

Alexandra Geissler, Matthias Schneider (Hrsg.)

Zwischen *artes liberales* und *artes digitales*

Beiträge zur traditionellen
und digitalen Geisteswissenschaft

Alexandra Geissler und
Matthias Schneider (Hrsg.)

Zwischen artes liberales und artes digitales

Zwischen *artes liberales* und *artes digitales*

Beiträge zur traditionellen und digitalen Geisteswissenschaft

Festschrift

gewidmet Michael Trauth

zum 65. Geburtstag am 10. Mai 2015

Herausgegeben von

Alexandra Geissler und Matthias Schneider

Tectum Verlag

Alexandra Geissler
Matthias Schneider (Hrsg.)
Zwischen artes liberales und artes digitales.
Beiträge zur traditionellen und digitalen Geisteswissenschaft
© Tectum Verlag Marburg, 2016

ISBN: 978-3-8288-6532-7

(Dieser Titel ist zugleich als gedrucktes Buch unter
der ISBN 978-3-8288-3809-3 im Tectum Verlag erschienen.)

Satz: Alexandra Geissler M. A.

Satzsystem: TUSTEP, entwickelt und programmiert am Zentrum für
Datenverarbeitung, Abteilung Literarische und Dokumentarische
Datenverarbeitung der Universität Tübingen

Umschlagabbildung: photocase.com © maspi

Umschlaggestaltung: Norman Rinkenberger | Tectum Verlag

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Besuchen Sie uns im Internet
www.tectum-verlag.de

Bibliografische Informationen der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der
Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Angaben sind
im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

INHALT

Vorwort	VII
---------------	-----

BEITRÄGE ZUR TRADITIONELLEN GEISTESWISSENSCHAFT

BARBARA BOLLIG

Soundscaping Denmark & the Athenian Forest. Gaining a Voice, Lending an Ear, & Being 'Over-Heard' in <i>Hamlet</i> & <i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i>	3
---	---

CHRISTIAN HAIN

Die Zäsur <i>Napoleon</i> im Leben des sachsen-weimarischen Legationsrats Johannes Daniel Falk	19
--	----

CHRISTOPH HÖBEL

Tugend und Stil. Ciceros philosophische Schriften als rhetorische Manifestation	35
---	----

ROBERT HÜBNER

Beobachtungen zur Textstruktur der <i>Ilias</i>	53
---	----

MANFRED KOLTES

Die Regestaugabe der Briefe an Goethe	75
---	----

IMMO MEENKEN

Eine Begegnung von Geschichte und Utopie. James Harringtons <i>The Commonwealth of Oceana</i> (1656)	85
--	----

MATTHIAS SCHNEIDER

Informationelle Interaktion als Herausforderung für die Verwaltungsreform Friedrich Wilhelms I. – Überlegungen zur Gründungsinstruktion des <i>General-Ober-Finanz-, Krieger- und Domänen-directoriums</i> 1723 ...	103
---	-----

ERIKA TIMM

Zur Vorgeschichte des altjiddischen <i>Maisebuchs</i> . Eine Skizze und ein Textbeispiel: ›Rabbi Pinchas ben Ja'ir und seine Eselin‹	135
--	-----

BEITRÄGE ZUR
DIGITALEN GEISTESWISSENSCHAFT

BERNHARD BALTES-GÖTZ

Regressionsmodelle für Paneldaten 157

THOMAS BURCH

Die Sichtbarmachung der Gleichzeitigkeit. Von Arno Peters' *Synchron-optischer Weltgeschichte* zurück in die Zukunft zu *Herodot* 183

KURT GÄRTNER

Wissenschaftliche Editionen und philologische Datenverarbeitung.
Rückblick auf eine fruchtbare Zusammenarbeit 211

WILHELM OTT

Et facta est lux. Die Anfänge des TUSTEP-Satzprogramms 227

MARTIN SCHUBERT

Repeat till the page is full, printer. Typografische Sorgfalt und der
wissenschaftliche Satz 251

FRIEDRICH SECK

Kalenderrechnung mit TUSTEP 263

Die Autoren und Herausgeber dieses Bandes 275

Vorwort

AD MULTOS ANNOS!

»Viele Jahren« wünschen die Herausgeber dem Jubilar Michael Trauth auch im Namen der Autoren, gratulieren und danken ihm in Form dieses Bandes.

Im Herbst 2014 begannen unsere Überlegungen, wie man anlässlich des 65. Geburtstages und des Ausscheidens aus dem aktiven Dienst an der Universität Trier unserem Kollegen und Freund Dr. Michael Trauth ein Zeichen des Danks und der Wertschätzung entgegenbringen könnte. Aus diesem Räsonnement entstand die Idee einer Festschrift mit Themen aus den »traditionellen« und den Digitalen Geisteswissenschaften – Felder, in den denen sich der Geehrte mit seiner Arbeit stets bewegte.

Der Jubilar begann sein Studium der Geschichte und Klassischen Philologie an der Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg. 1972 führte ihn sein Weg an die Universität Trier, wo er sein Studium abschloss und dann im Fach Neuere Geschichte als Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter zu arbeiten begann. 1987 wurde er mit der Arbeit *Eine Begegnung von Wissenschaft und Aufklärung: die Universität Trier im 18. Jahrhundert* promoviert. Später wechselte er als Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter in das Universitätsrechenzentrum – heute Zentrum für Informations-, Medien- und Kommunikationstechnologie (ZIMK). Dort war er bis zum September 2015 mit der Anwenderberatung bezüglich des IT-Einsatzes in den Geisteswissenschaften betraut.

