

*Linguae &*  
*Rivista di lingue e culture moderne*

Evelyn Gajowski

Afterword: Subjectivity v. Objectification

<https://doi.org/10.14276/l.v24i2.4430>

ISSN 1724-8698

Urbino University Press  
Università degli Studi di Urbino Carlo Bo



Evelyn Gajowski

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

[shakespe@unlv.nevada.edu](mailto:shakespe@unlv.nevada.edu)

## Afterword: Subjectivity v. Objectification

In view of the US Supreme Court's Dobbs decision overturning *Roe v. Wade*, it is difficult to understand how anyone, inside or outside academia, could claim that we in the twenty-first century exist in a post-feminist world. Indeed, is it possible to think about the rape and silencing of Lavinia in Shakespeare's dramatic text, *Titus Andronicus* – without simultaneously thinking about the rape and silencing of the ten-year-old Ohio female who sought an abortion in post-Roe US? Conversely, is it possible to think about the rape and silencing of the ten-year-old Ohio female who sought an abortion in post-Roe US – without simultaneously thinking about the rape and silencing of Lavinia in Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*? When we undertake to study issues of women's violation and silence in Shakespeare's texts, we cannot help but be influenced by the many instances of women's violation and silence in historical and contemporary societies around the globe. Present history has the effect of galvanizing our consideration of fictionalized texts. There are two things that women are silent about: "their pleasure and their violation", as Barbara Johnson puts it. "The work performed by the idealization of this silence is that *it helps culture not to be able to tell the difference between the two*" (1996, 136 emphasis hers).

Theoretical and critical work remains to be done in differentiating women's pleasure from women's violation.

"To be a subject is to be able to speak, to give meaning", as Catherine Belsey points out (1985, x). Dramatic instances of female voices and silences in Shakespeare's texts are inextricably bound up in theoretical issues of female subjectivity and objectification. On the one hand, female characters' speech, action, and, thereby, their ability to construct meaning constitute their subjectivity. On the other hand, female characters' silence, passivity, and, thereby, other characters' ability to inscribe meaning upon them constitute their objectification. Both female subjectivity and female objectification in Shakespeare's texts are deserving of greater theoretical and critical attention in the twenty-first century.

When considering female silences on the part of Shakespeare's female characters, Isabella at the end of *Measure for Measure* and Hermione at the end of *The Winter's Tale* come to mind, as well as Lavinia. Lavinia's silence is – brutally – externally imposed upon her, while the silences of Isabella and Hermione are self-imposed (or seemingly self-imposed by Shakespeare). What are we to make of Isabella's silence in response to Vincentio's marriage command? Marcia Riefer is the first Shakespeare scholar to problematize the play's ending by raising this question (1984). What are we to make of Hermione's silence in response to her reunion with Leontes? Adrian Kiernander points out that idea of the happy reunion of Hermione and Leontes is nothing more than a heterosexual male fantasy of forgiveness (1997). The externally imposed and self-imposed silences have differentiated implications for female objectification and female subjectivity – and therefore for the construction of meaning, generally construed. To what extent does Shakespeare invite audience members and readers to participate in male characters' objectifications of female characters as silent, passive objects upon whom others (i.e. characters and critics alike) impose meaning? To what extent does Shakespeare invite audience members and readers to sympathize (even identify) with female characters as speaking, acting subjects who are granted the ability to construct meaning? Elsewhere, I have coined the term, *theatrical subjectivity*, to convey audience members' and readers' awareness of the gap, or disparity, between female subjectivity as enacted onstage, on the one hand, and

male characters' simultaneous objectification of female characters, on the other (1992). Desdemona is a good example of this phenomenon: the utter innocence of her every word and deed onstage stands in sharp contrast to the male lies about her guilt of marital infidelity – initially, on the part of Iago, and, finally, on the part of Othello.

