

# William Shakespeare



## A Midsummer Night's Dream



Dr. David G. Pitt , *Introduction* / Lucy M. Fitzpatrick, *Notes*

AIRMONT SHAKESPEARE CLASSICS SERIES

A  
Midsummer  
Night's Dream

*By*

William  
Shakespeare



AIRMONT PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.  
22 EAST 60TH STREET · NEW YORK 10022

**An Airmont Classic**  
*specially selected for the Airmont Library*  
*from the immortal literature of the world*

THE SPECIAL CONTENTS OF THIS EDITION

©. Copyright, 1965, by  
Airmont Publishing Company, Inc.

## PREFACE

For the Airmont series of plays by William Shakespeare, we have chosen a text that we believe more nearly preserves the flavor of the old Shakespearean English than do those of more modernized versions.

In a popular-priced paperback edition, it is almost impossible to include a complete compilation of notes because of the limitations of the format. We suggest that the reader refer to the following excellent textbooks for additional material: The New Valiorum (Cambridge and Arden editions); the Globe edition edited by W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright (1866); the Oxford edition edited by W. J. Craig (1891); and the editions by G. L. Kittredge (1936). Also, the following books will be helpful to a better understanding of Shakespeare: Harley Granville-Barker, *Prefaces to Shakespeare, First Series* (London, 1933); Gerald Sanders, *A Shakespeare Primer* (New York and Toronto, 1945); J. Dover Wilson, *The Essential Shakespeare* (London, 1930).

Dr. David G. Pitt received his B.A. degree from Mt. Allison University in New Brunswick, and his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Toronto. Since 1949, he has been in the English Department of Memorial University of Newfoundland and Professor of English there since 1962. His publications include articles on literary and educational subjects, and editorial work on Shakespeare.

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

### *William Shakespeare: His Life, Times, and Theatre*

#### HIS LIFE

The world's greatest poet and playwright, often called the greatest Englishman, was born in Stratford-on-Avon, Warwickshire, in the year 1564. The exact date of his birth is uncertain, but an entry in the Stratford Parish Register gives his baptismal date as April 26. Since children were usually baptized two or three days after birth, it is reasonable to assume that he was born on or about April 23—an appropriate day, being the feast of St. George, the patron saint of England.

His father, John Shakespeare, was a glover and dealer in wool and farm products, who had moved to Stratford from Snitterfield, four miles distant, some time before 1552. During his early years in Stratford his business prospered, enabling him to acquire substantial property, including several houses, and to take his place among the more considerable citizens of the town. In 1557 he married Mary, daughter of Robert Arden, a wealthy landowner of Wilmcote, not far from Stratford. Two daughters were born to them before William's birth—Joan, baptized in 1558, and Margaret, baptized in 1562—but both died in infancy. William was thus their third child, though the eldest of those who survived infancy. After him were born Gilbert (1566), another Joan (1569), Anne (1571), Richard (1574), and Edmund (1580).

Very little is positively known (though much is conjectured) about Shakespeare's boyhood and education. We know that for some years after William's birth his father's rise in Stratford society and municipal affairs continued. Many local offices came to him in rapid succession: ale-taster, burgess (a kind of constable), assessor of fines, chamberlain (town treasurer), high bailiff (a kind of magistrate), alderman (town councilor), and chief alderman in 1571. As the son of a man of such eminence in Stratford, Shakespeare undoubtedly attended the local Grammar School. This he was entitled to do free of charge, his father being a town councilor. No records of the school are extant, so that we do not know how good a pupil he was nor what subjects he studied. It is probable that he covered the usual Elizabethan curriculum: an "A B C book," the catechism in Latin and English, Latin grammar, the translation of Latin authors, and perhaps some Greek grammar and translation as

well. But family circumstances appear to have curtailed his formal education before it was complete, for shortly before William reached his fourteenth birthday his father's rising fortunes abruptly passed their zenith.

Although we do not know all the facts, it is apparent that about the year 1578, having gone heavily into debt, John Shakespeare lost two large farms inherited by his wife from her father. Thereafter, he was involved in a series of lawsuits, and lost his post on the Stratford town council. Matters got steadily worse for him, until finally in 1586 he was declared a bankrupt. But by this time the future poet-dramatist was already a family man himself.