Kurse zur Verwendung von Bibliographieprogrammen, zur Datensicherheit und Datensicherung, zur typographisch hochwertigen Gestaltung von Druck- und elektronischen Publikationen sowie zur professionellen Verarbeitung von Graphiken umreißen nur einen Teil dessen, was der Jubilar zu seinem »Angebot an den Nutzer« zählte.

Für viele Geisteswissenschaftler in Trier und darüber hinaus war und ist die Begegnung mit der IT respektive der Einsatz von IT in der alltäglichen Arbeit in Forschung und Lehre eng verbunden mit der Person Michael Trauths. Für viele Hilfskräfte, Mitarbeiter und Professoren war und ist er der erste Anlaufpunkt für Probleme mit ihrer Datenverarbeitung. Von Fragen zur Wiederherstellung gelöschter Daten über die Bekämpfung von Virenbefall bis hin zur Erstellung komplexer Programme zur Verarbeitung von Forschungsdaten kam und kommt

man an der Universität Trier und darüber hinaus nicht am hier Geehrten vorbei. Wie Geisteswissenschaftler die Möglichkeiten von Computer und Internet für ihre Arbeit sinnvoll nutzen können, treibt Michael Trauth mit einer überaus großen Affinität zur Methodik bis heute um.

Seine Tätigkeit und sein Engagement werden weit über die Grenzen seiner Alma mater hinaus geschätzt. Zahlreichen Projekten hat er seine Unterstützung zukommen lassen, zum Teil begleitet er sie schon über Jahre. Seine Erfahrungen bei der Erstellung und Publikation von Indizes, Sammelbänden, Monographien, historisch-kritischen Editionen sowie zweisprachigen Textausgaben kommen Forschern nicht nur in Deutschland zugute.

Eine besonders lange, intensive und emotionale Verbindung besteht zwischen Michael Trauth und dem Tübinger System von Textverarbeitungsprogrammen (TUSTEP) inklusive dessen beiden Entwicklern Professor Dr. Wilhelm Ott und Kuno Schälkle sowie der International TUSTEP User Group (ITUG e.V.), zu deren ersten Mitgliedern er zählt. Trier wurde in den letzten Jahren und Jahrzehnten zu einem der wichtigsten Standorte des seit 1966 an der Universität Tübingen entwickelten Programmpakets. Die von Michael Trauth abgehaltenen Kurse waren für viele von uns der Einstieg in die Digitalen Geisteswissenschaften/Digital Humanities; und dies häufig schon lange, bevor dieses Begriffspaar erfunden und *en vogue* wurde.

Auch als Gesprächspartner und Ratgeber war Michael Trauth für viele an der Trierer Universität unverzichtbar – und wird es bleiben. Neben alltäglichen Herausforderungen des IT-Einsatzes (inklusive topaktueller Tipps zu Hard- und Software) konnte man sich stets gewiss sein, dass diverse weitere Themen historischer, philologischer, politischer oder auch naturwissenschaftlicher Art Gegenstand eines Gesprächs werden konnten. Seinem Ruf als Gelehrter und akademischer Lehrer wird er bei verschiedensten Gelegenheiten mehr als gerecht, bleibt dabei aber stets über alle Maßen bescheiden.

Es verwundert nicht, dass die Beiträger dieses Bandes aus den unterschiedlichsten Fachrichtungen stammen, zeichnen sich doch auch Michael Trauths Interessen durch eine enorme Vielseitigkeit aus. Vertreten sind Beiträge aus dem Bereich der Klassischen Philologie, der Editionsphilologie und der Geschichte, aus der Statistik, der philologischen Datenverarbeitung, der Typographie und den Digital Humanities.

Am Ende der circa einjährigen Arbeiten an diesem Band dürfen Worte des Dankes nicht fehlen. Zu danken ist den Autoren, deren Beiträge diese Festschrift erst möglich gemacht haben; und es sei ausdrücklich darauf hingewiesen,

dass noch viele andere sich an diesem Sammelband beteiligen wollten, es ihnen aber ob des straffen Zeitplans nicht möglich war. Heidi Hein danken wir für ihre unermüdliche theoretische und praktische Unterstützung, Wilhelm Ott und Hans Werner Bartz für ihre unentbehrliche Hilfe beim Satz, Heinrich Delfosse und Ute Recker-Hamm für ihren Rat und Andreas Dorn für seine Mitarbeit bei Korrektur- und Prüfarbeiten. Zu danken ist nicht zuletzt dem Tectum-Verlag, namentlich Ina Beneke, für die gute Zusammenarbeit. Zum guten Schluss gilt der größte Dank dem Geehrten selbst, mit dessen Satzroutine auch dieser Band gesetzt wurde, und seiner Familie, die ihn so oft mit seinen »Kunden« teilen muss. Wir wünschen ihnen weiterhin alles Gute und eine schöne gemeinsame Zeit in Michaels »Unruhestand«.

Trier, im November 2015

Alexandra Geissler und Matthias Schneider

Beiträge zur traditionellen Geisteswissenschaft

Soundscaping Denmark & the Athenian Forest

Gaining a Voice, Lending an Ear, & Being 'Over-Heard' in *Hamlet* & *A Midsummer Night's Dream*

By Barbara Bollig

William Shakespeare, arguably *the* most prominent and highly valued playwright in the English if not Western cultural canon, is an instance indispensable from both academic as well as popular cultural discourse. Audiences of all ages immerse themselves into the numerous and diverse microcosms that are his plays, be it through one of the manifold adaptations of his works or by studying the editions of his texts. Attending a theatre performance allows for a multi-sensual experience, relying not only on the peculiarity of a jester or a prologue to introduce the audience into the scenery of the play and an emotive engagement with the characters, but also on the setup of the stage, lighting, and soundscape. Particularly in an academic context and within the field of literary studies, the latter are often considered problematic as there are no other accounts of an authentic staging of Shakespeare's plays in his day than what is transmitted via notes and stage directions in the manuscripts.