It is surprising to learn that only five female protagonists in Shakespeare's texts speak more than 500 lines, as Jeanne Addison Roberts points out: Portia and Rosalind in the romantic comedies; Juliet (who speaks 509 lines) and Cleopatra (who speaks 622 lines) in the tragedies; and Imogen in the romances (2002, 201). When it comes to profoundly felt love eloquently expressed, both Juliet and Cleopatra come to mind. "My bounty is as boundless as the sea, / My love as deep: the more I give to thee, / The more I have, for both are infinite" (2.2.133-35) Juliet declares to Romeo in the most famous of all love scenes in Western literature. Throughout the dramatic action of *Romeo and Juliet*, she resists Romeo's attempts to construct her as a silent, passive beloved object on a pedestal in accordance with the centuries-old Petrarchan discursive tradition. "There is nothing left remarkable / Beneath the visiting moon" (4.15.69-70) Cleopatra mourns as Antony dies in her lap. Throughout the dramatic action of *Antony and Cleopatra*, her "infinite variety" (2.2.246) inheres in her ability to defy delimiting Roman stereotypes that would construct her as an inferior colonized female in accordance with discourses that are simultaneously idealizing, denigrating, and orientalist.

Critical evaluations of Shakespeare's work have focused on the issue of female subjectivity since the seventeenth century. In the first critical essay published on Shakespeare, Margaret Cavendish celebrates what she calls the "realism" of Shakespeare's female characters. One would think, she observed, that Shakespeare had actually been transformed into every one of the characters he portrayed, even "that he had been Metamorphosed from a Man into a Woman". Cavendish singled out eight characters as examples of Shakespeare's superlative representations of women, including Cleopatra, Beatrice, Alice Ford, and Margaret Page (1664, 246).

Groundbreaking book-length feminist studies in the 1970s and 1980s opened up new meanings in Shakespeare's texts that had been silenced for nearly four centuries. The first feminist monograph, *Shakespeare and the Nature of*

*Women* by Juliet Dusinberre (1975), constructed Shakespeare as a proto-feminist and appropriated him as a political ally in the international women's movement of the time. "Shakespeare saw men and women as equal", she observes, "in a world which declared them unequal" (1975, 308). Others followed suit, emphasizing the autonomy, agency and power of Shakespeare's female characters, particularly in the romantic comedies. The histories and the tragedies, on the other hand, were viewed as bailiwicks of male characters. Monographs such as Linda Bamber's *Comic Women, Tragic Men* (1982) encapsulate this binary of gender and genre. The first collection of feminist essays, *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare* (1980), edited by Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Greene and Carol Thomas Neely, enunciated four goals: (1) to liberate female characters from the stereotypes to which traditional liberal humanist criticism had confined them; (2) to examine relationships between and among female characters; (3) to analyze the effects of patriarchy on female characters; and (4) to explore the implications of genre for Shakespeare's depiction of females (1980, 4).<sup>1</sup>

However, generalities about early modern Europe came under scrutiny. Historical research differentiated men's lived experience and women's lived experience: that which was true of males was not found to be true of females. 'No' was the answer to the question that historian Joan Kelly posed, "Did Women Have a Renaissance?" (1984 [1977]). British feminist scholars such as Kathleen McLuskie offered a counter-argument to Dusinberre's proto-feminist Shakespeare: he was, instead, a "patriarchal bard". "Feminist criticism of this play [*Measure for Measure*] is restricted to exposing its own exclusion from the text", she notes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Following Dusinberre (1975), Lenz, Greene and Neely (1980) and Bamber, book-length studies of Shakespeare from a feminist standpoint include the following: Irene Dash (1981), Coppélia Kahn (1981, 1997), Lisa Jardine (1983), Marianne Novy (1984, 2017), Linda Woodbridge (1984), Carol Thomas Neely (1985), Dymphna Callaghan (1989, 2000a, 2000b), Valerie Wayne (1991), Evelyn Gajowski (1992, 2009, 2015), Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker (1994), Kim Hall (1995), Deborah Barker and Ivo Kamps (1995), Shirley Nelson Garner and Madelon Sprengnether (1996), Jean Howard and Phyllis Rackin (1997), Naomi Liebler (2002), Joyce MacDonald (2002), Phyllis Rackin (2005, 2015), Kay Stanton (2014) and Ania Loomba and Melissa Sanchez (2016). This list is suggestive, rather than exhaustive.

It has no point of entry into it, for the dilemmas of the narrative and the sexuality under discussion are constructed in completely male terms [...] and the women's role as the objects of exchange within that system of sexuality is not at issue, however much a feminist might want to draw attention to it. (1994 [1985], 97-98)

Regardless of the subversion that Shakespeare's female characters manage to pose to patriarchal imperatives, patriarchy inevitably contained that subversion. Although his intelligent, articulate, autonomous female characters possess agency, particularly in the romantic comedies, they inevitably end up disempowered, submitting to the institution of male supremacist marriage. Feminist criticism attempted to transcend the 'Shakespeare as proto-feminist' vs. 'Shakespeare as patriarchal bard' standoff by examining early modern English documents that gave rise to it. Under the influence of new historicism, feminism became preoccupied with the relationship between text and context, exploring the position of women in early modern English society as well as in literary texts.