In 1582, in the midst of his father's legal and financial crises—and perhaps because of them—Shakespeare married Anne, daughter of Richard Hathaway (recently deceased) of the village of Shottery near Stratford. The *Episcopal Register* for the Diocese of Worcester contains their marriage record, dated November 28, 1582; he was then in his eighteenth year and his wife in her twenty-sixth. On May 26 of the following year the *Stratford Parish Register* recorded the baptism of their first child, Susanna; and on February 2, 1585, the baptism of a twin son and daughter named Hamnet and Judith.

These facts are all that are known of Shakespeare's early life. How he supported his family, whether he took up some trade or profession, how long he continued to live in Stratford, we do not know for certain. Tradition and conjecture have bestowed on him many interim occupations between his marriage and his appearance in London in the early fifteen-nineties: printer, dyer, traveling-player, butcher, soldier, apothecary, thief—it reads like a children's augury-rhyme (when buttons or cherry-stones are read to learn one's fate). Perhaps only the last-named "pursuit" requires some explanation. According to several accounts, one of them appearing in the first *Life of Shakespeare* by Nicholas Rowe (1709), Shakespeare fell into bad company some time after his marriage, and on several occasions stole deer from the park of Sir Thomas Lucy, a substantial gentleman of Charlecote, near Stratford. According to Rowe:

For this he was prosecuted by that gentleman, as he thought somewhat too severely; and in order to revenge that ill-usage, he made a ballad upon him . . . and was obliged to leave his business and family in Warwickshire, for some time, and shelter himself in London.

The story has been repeated in varying forms by most subsequent biographers, but its authenticity is doubted by many who repeat it.

Another much more attractive story, which, however, if true, does not necessarily deny the authenticity of Rowe's, is that

Shakespeare during the so-called "lost years" was a schoolmaster. This, indeed, appears to be somewhat better substantiated. John Aubrey, seventeenth-century biographer and antiquary, in his *Brief Lives* (1681) declares that he had learned from a theatrical manager, whose father had known Shakespeare, that the dramatist "had been in his younger years a schoolmaster in the country." This may, then, account, in part at least, for the years between his marriage and his arrival in London about the year 1591. It is interesting to note that in two of his early plays Shakespeare includes a schoolmaster among his characters: Holofernes of *Love's Labour's Lost* and Pinch of *The Comedy of Errors*. But let us hope that neither is intended to be Shakespeare's portrait of himself.

However he may have occupied himself in the interim, we know that by 1592 he was already a budding actor and playwright in London. In that year Robert Greene in his autobiographical pamphlet *A Groatsworth of Wit*, referring to the young actors and menders of old plays who were, it seemed to him, gaining undeserved glory from the labours of their betters (both by acting their plays and by rewriting them), wrote as follows:

Yes trust them not: for there is an upstart Crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his Tygers heart wrapt in a Players hyde, supposes he is as well able to bombast out blanke verse as the best of you: and being an absolute *Johannes factotum*, is in his owne conceit the onely Shakescene in a cuntry.

"Shakescene" is clearly Shakespeare. The phrase "upstart Crow" probably refers to his country origins and his lack of university education. "Beautified with our feathers" probably means that he uses the older playwrights' words for his own aggrandisement either in plays in which he acts or in those he writes himself. "Tygers heart wrapt in a Players hyde" is a parody of a line of *III Henry VI*, one of the earliest plays ascribed to Shakespeare. And the Latin phrase *Johannes factotum*, meaning Jack-of-all-trades, suggests that he was at this time engaged in all sorts of theatrical jobs: actor, poet, playwright, and perhaps manager as well.

Greene died shortly after making this scurrilous attack on the young upstart from Stratford, and so escaped the resentment of those he had insulted. But Henry Chettle, himself a minor dramatist, who had prepared Greene's manuscript for the printer, in his *Kind-Harts Dreame* (1592), apologized to Shakespeare for his share in the offence:

I am as sory as if the originall fault had beene my fault, because my selfe have scene his demeanor no lesse civill, than he exelent in the qualitie he professes: Besides, divers of

worship have reported his uprightness of dealing, which argues honesty, and his facetious grace in writing, that approves his Art.

Thus, in a very indirect manner and because of an attack upon him by an irascible dying man, we learn that Shakespeare at this time was in fact held in high regard by "divers of worship," that is, by many of high birth, as an upright, honest young man of pleasant manners and manifest skill as actor, poet, and playwright.