The first part of this paper aims at soundscaping Denmark and the Elsinore court in *Hamlet* as well as the Athenian forest in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* both literally and metaphorically. I will be focusing on the significance of over-, under-, as well as mishearing, and the notions of gain and loss of voice in both tragedy and dark comedy, establishing the importance of the human ear as well as its metaphorical and politically powerful counterpart before unravelling the manifold sound- and voicebased power-plays initiated and indeed staged by Oberon, Hamlet, Theseus, and Claudius. It will be shown that both Hamlet and Bottom are instruments in a game of sounds between the human world and a second realm, a world of ghosts and fairies, yet whilst the weaver awakens from his fugue between the creatures of nature and the Athenians, the prince remains in a semibreve rest, ultimately forced into silence. In the end, I also aim to give an account of what can be referred to as the notion of disguising (and partly revealing) oneself in sounds of madness. It will be shown that in *Hamlet*, both Hamlet and Ophelia, but also the King and Queen, fall victim to and shape

further the concoctions caused by the Ghost, the spirit only Hamlet himself can actually hear. Where the prince arguably ‘stages’ his madness and melancholia, Ophelia is driven mad and killed by what becomes a distorted reality for her. In contrast to this dramatic notion stands the lust-fueled and envy-driven, yet comic love-madness of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, taking shape in both the Athenian women making their voices heard as well as the mishearings of both man and fairy in the course of the play.

As Bruce Johnson points out, the “Renaissance mind was suspended between two ways of knowing, what is read and what is heard.”¹ This distinction is significant in the context of this essay since, as Johnson continues, “hearing was not so much a supplementary source of information to vision, but [...] a superior one. The ear provided access to the inner truth of things.”² It is not surprising, then, that this importance is mirrored in both the soundscape of a play as well as its character’s words. Puck impishly proclaims “I’ll be an auditor/ and actor too, perhaps” (MND³ 3.1.75–76), bearing Maurice Hunt’s argument that “‘auditor’ rather than ‘spectator’ as a term for playgoers suggests that [Shakespeare] valued dramatic appeals to playgoer’s ears as much (or more) than those designed for their eyes.”⁴ Significantly, and transgressing the borders between the plays, Hamlet follows Puck’s words when he comments on the Mouse-trap in performance (H⁵ 3.2.148 ff.), acting along offstage, and taking over the part of Pyrrhus whilst conversing/enacting his sentimental monologue beforehand. Although the recital of the Phryrus speech is a collaborative effort between the prince and one of the actors, the latter taking over and finishing off the loaded address, (H 2.2.372 ff.), Hamlet’s active participation and, thus, his shaping of the soundscape alter the play as they call for a reaction of Claudius, Gertrude, and Ophelia. A clearly staged performance takes an impact on the conscientious behaviour of those witnessing it. “Shakespeare’s [use of the] ear is itself an agent,” Wes Folkerth states, “where predecessor narratives [...] enter, and are transformed.”⁶ But this in itself bears danger as both eye and ear can be fooled and corrupted. In Early Modern England, the latter is more significant to character and auditor as what is being heard influences the literal outlook on

1 JOHNSON (2005), p. 258.

2 Ibid.

3 MND: *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*.

4 HUNT (1992), p. 218.

5 H: *Hamlet*.

6 FOLKERTH (2002), p. 91.

that which has been heard about.⁷ This can easily be seen in *Hamlet* when the Ghost states “A serpent stung me. So the whole ear of Denmark / Is by a forged process of my death / Rankly abused” (H 1.5.35–37), drawing on and underlining the metaphor of the king being ‘head of state’ and the perversion of his persona bearing consequences for his subjects. Interestingly, these lines are spoken proleptically, foreshadowing what later emerges as the cause of King Hamlet’s death, namely being poisoned through the ear (H 1.5.61–70). A similar distortion takes place in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* in which especially Bottom’s senses and audio-visual perception are confused after his excursion to the fairy world (“The eye of / man hath not heard, the ear of man hath not seen, / man’s hand is not able to taste, his tongue to con- / ceive, nor his heart to report, what my dream was.”, MND 4.1.209–212). No less important is the question how such a ‘rank abuse’ is staged in the play – and staged is to be taken literally. Both plays contain plays within themselves, the Mousetrap and *Pyramus and Thisbe*, actual stagings of dramas, but also games of power being played out which transform the fictional reality of the tragedy and comedy beyond the stage they feature.

The question arises: who stages what, who directs the players? In the tragedy, it is of course Claudius who plays a game of power against his nephew, forming a plotting ‘triforce’ with Polonius and the Queen, whilst Hamlet himself, in an attempted counterstrike, stages the Mousetrap – one could say if the Ghost’s role in these intrigues was clear. He plays an ambiguous role and is doubted by his son, yet manages to inflict upon him (or rather: into his ear and mind) the will to avenge his ‘murder most foul’. “Hamlet, besides playing, also attempts to control the playing of others,” Lisa Stokes argues, and in “directing his play he, finally, in a creative and positive action [...] releases a self suppressed (unvoiced and unheard) in Denmark.”⁸ He indeed gains a voice by laying his own words into his players’ mouths and manages, other than with the preceding dumb show to which only Ophelia responds (H 3.2.128–131, “Belike this show imports the argument of the play.”), to have the player elicit an emotionally guilty reaction from his uncle (“cleave the general ear with horrid speech / Make them feel guilty”, H 2.2.498–499.). Underlining the aforementioned ‘female voice’ erupting from within is the stress on the golden, uncracked voice of one of the players (H 2.2.365–366, “Pray God your voice, like a piece of uncurrent gold,

⁷ SMITH (1999), p. 103 ff.

