations of buildings so that posterity would be able to learn about the glorious achievements of the king.

Koselleck and Hölscher might well have accepted these general points, but they appear to underestimate the confidence in the constructibility of the future underlying early modern projects. Individuals and families pursued marriage strategies in order to maintain themselves or to rise socially. Some of these strategies, notably the entail or mayorazgo, a legal device which was spreading in the early modern period, were attempts by heads of families to control the actions of their descendants hundreds of years later, making it impossible for them to break up the family estate. Some projects could only come to fruition after generations had passed—from planting trees to founding hospitals or colleges.

It is true that these examples imply a future more or less like the present—for example, the founder of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, Sir Walter Mildmay, might well be shocked if he could return to earth and observe the changes which had taken place in his foundation, intended as a seminary for Protestant clergymen. In similar fashion, the stocking of grain in public granaries was an attempt to mitigate the effects of future poor harvests of a kind that had been experienced in the past. However, other early modern practices implied a future which was different from the present in important respects.

Some mariners, for example, expected to discover new lands.11 Natural philosophers expected to make other kinds of discovery in the near future. Missionaries expected to make converts, to turn Jews, Muslims and pagans into Christians, by their own efforts as well as by the grace of God. Gamblers expected to win fortunes.

To reinforce these generalizations, it may be illuminating to examine three practical domains of activity in a little more detail: demography, politics and commerce.

It was in the later seventeenth century that the first serious attempts were made, in England and France, to calculate the size of the population in the future. The London merchant John Graunt (1620–1674) discussed the present and future population of the city in his Observations on the Bills of Mortality (1662). The merchant-physician William Petty (1623–1687) presented a plan to repopulate ('repeople' or 'replant') Ireland, advised the British government to follow a 'method of forecasting and computing' and imagined what the population of the world might be in two thousand years. The herald Gregory King (1648–1712) calculated the population of England not only as it was in 1696 but also as it would be in the year 2000 (eight million, so he thought) and even in 3500 (twenty-two million). In France, Marshal Vauban (1633–1707) argued that Canada, then a French colony, would have more than fifty million inhabitants by the year 2000 (Hecht 32.5–66).

In the associated domains of warfare and politics, early modern 'strategy' (a term recorded only in 1810) and 'tactics' (already in use by 1626) implied
a sense of a constructible future. Early modern generals, from Gonzalo de Córdoba to the Duke of Marlborough, were successful precisely because they were able to anticipate the future moves of their opponents. Turning to the continuation of warfare by other means, Machiavelli was constantly calculating the consequences of the actions of the prince. The reports and dispatches of early modern ambassadors from Venice and elsewhere regularly discuss the possible future actions of rulers such as Charles V or Louis XIV, their attempts to achieve ‘universal monarchy’, for example, as possibilities that might be countered by appropriate action.

On the home front, new statutes and reforms of the law expressed a sense of the future as controllable, whereas some governments, from the later seventeenth century onwards, were increasingly concerned with facts and figures (which we call ‘statistics’ precisely because they were collected by the state), as a basis for future policies in the domains of taxation, military service, food supplies and so on. Some governments, notably the pope’s, operated with something like what we call a ‘budget’, attempting to forecast both income and expenditure. By the early seventeenth century, the general of the Jesuits, Claudio Acquaviva, was requesting information from the different provinces of the order specifically in order to orient future decisions (Friedrich 127).

For these reasons the concept of a government ‘policy’, which may be anachronistic if used about the Middle Ages—although even then kings faced the choice between peace and war—helps us understand the actions of the state in Renaissance Florence or Venice or in late seventeenth-century France or England. Colbert and other statesmen pursued what we would call an ‘economic policy’, the one that the Swedish historian Eli Heckscher described as ‘mercantilism’, trying to expand the trade of their own nation at the expense of others. They sometimes tried to follow foreign models (that of the Dutch, for example), thinking that if they did so their nation would become as prosperous as the Dutch at some point in the future.

Governments were not alone in attempting to predict the political future at this time. Ordinary people did this as well, at least in major cities such as Paris or Venice where the ‘public sphere’ already included artisans and shopkeepers. Their interest in what would happen next was fuelled by the rising number of newspapers, gazettes and avvisi in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Some of the writers of news-sheets engaged in what the sceptics called ‘political astrology’, whether in the literal or the metaphorical sense of that term (Barbiera 159).