Feminism took its place among cultural materialism, new historicism, and psychoanalysis as one of the dominant theoretical and critical approaches challenging traditional liberal humanism and interpreting Shakespeare afresh in a poststructural, postmodern theoretical and critical climate. By the 1990s, however, new historicism evolved into hegemony, as Hugh Grady points out, marginalizing other theoretical and critical approaches to analyzing Shakespeare's texts (1996, 4-5). Under the influence of historicism, it became unfashionable and naïve to celebrate the power and agency of Shakespeare's female characters and their subversion of patriarchal imperatives. It became fashionable, instead, to emphasize how any subversion, including female subversion, is inevitably contained by patriarchal power structures. Lena Cowan Orlin points out that contemporary new historicists used the phrase, "chaste, silent, and obedient", to describe the status of women in early modern English society. Yet, new historicists themselves cite the refrain more frequently than early modern English conduct books, marriage sermons, and household manuals did (2001). Building upon Cowan's work, Phyllis Rackin points out a curiosity in contemporary Shakespeare studies: scholars, including feminist scholars, give more theoretical and critical attention to Katherine's mistreatment

by Petruchio in *The Taming of the Shrew* than, for example, Alice Ford's and Margaret Page's empowerment in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (2000, 54).<sup>2</sup> Why is this the case?

Approaching the millennium, feminist studies began to focus on the intersectionality of gender and race, postcolonialism, nationality, sexual orientation and class. The collection of essays, *Women, 'Race', and Writing in the Early Modern Period* (1994), co-edited by Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker, and Kim Hall's monograph, *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender* (1995), broke ground in this regard. Dympna Callaghan articulated the aims of her edited collection, *The Feminist Companion to Shakespeare*: "to demonstrate feminist visibility – even to the point of conspicuousness – and its integration into the broader field of Shakespeare studies by way of overlapping categories: the history of feminist Shakespeare criticism, text and language, social economies, sexuality, race and religion" (2000, xv).<sup>3</sup> More recently, in their co-edited collection of essays, *Rethinking Feminism in Early Modern Studies: Gender, Race, and Sexuality*, Ania Loomba and Melissa Sanchez focus on the relationship of feminism to scholarly work since the millennium on race, postcolonialism, affect, sexuality, transnationality and posthumanism that challenges earlier definitions of "women" and gender (2016). Marianne Novy's monograph, *Shakespeare and Feminist Theory* (2017), for the Arden Shakespeare and Theory Series, provides a comprehensive survey of feminist theoretical and critical developments, analyzing female characters' embodiment of various social roles – lovers, wives, mothers, friends, allies and workers – in Shakespeare's texts. Early feminist Shakespeareans were concerned to emphasize the innocence of Shakespeare's female characters in opposition to male characters' lies about their sexual guilt, particularly in Shakespeare's texts that dramatize the issue of the true woman falsely accused, such as *Much Ado about Nothing*, *Othello*, *Cymbeline*, and *The Winter's Tale*. In recent years, however, a shift emerged to an

---

<sup>2</sup> In our co-edited collection of essays, *The Merry Wives of Windsor: New Critical Essays* (2015), Rackin and I attempt to correct this imbalance.

<sup>3</sup> See Rackin's contribution to the essay collection, *Presentism, Gender, and Sexuality in Shakespeare* (2009), edited by Evelyn Gajowski, for a fuller analysis of feminism vis-à-vis historicism, on the one hand, and feminism's relationship to contemporary political, social and economic developments in the US, on the other.

emphasis on female characters as sexual subjects rather than sexual objects. Critical studies such as Kay Stanton's monograph, *Shakespeare's 'Whores': Erotics, Politics, and Poetics* (2014), which includes chapter-length studies of Cleopatra, Rosalind, and Venus, perhaps best exemplifies this shift.