⁸ STOKES (1992), p. 77.

be / not cracked within the ring.”); although this unbroken voice signifies female connotations and is, thus, in the Early Modern English mindset, to be perceived as emotional and irrationally immature, it seems that the child speaks the proverbial truth, helping to achieve Hamlet’s goal of having his uncle confess the unruly kingslaughter he committed. In *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, we find a similarly interwoven structure of stagings and plays, with the exception that the interlacing power-plays are more comedic and do not bring with them the death of those engaging in and being dragged into them. Whilst the human and the fairy world coexist, each has their power-games, the former between Theseus and Hippolyta, including their subjects, the latter between Oberon and Titania, including their respective entourage. As the worlds collide with the young Athenians entering the secluded and quite literally ‘wonder-full’ forest, Oberon, with the help of Puck, stages a deliberate confusion to win over Titania, whilst Quince and his fellows rehearse a production of *Pyramus and Thisbe*, unknowingly paralleling the love story of Hermia and Lysander.⁹ But Bottom, a player in the stage production, soon becomes a plaything in Oberon’s semi-foul play, losing not only his ability to see, speak, and hear properly, but also his human head, gaining furry ass’s ears that visibly mark his obscured senses.

Surrounding these theatrical events, the auditor and reader finds a stark contrast: silence. It is necessary to distinguish between the somewhat ‘impure’ silence encountered whilst attending a stage performance – given the sheer presence of a live audience, breathing, the rustling of cloth, maybe coughing, a creaking stage – and the silences in the form of pauses in the interaction between character’s speech and stage directions when dealing with a printed script. But within these silences, there are voices to be heard, voices which do not sound in the noise of the surrounding world, which will only be heard briefly, and often only by a selected few. A prime example is the Ghost who appears in both a public and private sphere, i. e. on the platform with the guards as well as in the queen’s chambers, but who is perceived differently by various onlookers. Whilst Hamlet can see and hear him, the guards only see him, and the Queen does not take notice of him at all. “[S]he is no longer worthy to look on his form,” H. A. Manson arrogates, “the Ghost’s agitation conveys first his amazement that she cannot see or hear him, and then his horror as he realises the cause. It is only after she has declared herself completely insensible of his presence that he ‘steals

9 DENT (1964), p. 123.

away' in shame."¹⁰ (cf. H 3.4.132 ff.) Although it is true that he only vanishes after Gertrude openly admits her blindness towards his presence, it is questionable if the Ghost's demand for Hamlet to soothe his mother's terror in the face of the stabbed Polonius can indeed be interpreted as fuelled by amazement and horror. It appears more likely that the Ghost is aware of his invisibility and, more importantly, inaudibility given that he, in addition to only being heard by Hamlet in the first act (H 1.4.58–59 "It beckons you to go away with it / As if it some did desire / To you alone." – H 1.5.1–2 "Whither wilt thou lead me? Speak! I'll go no further." / "Mark me."), addresses his son in the aforementioned situation instead of talking to the Queen directly. Horatio, on the other hand, is suspicious of the Ghost's silence. "The silence demands a response, or provokes a need for signs, for language – for significance," David MacDonald concludes. "The presence of silence raises the presumption that the Ghost has something to say. The silence signifies secrecy, and the secrecy signifies power; the power of concealed knowledge, the power of death."¹¹ And whilst he questions them, Hamlet even proceeds to mock his father's words, at first not believing in this presumably devilish phantom. Yet, he soon comes to acknowledge and trust the voice only he can hear, engaging in what one might call a conspiracy – putting on the disguise that is madness – to break the conspiracy of having himself sent off and killed at sea, convicting Claudius of his crime against his own brother. Yet, in this vocal engagement, the demand for yet again silence is found, as the Ghost urges him and his guards to "swear to never speak of this" (H 1.5.153–160) – but this is not the same silence as the Ghost's, it's rather a 'not speaking too much', a conscious choice to remain silent in a certain situation; but this is also one of many accounts of an echoing call for silence throughout the play – most remarkably last heard in Hamlet's own last lexical words "the rest is silence" (H 5.2.342). Remarkably, the folio edition adds after this "O, o, o, o", conventionally indicating a dying groan or sigh¹² (which will later be evaluated in more detail).

A character who deliberately chooses not to remain silent is Hermia in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. She breaks the sleepy silence surrounding her "with her cries" ("[Starting.] Help me, Lysander", MND 2.2.144 ff.) after she wakes up in the nightly forest, and whilst they find themselves in this fantastic world,

¹⁰ MANSON (1968), p. 146.

¹¹ McDONALD (1978), p. 41.