Although Shakespeare by 1593 had written, or written parts of, some five or six plays (I, II, and III *Henry VI*, *Richard III*, *The Comedy of Errors*, and perhaps *Titus Andronicus*), it was as a non-dramatic poet that he first appeared in print. *Venus and Adonis* and *The Rape of Lucrece*, long narrative poems, both bearing Shakespeare's name, were published in 1593 and 1594 respectively. But thereafter for the next twenty years he wrote almost nothing but drama. In his early period, 1591 to 1596, in addition to the plays named above, he wrote *Love's Labour's Lost*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Richard II*, and *King John*. Then followed his great middle period, 1596 to 1600, during which he wrote both comedies and history-plays: *The Merchant of Venice*, I and II *Henry IV*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Much Ado about Nothing*, *Henry V*, *Julius Caesar*, *As You Like It*, and *Twelfth Night*. The period of his great tragedies and the so-called "dark comedies" followed (1600-1608): *Hamlet*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *All's Well that Ends Well*, *Measure for Measure*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Timon of Athens*, and *Coriolanus*. The last phase of his career as dramatist, 1608 to 1613, sometimes called "the period of the romances," produced *Pericles*, *Prince of Tyre*, *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale*, *The Tempest*, parts of *Henry VIII*, and perhaps parts of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. Many other plays were ascribed to him, but it is doubtful that he had a hand in any but those we have named. Long before his death in 1616 his name held such magic for the public that merely to print it on the title page of any play assured its popular acclaim. The "upstart Crow" had come a long way since 1592.

He had come a long way too from the economic straits that may well have driven him to London many years before. We know, for example, from the records of tax assessments that by 1596 Shakespeare was already fairly well-to-do. This is further borne out by his purchasing in the following year a substantial house known as New Place and an acre of land in Stratford for £60, a sizable sum in those days. In 1602 he made a further purchase of 107 acres at Stratford for £320 and a cottage and more land behind his estate at New Place. But his life during



this time was not quite unclouded. His only son, Hamnet, died in 1596 at the age of eleven years, his father in 1601, and his mother in 1608. All three were buried in Stratford. More happily he saw, in 1607, the marriage of his daughter Susanna to Dr. John Hall, an eminent physician of Stratford, and in the following year, the baptism of his granddaughter, Elizabeth Hall.

Shakespeare's retirement to Stratford appears to have been gradual, but by 1613, if not earlier, he seems to have settled there, though he still went up to London occasionally. Of the last months of his life we know little. We do know that in February, 1616, his second daughter, Judith, married Thomas Quiney. We know that on March 25, apparently already ill, Shakespeare revised and signed his will, among other bequests leaving to his wife his "second best bed with the furniture." A month later he was dead, dying on his fifty-second birthday, April 23, 1616. He was buried in the chancel of Holy Trinity Church, Stratford, on April 26.

## HIS TIMES

Shakespeare lived during the English Renaissance, that age of transition that links the Mediævil and the Modern world. Inheriting the rich traditions of the Middle Ages in art, learning, religion, and politics, rediscovering the great legacies of classical culture, the men of the Renaissance went on to new and magnificent achievements in every phase of human endeavour. No other period in history saw such varied and prolific development and expansion. And the reign of Elizabeth I (1558-1603), Shakespeare's age, was the High Renaissance in England.

Development and expansion—these are the watchwords of the age, and they apply to every aspect of life, thought, and activity. The universe grew in immensity as men gradually abandoned the old Ptolemaic view of a finite, earth-centered universe, accepting the enormous intellectual challenge of the illimitable cosmos of Copernicus' theory and Galileo's telescope. The earth enlarged, too, as more of its surface was discovered and charted by explorers following the lead of Columbus, Cabot, Magellan, and Vespucci. England itself expanded as explorers and colonizers, such as Frobisher, Davis, Gilbert, Raleigh, Grenville, Drake, and others, carried the English flag into many distant lands and seas; as English trade and commerce expanded with the opening of new markets and new sources of supply; as English sea power grew to protect the trading routes and fend off rivals, particularly Spain, the defeat of whose Invincible Armada in 1588 greatly advanced English national pride at home, and power and prestige abroad.