Because feminist critical practices are grounded in the political, economic and social forces of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, they have a particular responsibility to acknowledge these origins. Rackin is foremost among Shakespeare scholars in understanding this inherent responsibility:

Our own experience of Shakespeare's women is conditioned not only by the accumulated tradition of Shakespeare scholarship and reception but also by the present history of the world in which we live: both of these histories help to shape our experience of the plays, whether we study them in an academic setting, see them on stage or screen, or read them in the privacy of our own rooms. (2005, 5-6)

Both of these histories – scholarly tradition and the twenty-first-century world in which we are enmeshed – are in need of feminist intervention.

Feminism's critique of new historicism's erasure of gender issues, especially the theoretical issue of female subjectivity, originates in the 1970s and 1980s. Lynda Boose condemns both new historicism and cultural materialism for their indifference to gender issues:

When gender is not being simply ignored in the materialist critiques, it repeatedly ends up getting displaced into some other issue – usually race or class – and women are silently eradicated from the text, leaving only one gender for consideration. This kind of displacement and erasure [...] is, in effect, a modern day re-silencing taking place even as Renaissance strategies of silencing are being discussed" (1987, 728-29). She criticizes Stephen Greenblatt for his declaration that "on stage there is in fact but a single gender. (1986, 52)

"Suddenly, there is one gender and there are no more women in Shakespeare's plays", she notes (1987, 730). Carol Thomas Neely criticizes both new historicists and cultural materialists for erasing the female subject in early modern literature and society that feminists had laboriously brought to life: "The denial of subjectivity and identity are pleasurable", she notes, "especially to those who have had the luxury of indulging in and benefiting from them. But for feminist criticism, this decentering is a decapitation. If feminist criticism abandons the notion of the subject, replacing it with the much more



slippery concept of subject positions, [...] the ground for its critique is eliminated” (1988)<sup>4</sup>. Boose’s and Neely’s concerns with female subjectivity in the 1980s resonate with an even greater sense of urgency today.

Hugh Grady scrutinizes new historicist theories of the relationship between the subject and the power structures within which the subject is situated. He finds the theorizing of the subject as “monolithically determined by all-containing structures of ideology and power” to be an inescapable “straitjacket” (1996, 216-17). He instead envisages and theorizes the possibility of a less constricted subjectivity, one that is “an active agent”, not merely “a passive effect”. Grady, from a presentist standpoint, and Neely, from a feminist standpoint, both theorize similar kinds of subjectivity. Like her, he deems new historicism’s deployment of Jonathan Dollimore’s “consolidation/subversion/containment” paradigm (1994 [1985], 10-15) insufficient – particularly its privileging of power structures’ containment of any possibility of subversion on the part of a subject. In theorizing a subjectivity that possesses a potentially critical rather than a merely complicit relation to early modern English power (1996, 14, 219), Grady theorizes a subjectivity that accommodates the concerns of feminist theorists and critics, allowing for the possibility of successful subversion and social change – in Shakespeare’s texts as in twenty-first-century societies.

At the moment of this writing in 2023, transgender studies and asexuality studies are theoretical and critical developments at the forefront of feminist, gender, and sexuality studies. Transgender studies interrogate and challenge the socially-constructed gender binary – ‘masculine’/‘feminine’ – as inadequate to convey the complexities of actual lived human experience. Alexa Alice Joubin’s monograph, *Shakespeare and Transgender Theory*, forthcoming in the Arden Shakespeare and Theory Series, exemplifies these traits. Similarly, asexuality studies take into consideration human experience that transcends sexual desire – whether gay, lesbian, bi, trans, queer, homo, or hetero. Indeed, riffing on

---

<sup>4</sup> In addition to Boose and Neely, other Shakespeare scholars who critique new historicism from a feminist theoretical/critical standpoint include the following: Peter Erickson (1987), Marguerite Waller (1987), Carolyn Porter (1988 and 1991), Sarah Eaton (1991), Ann Thompson (1991), Valerie Wayne (1991a), Evelyn Gajowski (1992, 2009), Lisa Jardine (1996), and Phyllis Rackin (2000, 2005, 2009).

Adrienne Rich's groundbreaking article, "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence" (1986), asexual studies interrogate and challenge what it calls "compulsory sexuality". Simone Chess is notable for spearheading work in this area.