¹² Cf. *Hamlet*, explanations to 5.2.343.

she and Helena both gain their own voices. In Athens, David Marshall remarks, "Theseus tells Hermia that her voice has no standing in his court; her plea must fall on deaf ears. [O]thers dictate [her] sentiments while [she] is silent or silenced."¹³ This becomes particularly obvious in Theseus's words warning her to "fit your fancies to your father's will; / Or else the law of Athens yields you up / [...] / To death, or to a vow of single life." (MND 1.1.118–121). But in this new space, the forest full of wonder, she speaks freely, powerfully, and seeks to defend Lysander against and prevent him from pursuing Helena in his bewitched state. It is in the forest also that Helena finds her voice to speak up against the childhood friend with whom she claims to have shared tongue and mind – Hermia. Much to the latter's disdain, the unloved shows her enviously enraged, yet truthful self in protest:

Injurious Hermia! Most ungrateful maid!
 Have you conspir'd, have you with these contriv'd,
 To bait me with this foul derision?
 Is all the counsel that we two have shar'd,
 The sisters' vows, the hours that we have spent
 When we have chid the hasty-footed time
 For parting us – O, is all forgot?
 All school-days' friendship, childhood innocence?
 We, Hermia, like two artificial gods,
 [...]
 As if our hands, ours sides, voices and minds,
 Had been incorporate. [...]
 And will you rent our ancient love asunder
 To join with men in scorning your poor friend? (MND 3.2.195–216)

They fight, they speak their minds, but they do not reconcile until the night is over. Everything goes back to the status quo, as Shirley Nelson Garner points out: "Once they leave the forest, they lose their voices. Neither of them speaks again."¹⁴ The women find themselves back in the realm of humans, in their old space and place in Athenian society, the only alteration being that they, as ruled by Theseus against Egeus's will, are now allowed to marry their respective lovers ("Fair lovers, you are fortunately met; / Of this discourse we more will hear anon. / Egeus, I will overbear your will", MND 4.1.176–178); both are put back into their old silenced state. A state Hippolyta, standing in Theseus's shadow, has never left, giving evidence, as Marshall states, of the general devaluation of women's words in the play:

¹³ MARSHALL (1982), p. 551.

¹⁴ GARNER (2001), p. 138.

[Her] silence is an important key to the conflicts of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. The problem of how to read her silence – and what it means [arises]. As readers who must imagine Hippolyta represented on a stage, we must first hear her silence, we must recognize that she does not speak.¹⁵

One way of evaluating her scarce articulations is that she chooses her few words wisely, her voice is substantial, and even Theseus, besides inflicting his voice upon and silencing her, cannot discard her completely – given that she is to become his queen. Yet, her silence can as easily be interpreted as subjugation, especially given that her husband-to-be took her by force (“Hippolyta, I woo’d thee with my sword, / And won thy love doing thee injuries; / But I will wed thee in another key, / With pomp, with triumph, and with revelling.” MND 1.1.16–19), and one might even go as far as to read into her behaviour mistrust in his words and careful reserve in the face of what appears to be a coercive bond. She spends more than half of her time on stage silently alongside Theseus, and when she talks her words are quickly contradicted by the man. Him commenting on her opinions and deconstructing for example her (sarcastic?) critique of the craftsmen’s play (MND 5.1) signifies what overtly is a subordinate role as a female character in the play. Covertly, on the other hand, she is not to be underestimated, given her careful consideration of when to speak and what to say; her words have value and prove her intelligence.

In *Hamlet*, we find Ophelia in one way similar to Hippolyta – she too has her own mind and is occasionally outspoken, yet she is not so much silenced as rather disregarded by Polonius and Laertes who inflict their voices upon her. Her words do not have any value to the ears that hear her, she is misread, ‘over-read’, and ‘under-heard’, especially by her disapproving father:

Ophelia

He hath, my lord, of late made many tenders
Of his affection to me.

Polonius

Affection? Pooh, you speak like a green girl
Unsifted in such perilous circumstance.
Do you believe his ‘tenders’, as you call them?

Ophelia

I do not know, my lord, what I should think.

Polonius

Marry, I will teach you; think yourself a baby
That you have ta’en these tenders for true pay
Which are not sterling.

(H 1.3.98–106)

¹⁵ MARSHALL (1982), p. 549ff.

Given that he considers her not seeing to Hamlet's wooing with the required caution, he calls her naivety childish – causing her (hi)story to become what David Leverenz considers “another instance of how someone can be driven mad having her inner feelings misrepresented.”¹⁶ But just as Hippolyta does in Athens, “Ophelia, despite in a narrow space, enlarges the cracks of Denmark's world. [S]he is not helpless,” arrogates Lisa Stokes, “her lines suggest a knowledge of her predicament and her comment upon it”¹⁷, as can be seen in her insecurity about how to evaluate Hamlet's courting (s. a. H 1.3.103). Being alone amongst those who do not listen to her, she is told by her father to “Read on this book / That show of such an exercise may colour / Your loneliness.” (H 3.1.43–45); although it is generally agreed that the book in question is most likely a prayer-book¹⁸, she has knowledge and power of words which she shows particularly in incorporating what she reads and hears into her songs (both hymns and chants) as well as in the commentary on the dumb show. Nevertheless, this does not change her generally being misheard, misread, and ultimately falling silent. With her silence even before her death she fills the halls of Elsinore, but she is not mute for Hamlet. They exchange words, thoughts, but do so in writing, as silence allows for curiosity and eavesdropping on a quest to hear. Especially Polonius masters this questionable task and is able to report back to Claudius what is not for his ears, his inaccuracies adding to the tumults he causes. He occupies and infiltrates the private space those whom he listens in on claim for themselves, making a former secure space most dangerous, especially in a time of power-plays. This eavesdropping on his own daughter and his prince (“How now, Ophelia? / You need not tell us what Lord Hamlet said – / We heard it all.” H 3.1.177–179) and his inability to ‘un-hear’ and not report what he has become an ‘ear-witness’ of is what ultimately silences him forever. He yet again infiltrates a private space to listen in on what is not his to hear: “Behind the arras I'll convey myself / To hear the process. [...] / 'Tis meet that some more audience than a mother / (Since nature makes them partial) should o'er-hear / The speech of vantage.” (H 3.3.28–33). It is here that Hamlet stabs him behind the curtains in the Queen's chambers, alerted by the treacherous cry he assigns to the metaphorical rat (H 3.4.23).