The world of ideas changed and expanded, too. The rediscovery and reinterpretation of the classics, with their broad and humane view of life, gave a new direction and impetus to secular education. During the Middle Ages theology had dominated education, but now the language, literature, and philosophy of the ancient world, the practical arts of grammar, logic, and rhetoric, and training in morals, manners, and gymnastics assumed the major roles in both school and university—in other words, an education that fitted one for life in the world here and now replaced one that looked rather to the life hereafter. Not that the spiritual culture of man was neglected. Indeed, it took on a new significance, for as life in this world acquired new meaning and value, religion assumed new functions, and new vitality to perform them, as the bond between the Creator and a new kind of creation.

It was, of course, the old creation—man and nature—but it was undergoing great changes. Some of these we have already seen, but the greatest was in man's conception of himself and his place in nature. The Mediæval view of man was generally not an exalted one. It saw him as more or less depraved, fallen from Grace as a result of Adam's sin; and the things of this world, which was also "fallen," as of little value in terms of his salvation. Natural life was thought of mainly as a preparation for man's entry into Eternity. But Renaissance thought soon began to rehabilitate man, nature, and the things of this life. Without denying man's need for Grace and the value of the means of salvation provided by the Church, men came gradually to accept the idea that there were "goods", values, "innocent delights" to be had in the world here and now, and that God had given them for man to enjoy. Man himself was seen no longer as wholly vile and depraved, incapable even of desiring goodness, but rather as Shakespeare saw him in *Hamlet*:

What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!

And this is the conception of man that permeates Elizabethan thought and literature. It does not mean that man is incorruptible, immune to moral weakness and folly. Shakespeare has his villains, cowards, and fools. But man is none of these by nature; they are distortions of the true form of man. Nature framed him for greatness, endowed him with vast capacities for knowledge, achievement, and delight, and with aspirations that may take him to the stars. "O brave new world, That has such people in 't!"

The chief object of man's aspiring mind is now the natural world, whose "wondrous architecture," says Marlowe's *Tam-*

*burlaine*, our souls strive ceaselessly to comprehend, "Still climbing after knowledge infinite." Hamlet, too, speaks of "this goodly frame, the earth . . . this brave o'erhanging firmament, this majestical roof fretted with golden fire." No longer the ruins of a fallen paradise and the devil's, nature is seen as man's to possess, her beauty and wonder to be sought after and enjoyed, her energies to be controlled and used—as Bacon expressed it, "for the glory of the Creator and the relief of man's estate."

It was, indeed, a very stirring time to be alive in. New vistas were breaking upon the human mind and imagination everywhere. It was a time like spring, when promise, opportunity, challenge and growth appeared where none had been dreamed of before. Perhaps this is why there is so much poetry of spring-time in the age of Shakespeare.

## HIS THEATRE

There were many theatres, or playhouses, in Shakespeare's London. The first was built in 1576 by James Burbage and was called the *Theater*. It was built like an arena, with a movable platform at one end, and had no seats in the pit, but had benches in the galleries that surrounded it. It was built of wood, and cost about £200. Other famous playhouses of Shakespeare's time, for the most part similarly constructed, included the Curtain, the Bull, the Rose, the Swan, the Fortune, and, most famous of them all, the Globe. It was built in 1599 by the sons of James Burbage, and it was here that most of Shakespeare's plays were performed. Since more is known about the Globe than most of the others, I shall use it as the basis of the brief account that follows of the Elizabethan playhouse.

As its name suggests, the Globe was a circular structure (the second Globe, built in 1614 after the first burned down, was octagonal), and was open to the sky, somewhat like a modern football or baseball stadium, though much smaller. It had three tiers of galleries surrounding the central "yard" or pit, and a narrow roof over the top gallery. But most interesting from our viewpoint was the stage—or rather *stages*—which was very different from that of most modern theatres. These have the familiar "picture-frame" stage: a raised platform at one end of the auditorium, framed by curtains and footlights, and viewed only from the front like a picture. Shakespeare's stage was very different.