A second domain that needs to be discussed here is that of early modern commerce. Calculations of risk and of future profit must be as old as trade itself. The medieval scholastic theologians who discussed the problem of usury defended compensation to lenders on three grounds, all of them concerned with future outcomes: the danger of loss, the possibility that the money lent would be needed in order to meet an emergency and the giving up of opportunities for profit: periculum sortis, damnum emergens and lucrum cessans (Wood 192–205).

In the early modern period, the development of institutional supports for commerce implied views of the future as to some extent subject to human control. Take the case of insurance, for example. Maritime insurance was already practiced in Italian ports such as Genoa and Venice in the late Middle Ages. Life insurance developed in the seventeenth century in Amsterdam, thanks to developments in the mathematics of probability which reduced the element of risk, thanks to the work of a group that included Johannes Hudde, burgomaster of Amsterdam, and Johan de Witt, Grand Pensionary of Holland. The rise of stock markets in the seventeenth century and the buying and selling of company shares in the anticipation of rising or falling prices involved what we now call the language of ‘futures’. The delightfully named late seventeenth-century text by Josef Penso de la Vega, the Confusion of Confusions, discusses bulls and bears on the Amsterdam Exchange and the deliberate spreading of rumours (of the arrival or loss of cargoes, for example), in order to force prices up or down.

The final example offered here also comes from the Dutch Republic. By the end of the seventeenth century, thanks to one of its directors, Johannes Hudde, whose role in the development of life insurance has already been mentioned, the Dutch East India Company, the Vereenigde Ost-Indische Compagnie, or VOC, which had long been collecting information, including statistics, about its various establishments in the East, was already analysing sales figures for pepper and other imports in order to determine the company’s future strategy (Smith 1001–3). This would make no sense without the assumption that the near future at least is predictable and to an extent constructible.

I have no intention of claiming that everyone in early modern Europe thought of the future in this way. Certain regions (notably North Italy and the Dutch Republic), and certain social groups (merchants, diplomats, bureaucrats) were more involved in these ways of thinking than others. In any case, a pragmatic sense of a near future in a certain domain should not be confused with a general vision of a more distant future, the question which most concerned Koselleck and Hölscher.

So, to sum up, how should the Koselleck thesis be restated? What was the importance of the years around 1770 for the history of the future, or for our histories of that history of the future? The crucial changes, in my view, may best be described in terms of widening. ‘Widening’ in the geographical and social senses of the term; more people in more places were coming to see the relatively distant as well as the near future as constructible. The future was perceived as more open than before (it is probably more illuminating to think in terms of degrees of openness than to oppose ‘closed’ and ‘open’ visions of the future). No less important, there was also a widening in the range of the individual and collective futures which it was possible to envisage (or envision), or to change the metaphor, a sharper sense than before of what we have come to call ‘alternative scenarios’. Significant changes, certainly, but not the same thing as ‘discovery'.
NOTES

1. This chapter began life as a paper to the millennial conference of the Social History Society in Cambridge in 2000; my thanks to Vic Gatrell for inviting me to speak.
2. On this approach, see Richter.
3. On medieval approaches to the future, see Burrow and Wei.
4. Reeves; Niccoli; and Minois 271–307. For politically inflected millenarianism, see A. Wade Razzz’s chapter in this collection.
5. Compare Thomas 347–56 with Capp, and especially Curry; Minois 308–81 and 396–8; and Perkins 46–88. See also Hugh Robert’s chapter in this collection.
7. On Campanella and Bacon, see contributions to this collection by Peter Forshaw, A. P. Langman and Rob Iliffe.
8. See Tovey; Rabb; and Martin, especially 106–7, 116–7 and 148. On the reform of the law, see also Hill 267–76.
9. See Yates 42, 44, 238 and 249.
10. On Guttin and Madden, see Alkon, 17–44, and 92–111, respectively; on George VI, see Clarke, Voices 4–6 and Clarke, Pattern 16–22.
11. See Michael Harrigan’s chapter in this collection.
12. Contrast Bosher on the lack of budgeting with Partner.
13. See Tenenti; Barbour; and Hacking 92–118.
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