16 LEVERENZ (1978), p. 300.

17 STOKES (1992), p. 84ff.

18 Cf. *Hamlet*, explanations to 3.1.43.

The ear itself is most important in both *Hamlet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Although the crucial mode of perception in the comedy is the eye (in which the plant juice is dribbled, creating an *optical* illusion), *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, as Folkerth points out, "is literally a *dark* comedy: most of it takes place in the woods at night, where, as Hermia notes, the sense of hearing is all the more relied upon."¹⁹ The words he refers to are as follows: "Dark night, that from the eye his function takes, / The ear more quick of apprehension makes; / Wherein it doth impair the seeing sense, / It pays the hearing double recompense." (H 3.2.177–180) It is indeed hearing that starts off Oberon's games as Titania is awakened by Bottom's voice, whilst Hermia is beset by the silence around her. In the tragedy, the ear is more prominently used, both literally and metaphorically. Hamlet will not hear any of Horatio's self-scolding talk ("I would not hear your enemy say so, / Nor shall you do my ear that violence / To make it truster of your own report / Against yourself." H 1.2.169–172) and listens to him, as he demands, with "an attent ear" (H 1.2.192), showing his trust in the friend's report. Mischievously, on the other hand, Polonius advises Laertes to "[g]ive every man thy ear but few thy voice" (H 1.3.67), making both listening to and speaking (up) for as well as to someone else potentially dangerous. With the Ghost's story, the metaphorical and literal ear are combined: as Denmark's ear is "rankly abused", the metaphor not only draws attention to Claudius's intrigue within the state, but also to the tragedy's starting point: the venom injected into the ear of the head of state. In describing the conduct as "in the porches of my ears did pour" (H 1.5.63), the Ghost underlines the intertwinedness of the metaphorical monuments that are state and the king's body, given that ears here are considered as the 'porches' (read: entrance points) to "the house which is [the] head/body".²⁰

Claudius seeks to disguise his foul play at court by leaving no silence unattended. All the open spaces in Elsinore are filled with his noise: trumpets and flourishes go off repeatedly, infiltrating Hamlet's thoughts and chosen silence,²¹ a constant reminder of the treacherous uncle being the new leading voice in Denmark. The disapproval these disturbances cause are immanent in Horatio and Hamlet's conversation on the castle's platform, awaiting the Ghost:

¹⁹ FOLKERTH (2002), p. 95.

²⁰ Cf. *Hamlet*, explanation to 1.5.63.

²¹ Cf. BEVINGTON (2011), p. 30f.

Horatio

It then draws near the season
Wherein the spirit held his wont to walk.
[A flourish of trumpets and two pieces goes off.]
What does this mean, my lord?

Hamlet

The King doth wake tonight and takes his rouse,
Keeps wassail and the swaggering upspring reels,
[...]

Horatio

Is it a custom?

Hamlet

Ay, marry is't,
But to my mind, though I am native here
And to the manner born, it is a custom
More honoured in the breach than the observance. (H 1.4.5–16)

Johnson stresses that “the sound is a sudden, unexpected, and deafening collision between two orders of reality and perception. While their eyes scan the darkness for signals from the ‘otherworld’, [...] their ears are suddenly assaulted with the disordered raucousness of this one.”²² This scaffolding of sounds haunts Hamlet until his very end. When his infamous last literal words “the rest is silence” (H 5.2.342) fade out, the First Folio suggests four /o/ sounding afterwards; a development, Johnson claims, “from speech, through which the mind projects itself acoustically, to pure sound, the projection of the body, and finally to silence.”²³ Smith sees this as a last sign of power from within²⁴, whilst Leverenz implies several meanings: “that ‘rest’ is equivalent to silence; that my rest is silence; or that the rest of my story is untold.”²⁵ Given the significance of the /o/ sounding throughout the play, be it in lament, song, or approaching death, the closest of the aforementioned readings is the idea that the rest of Hamlet’s story is untold. He is being silenced in his lexical articulations and reduced to pure bodily utterances, but interestingly the play itself does not end here. Not all of the Prince of Denmark’s story is to fade as it is again Horatio who proves loyal to his lord, addressing Fortinbras:

And let me speak to th’ yet unknowing world
How these things came about. So shall you hear
Of carnal, bloody and unnatural acts,

²² JOHNSON (2005), p. 261.

²³ Ibid. p. 266; cf. also Berry (1999), p. 49.

²⁴ SMITH (1999), p. 14.

²⁵ LEVERENZ (1978), p. 305.

Of accidental judgements, casual slaughters,
 Of deaths put on by cunning, and for no cause,
 And in this upshot purposes mistook
 Fallen on th'inventors' heads. All this can I
 Truly deliver.