The main stage, or *apron* as it was called, jutted well out into the pit, and did not extend all the way across from side to side. There was an area on either side for patrons to sit or stand in, so that actors performing on the apron could be viewed from three sides instead of one. In addition there was an inner stage,

a narrow rectangular recess let into the wall behind the main stage. When not in use it could be closed by a curtain drawn across in front; when open it could be used for interior scenes, arbor scenes, tomb and anteroom scenes and the like. On either side of this inner stage were doors through which the main stage was entered. Besides the inner and outer stages there were no fewer than four other areas where the action of the play, or parts of it, might be performed. Immediately above the inner stage, and corresponding to it in size and shape, was another room with its front exposed. This was the upper stage, and was used for upstairs scenes, or for storage when not otherwise in use. In front of this was a narrow railed gallery, which could be used for balcony scenes, or ones requiring the walls of a castle or the ramparts of a fortress. On either side of it and on the same level was a window-stage, so-called because it consisted of a small balcony enclosed by windows that opened on hinges. This permitted actors to stand inside and speak from the open windows to others on the main stage below. In all it was a very versatile multiple stage and gave the dramatist and producer much more freedom in staging than most modern theatres afford. It is interesting to note that some of the new theatres today have revived certain of the features of the Elizabethan stage.

Very little in the way of scenery and backdrops was used. The dramatist's words and the imagination of the audience supplied the lack of scenery. No special lighting effects were possible since plays were performed in the daylight that streamed in through the unroofed top of the three-tiered enclosure that was the playhouse. Usually a few standard stage-props were on hand: trestles and boards to form a table, benches and chairs, flagons, an altar, artificial trees, weapons, a man's severed head, and a few other items. Costumes were usually elaborate and gorgeous, though no attempt was made to reproduce the dress of the time and place portrayed in the play.

Play production in Shakespeare's time was clearly very different from that of ours, but we need have no doubts about the audience's response to what they saw and heard on stage. They came, they saw, and the dramatist conquered, for they kept coming back for more and more. And despite the opposition that the theatre encountered from Puritans and others, who thought it the instrument of Satan, the theatre in Shakespeare's time flourished as one of the supreme glories of a glorious age.

—DAVID G. PITT  
Memorial University of  
Newfoundland.

## INTRODUCTION TO

### *A Midsummer Night's Dream*

#### AN EARLY PLAY

*A Midsummer Night's Dream* was probably written in 1595-96, and therefore belongs to Shakespeare's early period as dramatist. This was his time of apprenticeship to the playwright's craft, when he was experimenting in various dramatic forms, exploring among the many materials available to him, trying out new combinations of effects, making himself familiar with the tools of his craft, and perfecting his use of them. This is not to say that *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is a crude or amateurish play. In certain respects it is imperfect: for example, some of the characters are poorly drawn and do not always come fully to life. Yet when we take into account the manner in which the young dramatist has combined so effectively such a rich variety of materials—delightful stories, superb poetry, charming songs, moonlight and magic, rustics and fairies, aristocrats and common folk, humor, satire, and some quite serious observations on love and marriage—one can only marvel at the craftsmanship that has been able to weld it all into such a balanced, controlled, and unified whole as *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is.

#### FOUR STORIES IN ONE

The play contains no fewer than four distinct stories, each representing a different world and providing its own kind of comedy. The Theseus-Hippolyta story gives us the world of courtly and chivalric life, of noble blood and manners, of power and authority, of heroic deeds and heroic loves. In it we have the comedy of the ceremony and ritual of love, love that is freed from the caprices of fancy and dreams, and submitted to the order and pattern of a social pageant. In the story of the "rude mechanicals"—Bottom and his friends—we have the coarser but laughable comedy of a lower stratum in society, a farcical comedy that depends for its effects on comic character, on verbal wit and physical antics, ignorance, stupidity, and occasional though unconscious illumination, all of which is delightfully incongruous in the context of the Theseus-Hippolyta story. In their play-within-the-play of Pyramus and Thisby we have the same farcical strain carried over to a parody of romantic and tragic love. In the story of the four Athenian lovers, who represent our own world of give-and-take (in love as in other things), we have a comedy of

situation combined with a gentle satire on the foibles of lovers who love at first sight, who do not know their own minds and are not certain of their own hearts. And, finally, in the story of Oberon and Titania we have a kind of composite comedy that presents both the *reductio ad absurdum* of the other main love themes and situations (a travesty of marriage and a parody of love-in-idleness) and an allegory that depicts the catastrophic effects of instability in marriage.