Feminist theory and criticism continue to build upon the fresh insights gained from intersectional, global studies of women, GLBTQ+ people, non-white people and indigenous people that inhabit the twenty-first century world, as they inhabit Shakespeare's texts.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, in view of a conservative backlash in societies around the globe, a sense of urgency pervades current feminist criticism as it continues to interrogate, challenge and deconstruct the objectification of women, GLBTQ+ people, non-white people and indigenous people. Feminist criticism insists, instead, on illuminating their subjectivity. A sense of urgency also pervades current feminist criticism as it expands its recognition of the subjectivity of entities that have, historically, been objectified: nonhuman species of animals chief among them – territory that ecofeminists, posthumanists, and ecocritics, in particular, have staked out for analysis.<sup>6</sup> It is not hyperbolic to realize, and admit, that the existential crisis that confronts the human species in the twenty-first century – nothing less than the survival of life on earth – depends upon intervention, in Shakespeare criticism as in the present moment, into the 'strong man' politics that are currently spreading across the globe, celebrating tyranny and violence and eradicating democracy in its wake.

---

<sup>5</sup> *White People in Shakespeare: Essays on Race, Culture and the Elite* (2023), a collection of essays edited by Arthur L. Little, Jr., and Jyotsna Singh's monograph, *Shakespeare and Postcolonial Theory* (2019) for the Arden Shakespeare and Theory Series, provide recent examples of this kind of intersectionality and globalism.

<sup>6</sup> In their co-authored monograph, *Shakespeare and Ecofeminist Theory* (2017), for the Arden Shakespeare and Theory Series, for example, co-authors Rebecca Laroche and Jennifer Munroe argue for decentering the monarch in our theoretical and critical responses to Shakespeare's *King Lear*, as well as a focus on traditionally marginalized individuals and groups: the poor, the homeless, female characters and nonhuman animals.

## References

- Bamber, Linda. 1982. *Comic Women, Tragic Men. A Study of Gender and Genre in Shakespeare*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Barker, Deborah E. and Ivo Kamps, eds. 1995. *Shakespeare and Gender: A History*. London: Verso.
- Belsey, Catherine. 1985. *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama*. London and New York: Methuen.
- Boose, Lynda E. 1987. "The Family in Shakespeare Studies; or—Studies in the Family of Shakespeareans; or—The Politics of Politics". *Renaissance Quarterly*, 40 (4): 707-42.
- Callaghan, Dympna. 1989. *Woman and Gender in Renaissance Tragedy: A Study of King Lear, Othello, The Duchess of Malfi and The White Devil*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press International.
- Callaghan, Dympna, ed. 2000. *A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare*. Malden, MA, and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Callaghan, Dympna. 2000a. "Introduction". In Callaghan ed. 2000, xi-xxiv. Malden, MA, and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Callaghan, Dympna. 2000b. *Shakespeare without Women: Representing Gender and Race on the Renaissance Stage*. London: Routledge.
- Cavendish, Margaret. 1664. "Letter 122". In *Sociable Letters*. London: William Wilson.
- Dash, Irene. 1981. *Wooing, Wedding and Power: Women in Shakespeare's Plays*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dollimore, Jonathan. 1994 [1985]. "Introduction: 'Shakespeare, Cultural Materialism, and the New Historicism'". In *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Ed. by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, 2-17. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Dusinberre, Juliet. 1975. *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Eaton, Sara 1991. "Defacing the Feminine in Renaissance Tragedy". In Wayne ed. 1991, 181-98. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Erickson, Peter. 1987. "Rewriting the Renaissance, Rewriting Ourselves". *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 38: 327-37.
- Gajowski, Evelyn. 1992. *The Art of Loving: Female Subjectivity and Male Discursive Traditions in Shakespeare's Tragedies*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Presses.
- Gajowski, Evelyn, ed. 2009. *Presentism, Gender, and Sexuality in Shakespeare*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gajowski, Evelyn and Phyllis Rackin, eds. 2015. *The Merry Wives of Windsor: New Critical Essays*. London: Routledge.
- Garner, Shirley Nelson and Madelon Sprengnether, eds. 1996. *Shakespearean Tragedy and Gender*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Grady, Hugh. 1996. *Shakespeare's Universal Wolf. Studies in Early Modern Reification*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hall, Kim F. 1995. *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Hendricks, Margo and Patricia Parker, eds. 1994. *Women, 'Race', and Writing in the Early Modern Period*. New York: Routledge.
- Howard, Jean E. and Phyllis Rackin. 1997. *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's English Histories*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jardine, Lisa. 1983. *Still Harping on Daughters: Women and Drama in the Age of Shakespeare*, 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jardine, Lisa. 1996. *Reading Shakespeare Historically*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Johnson, Barbara. 1996. "Muteness Envy". In *Human, All Too Human*. Ed. by Diana Fuss, 131-48. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kelly, Joan. 1984 [1977] "Did Women Have a Renaissance?". In *Women, History, and Theory: The Essays of Joan Kelly*. Ed. by Joan Kelly, 19-50. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Kahn, Coppélia. 1981. *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kahn, Coppélia. 1997. *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women*. New York: Routledge.