(H 5.2.363–369)

With regard to the prominent flourishes and musical interferences with silence, the 'rest' can also be seen as a leading melody or instrument being assigned a break by the composer; here, Hamlet, both composer and composed, takes a semibreve rest *al fine*, remaining silent/silenced when Claudius's volley sound again. The tranquillity at the mourning court is immediately invalidated in two ways. Firstly, Horatio laments his prince's death by establishing that Hamlet's 'silence' is directly replaced not only by the sound of the loyal friend's words, but also by the sound of heavenly music. Where "flights of angels sing thee to thy rest" (H 5.2.344), dying words are drowned in tumult. Secondly, and more strikingly, this evocation of singing creatures of heaven is brought to an end by the sound of drums. Although "warlike volley" can be heard even before Hamlet is slain (H 5.2.336), it is the drum declaring Fortinbras's arrival that draws attention from the prince (H 5.2.345). It is not Claudius himself polluting the Danish soundscape with his noise, but the Prince of Norway's 'invasion' of the court so struck with tragedy is to be read as a continuation of the illegitimate king's disturbances. It is his representative noise sounding last, Hamlet even dying whilst having to listen to the sounds of revelry he considered appalling earlier, signifying the prince's ultimate defeat. It is Fortinbras who inherits Hamlet's dying voice, in the end triumphant over the prince, and marking what Anna Cetera calls an "apocalyptic return of evil, extinguish all hopes for a free Elsinore."²⁶ The final sounds of drums and flourish signify Denmark being taken by the king's men, leaving no choice for silence, even in an hour of death.

The tragedy comes to an end showing that all the madness, be it pretend or beyond the character's control, has been real, and in the end Hamlet and the other playing pieces in this game of power are silenced. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Puck's closing statement in the form of an epilogue suggests a different idea of reality, leaving staging and dreaming tightly interwoven to one another and the auditor in calm wonder. Just as the fairy world in the forest, it has all been fantastic, rather a dream, but its aftermath lingers with those involved, allowing for a happy ending for the pairs of lovers, and the memories of a 'wonder-full' set of events for Bottom.

²⁶ CETERA (2007), p. 139.

It is this madness also that does not only break the silence of the night in the forest or the mourning at court, but which also impacts the soundscape of both places significantly. As mentioned before, voices are heard and silenced, yet the chaos in both human world and the fairy realm also functions as a veil for deeds beyond the character's control. The idea of the sounds of madness functioning as a disguise (and, thus, revealing truth – about both characters and mindsets) is eloquently described by Oscar Wilde when he has his character Gilbert in “The Critic as Artist” say that “[m]an is least himself when he talks in his own person. Give him a mask, and he will tell you the truth.” In *Hamlet*, it clearly is the Ghost who, with the demand to have his murder revenged, brings his son into the precarious position of doubting the machinations at court more than is good for him. It is only in the folio edition of the text that Hamlet, being a well-read and open-minded scholar, actively announces that “Denmark's a prison” (H F 2.2.244), but it is unchanged in the quarto that his philosophizing and pondering whether “to be or not to be” (H 3.1.55) are interpreted as madness by those who have learned to not look beyond these prison walls and blank out the many voices trying to reach open ears. Aware of how he is perceived, the prince fuels the rumours of him having lost his mind whilst plotting to unearth his father's murder, yet it is questionable if this ‘madness’ is a mask he wears successfully, making his true and innermost voice heard. It appears to be rather his late father's voice speaking through his disguise, which makes the question of sanity and madness more complicated. Is not the Ghost himself mad with bloodlust asking to be revenged given that there surely is a law in place to sentence a criminal, particularly when the suspect is guilty of kingslaughter? It is all the more suspicious that the Ghost refuses to speak publically and to any other than his son, and curious that the guards can see their former king, pale as he is now, whilst his own wife is unable to do so; although it has been claimed before that she may no longer be worthy to look upon his face, this encounter could just as easily be read as underlining the possibility that the Ghost, at this point visiting the private chambers, is no longer there (if he ever was), but rather a figment of his son's imagination. If this were the case, Hamlet would be following the echo of his own internal voice, but even without engaging psychoanalytical readings of the triplet of voices constituted of Hamlet, the Ghost, and Ophelia, the prince can be called mad for listening to disembodied utterances. They may tell the truth about the king's death, yet even this remains partly blurred. Was it really only Claudius who plotted against and killed his brother or did Gertrude have a role in this as well? Although it remains unclear what the queen had to

do with her late husband's death, she manages to fuel Laertes's hatred against Hamlet by invading his mourning with her report on Ophelia's drowning. She is the only one able to give an account of the maiden's death (H 4.7.161 ff.), and given the detailed description of the woman falling from a breaking 'sliver' whilst chanting songs she must have been within earshot and sight of the event, yet does not mention any intention to help the fallen girl.