How has Shakespeare achieved unity in this diversity? It is achieved largely by the simple device of narrative dove-tailing, of fitting the separate stories together in such a manner that none loses its identity while, at the same time, impinging upon the others so as to affect them materially both in spirit and in form. The Theseus-Hippolyta story may be called the "framing" story of the play, the story that begins and ends the action, and both encloses the other tales and forms the main bond among them. Of the others, two are related directly to the Theseus-Hippolyta story and are in a sense subsidiary to it: the rustics are rehearsing a play to perform at the ducal wedding, at which the fairies have come from India to be present. The fairy king and queen bring with them their quarrel over the changeling boy, and it is this that causes, through the intervention of Puck at Oberon's behest, the many delightful muddles of the lovers' story. This last story comes rather by accident or coincidence into the orbits of the others and is affected by rather than affects their action. While Theseus is instrumental in enforcing the edict that sends the four lovers into the wood, it is entirely accidental, though very appropriate, that it should be the same wood near Athens in which the rustics have chosen to rehearse and the fairies to gather. Thus, the three groups of characters, each with its own private concerns, are thrown together in the wood, and this wood, where the laws of nature are suspended and magic rules, becomes the main locale of the entire action of the play, and the atmosphere of moonlight and flowers that pervades it the atmosphere that envelops the whole. Thus the fairy world of the wood and its dream vistas and its moonlight are in themselves important unifying and harmonizing elements in the play.

#### THE LOVE THEME

A further unifying element of the play is its primary theme: love. To say that this play has such a theme does not mean that Shakespeare has written it primarily to dramatize or illustrate a moral or social thesis. Shakespeare never does this. Yet it is true that even in his most lighthearted comedies, and this is one of them, he is usually concerned to reflect certain ideas and attitudes that bear on human life and behavior. At the

same time one should not look too closely here for a full-blown philosophy of love. Shakespeare is laughing in this play more than he is philosophizing. But are there any inferences to be drawn, say, from the quality of his laughter, or the circumstances that evoke it? Let us see.

All four stories are about love in one way or another, but that of the four Athenians is the primary love story of the play. Not only does it occupy the largest place, but it concerns people closer to ourselves than are any of the others, and is, probably for this reason, the primary context for Shakespeare's treatment of love in this play. As suggested earlier the story of the four Athenians is, at least in part, a gentle satire on the foibles of lovers who succumb to Fancy—Shakespeare's term for love that is "engendered in the eyes." His point seems to be that love which is of the eyes or of the senses alone, love-in-idleness, is a fickle and unstable love. Indeed Puck's exploits parody this fanciful love. It will be recalled that Shakespeare links the lower and the lunatic (literally, moonstruck one) in terms of how and what they *see*. Neither sees with the clear cold light of reason.

One sees more devils than vast hell can hold,  
That is, the madman; the lover, all as frantic,  
Sees Helen's beauty in a brow of Egypt.

But is this really love? Is this the deep and lasting love that alone can make a stable marriage and a stable society? Shakespeare seems to think not. Helena observes that love "looks not with the eyes, but with the mind." And Puck exclaims at the sight of the "fond pageant" of the eye-cnamored lovers, "Lord, what fools these mortals be!"

In this story, however, "the course of true love" that "never did run smooth" has been troubled by another kind of caprice than that of love-in-idleness, the irrational, passionate choice of the eyes; it is troubled also by the rational, but unfeeling, choice of a third party: Hermia's father, Egeus. His choice for Hermia has been made in a very different way from hers, but, from the viewpoint of love, it is as capricious a choice as that of love-in-idleness. Love ought not to be the subject of caprice, no matter whose. Thus the rustics' play, though a parody, shows the folly of this second kind of caprice: misguided parental authority. Love may, then, be at the mercy of blind people, and this is worse than being blind itself.

The love of Oberon and Titania is troubled too, though theirs is a married love. But Shakespeare is not here satirizing married love in a normal human relationship. Theirs is not such a relationship; after all, they are not mortals. But, most important, they have no home, no settled place of abode, no household. This is necessary to married love; for stable mar-

riage, domesticity is the necessary complement to romance. Thus the love of Oberon and Titania is no more stable than that of Puck's victims. The Queen is as susceptible to love-in-idleness as are the mortal lovers. In contrast, Theseus and Hippolyta provide a background of sanity and stability in love for the folly and inconstancy of the others. Both have had their time of love-in-idleness, but now they represent the settled and untroubled love that, though still a passion, has been ordered and tempered by reason.