- Kiernander, Adrian. 1997. Online comment. SHAKSPER: The Global Shakespeare Discussion List, 10 April, Available online: <http://shaksper.net> (20/11/2023).
- Laroche, Rebecca, and Jennifer Munroe. 2017. *Shakespeare and Ecofeminist Theory*. Arden Shakespeare, London: Bloomsbury.
- Lenz, Carolyn Ruth Swift, Gayle Greene, and Carol Thomas Neely, eds. 1980. *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Liebler, Naomi Conn, ed. 2002. *The Female Tragic Hero in English Renaissance Drama*. London and New York: Palgrave.
- Little, Jr., Arthur L. 2023. *White People in Shakespeare: Essays on Race, Culture and the Elite*. Arden Shakespeare, London: Bloomsbury.
- Loomba, Ania, and Melissa E. Sanchez, eds. 2016. *Rethinking Feminism in Early Modern Studies: Gender, Race, and Sexuality*. New York: Routledge.
- MacDonald, Joyce Green. 2002. *Women and Race in Early Modern Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McLuskie, Kathleen. 1994 [1985]. "The Patriarchal Bard: Feminist Criticism and Shakespeare: *King Lear* and *Measure for Measure*". In *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Ed. by Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield, 88-108. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Neely, Carol Thomas. 1985. *Broken Nuptials in Shakespeare's Plays*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Neely, Carol Thomas. 1988. "Constructing the Subject: Feminist Practice and the New Renaissance Discourses". *English Literary Renaissance*, 18: 5-18.
- Novy, Marianne. 1984. *Love's Argument: Gender Relations in Shakespeare*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Novy, Marianne. 2017. *Shakespeare and Feminist Theory*. Arden Shakespeare, London: Bloomsbury.
- Orlin, Lena Cowen 2001. "A Case for Anecdotalism in Women's History: The Witness Who Spoke When the Cock Crowed". *English Literary Renaissance*, 31(1): 52-77.
- Porter, Carolyn 1988. "Are We Being Historical Yet?". *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 87: 743-87.

Rackin, Phyllis. 2000. "Misogyny Is Everywhere". In Callaghan ed. 2000, 60-74. Malden, MA, and Oxford: Blackwell.

Rackin, Phyllis. 2005. *Shakespeare and Women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rackin, Phyllis. 2009. "Dated and Outdated: The Present Tense of Feminist Shakespeare Criticism". In Gajowski ed. 2009, 49-60. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rich, Adrienne. 1986. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence". In *Blood, Bread, and Poetry: Selected Prose 1979-1985*. Adrienne Rich, 23-75. New York: Norton.

Riefer, Marcia. 1984. "'Instruments of Some More Mightier Member': The Constriction of Female Power in *Measure for Measure*". *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 35 (2): 157-69.

Roberts, Jeanne Addison. 2002. "Sex and the Female Tragic Hero". In *The Female Tragic Hero in English Renaissance Drama*. Ed. by Naomi Coon Liebler, 199-215. New York: Palgrave.

Shakespeare, William. 2001. *The Arden Shakespeare Complete Works*. Ed. by Richard Proudfoot, Ann Thompson, and David Scott Kastan, rev. ed. Arden Shakespeare, London: Bloomsbury.

Singh, Jyotsna G. 2019. *Shakespeare and Postcolonial Theory*. Arden Shakespeare, London: Bloomsbury.

Stanton, Kay 2014. *Shakespeare's 'Whores': Erotics, Politics and Poetics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Thompson, Ann. 1991. "Are There Any Women in *King Lear*?" In Wayne ed. 1991, 117-28. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Waller, Marguerite. 1987. "Academic Tootsie: The Denial of Difference and the Difference It Makes". *Diacritics*, 17: 2-20.

Wayne, Valerie, ed. 1991. *The Matter of Difference: Materialist Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Wayne, Valerie. 1991a. "Introduction". In Wayne ed. 1991, 1-26. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Woodbridge, Linda. 1984. *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womanhood 1540-1620*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.