What, then, is Shakespeare's attitude toward marriage in so far as this play reflects it? Theseus early in the play sets the single over against the married state, saying that the former is "thrice-blessed" but the latter "earthlier-happy." Shakespeare does not debate the question, but he is clearly not on the side of "single blessedness." And yet he seems to say that it is better to "wither on the virgin thorn" than marry without love. This is a typical Renaissance attitude, in its insistence both on love as essential in marriage and on marriage as preferable to celibacy. For him, too, marriage should be the natural goal of love between man and woman. In this he is opposing the Mediæval notion of Courtly Love, which saw love outside of marriage as a possible end in itself.

Shakespeare also suggests that stability in marriage is necessary to ensure the stability of the ordered scheme of things—of society and even of nature itself. For the Oberon-Titania story may be read as an allegory having a meaning for human life and society. Titania may be taken to represent the moon (her name is one of several for Diana, the moon goddess) and Oberon the sun (see III, ii, 389-395). The changeling boy, then, may represent the day. Whose is the day, the moon's or the sun's? The question is not easy to answer, for a day includes both light and darkness, being the twenty-four hour span from midnight to midnight. It actually belongs to them both in partnership. But the elemental powers quarrel, and nature is turned topsy-turvy. Titania gives us a long and vivid description of nature laid waste, adding that "this same progeny of evils comes/From our debate" (III, i). The governing forces in nature must agree, must function in harmony, else all is disorder and disaster. Likewise in love and marriage, for marriage is the great stabilizer of society as the union of sun and moon is of nature.

#### THE CHARACTERS

As we have noted, this is an early play. It was written before Shakespeare had achieved his full powers in dramatic characterization. Hence, it is not surprising that, in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, some of the qualities are lacking that make dramatic characters both lifelike and unique, both recogniz-



able as human beings and yet different from anyone we have met before or are likely to meet again. Even so, the characters in this play, particularly the human ones, are never merely faceless names.

The fairies, perhaps, ought not to be judged in these terms anyway. They are a different order of beings to start with. Who are we to pass judgment on "every elf and fairy sprite"? Yet both Titania and Oberon, king and queen of Fairyland, are much like their human counterparts: dignified, regal, and courteous, yet, like them too, moved by such passions as jealousy and pride. Puck is more difficult to see as having any truly human counterpart; he is simply a quintessence of playful knavishness, good humor, gay spirits, cheerful and swift obedience. How could there be his equal amongst us monotonous mortals?

Of the mortals in the play Theseus and Hippolyta are (apart from the rustics) the most distinctly drawn and fully realized. Providing a centre of stability—in love as in temperament—in the midst of so much inconstancy and folly, they stand for intelligence, imagination, and common sense. They have passed through their time of love-in-idleness, and now have achieved the mature and settled love of people who know both their own hearts and their own minds. Here we find no quarrels over changlings, no passing infatuations, no falling in love with asses' heads. Shakespeare has not, however, pictured them as identical personalities. Theseus has undoubtedly the greater intellectual powers. Hippolyta's common-sense judgement of the rustics' play is that it is "the silliest stuff that ever I heard." But Theseus, with deeper imaginative insight, replies that "The best in this kind are but shadows; and the worst are no worse, if imagination amend them." His is the more profound judgment, for it is born of imagination as well as of intellect. The Duke and his Queen respectively represent, perhaps, imagination and common sense. If so, their marriage will be eminently successful.

The four Athenian lovers are for the most part rather vaguely drawn, although there is some differentiation among them. Lysander, for example, is more amiable than Demetrius, who is somewhat harsh and irascible though not unlikeable. The two women are rather more fully delineated and distinguished. In general, they stand in contrast to each other in both appearance and temperament. Hermia is short and dark, and has the more forceful personality of the two. She is vivacious and a bit quick tempered. We are told that "She was a vixen when she went to school; and though she be but little, she is fierce." Yet she is modest, affectionate, and loyal. We doubt that she will ever become a shrewish wife. Helena is tall and blonde, and has "no gift at all in shrewishness." She is quieter than Hermia, more easygoing, and more stable in