Ophelia herself is considered to be mad with grief and loneliness, having lost her father to Hamlet's sword and her lover to his pursuit of revenge. Although her voice is considered to be one in the triangle of echoing voices, in connection to the idea of masquerading madness it has to be pointed out that she is truly affected by the toll the recent events take on the court (and with that, her life). In comparison to Hamlet, though, it can be said that she indeed speaks most truthfully and reasonably at a time where her father, brother, as well as king and queen, presume she has lost her mind. It is a gentleman who reports that she "speaks things in doubt / That carry but half sense. Her speech is nothing, / Yet the unshaped use of it doth move / The hearers to collection." (H 4.5.6–9), and Horatio acknowledges the danger of her words, admitting "Twere good she were spoken with, for she may strew / Dangerous conjectures in ill-breeding minds." (H 4.5.14–15). "[Her speech] combines the appearance of madness with acute social insights, albeit obscurely expressed," Philippa Berry states.²⁷ Throughout the play, Ophelia's state of mind and voicing of thoughts shift just as Hamlet's words do; the former "words of sweet breath" (H 3.1.97) have been replaced by a very different vocal sound, "like sweet bells jangled out of time and harsh" (H 3.1.157), and harsher are her utterances as well. Berry points out that it "seems that Ophelia has indeed 'conceived' or understood the cryptic as well as bawdy utterances [...] – a sounding of corruption and death."²⁸ The girl's words are perceived as just as cryptic, nonsensical 'nothing' even, and it is in corruption and death that she is heard singing. Once gone mad, she does no longer carry her book with her, reading silently, but retreats to singing verses of old songs dealing with lost love (H 4.5.23 ff.) and even in death voices "snatches of old lauds" (H Q4.7.175) or "tunes" (H F4.7.175), echoing her emotional decay aloud. A further parallel between Ophelia and Hamlet, especially with death approaching, is the recurring use of /o/ sounds. As already established, four os are seen to be the prince's last utterances, and the girl uses those in many

²⁷ BERRY (1999), p. 70.

²⁸ Ibid.

of her songs and throughout the play in general, allegorically hinting at Hamlet's dying sounds. It is most significant that Ophelia is reported to have chanted tunes before she drowned as this not only indicates she made herself heard until the last moment of her life, voicing her thoughts considered to be mad, but also that she too had not yet finished her story which now surfaces under the mask of madness albeit being forced into the ultimate speechlessness of death. Although it is not mentioned in the text, it is interesting that the importance of /o/ is also represented in many famous paintings of the drowned maiden. Both John Everett Millais in his painting *Ophelia* (1852) and Theodor von der Beek in his work of the same title (1901) feature the girl with her mouth opened in an o-shape, paying a visual tribute to an auditory phenomenon linking the 'birthplace' of the word to a story fuelled by madness and unfinished in death.

Whilst the madness in *Hamlet* leaves half the court dead, the masquerade and tumult in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* are over as morning breaks. Oberon, love-mad and hiding behind pride and jealousy in the beginning of the play, and enchanting Titania as well as the Athenian men in a play of power, has won his queen back and Titania herself has given up on her initial pride too. In their play, it is not an unspoken truth that surfaces from the safety of disguise, but the dominance of one over the other. The characters embracing the notion of the sounds of madness as disguise to safely make a hidden voice heard are Hermia and Helena, with especially the latter revealing her true mindset. Her intention was veiled in the space of the city, particularly with her even encouraging Hermia's decision to flee Athens in order to be able to be with Lysander; speaking in her own persona, she has her advantage in mind, namely winning over Demetrius's affection by revealing her childhood friend's plan in order to emerge as a truthful companion worthy of his love ("I will go tell him of fair Hermia's flight: / Then to the wood will he, tomorrow night, / Pursue her; and for this intelligence / If I have thanks, it is a dear expense." MND 1.2.246–249). It is only in the woods, driven by the silence of the night and being overwhelmed by what she thinks is foul play and Hermia "join[ing] with men in scorning [her] poor friend" (MND 3.2.216), that she reveals herself:

Helena

Have you no modesty, no maiden shame,
No touch of bashfulness? What, will you tear
Impatient answers from my gentle tongue?
Fie, fie, you counterfeit! You puppet you!

Hermia

‘Puppet’! Why, so? Ay, that way goes the game!

Now I perceive that she hath made compare

Between our statures; [...]

(MND 3.2.285–291)

In entering the fairy realm (and falling victim to Puck’s mistake in enchanting Demetrius) are no longer restricted by their human laws and thus free to reveal their true, madness-induced opinions of each other in jealousy. This wears off with the Athenians leaving the forest in the morning, leaving Demetrius enchanted but the two girls able to forget the events of the night, back to being best friends again. The only one visibly disguised and altered is Bottom; being transformed into an ass, he too falls victim to Oberon’s jealous doings, yet his metamorphosis does not reveal anything hidden away within and he is left not mad but confused and full of wonder regarding the past night’s events with the fairies. The madness and thus the whole masquerade end as soon as the worlds of fairies and humans no longer intertwine and every pair is finally put together.

Concluding this account of the Athenian and Danish soundscape, it has been shown that voices are gained and lost, unveiled and muffled, and ears are being lent as well as penetrated in various ways. The characters in both *Hamlet* and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* are mostly playthings in one another’s games of power and instruments in stagings pursuing the silencing of nonconformist voices most of all. It is a sound of madness echoing in both the drama and the dark comedy, allowing those falling victim to its machinations to be heard once more before being hushed. In the distorted realities underlined with the chaotic fugue of sounds infiltrating both court and forest, the female protagonists’ voices are those sounding the loudest, but with Ophelia lowered into her wet grave, and Hermia and Helena wed to their respective lovers, they fade out as abruptly as they erupted. Both plays end with the same soundscape they started with, the status quo, tackled and partly loudly overcome by e.g. a mute Ophelia speaking up (although not taken seriously) or Claudius’s tumult being muffled (even if only briefly), is reestablished in death or by marriage. The Athenians are again fully engaged in the human realm and, thus, obliged to follow their laws, the women no longer able to reveal their silent voices under the safe disguise of madness; those who spoke up in Denmark are dead. Although Horatio is able to report the events, both Hamlet and Ophelia’s stories remain, as signified by their /o/s, unfinished and are ultimately swallowed up by the royal volley filling the secluded space of Elsinore, preventing other voices from entering and developing. They are destined to be over-heard and disregarded, and, whilst the sound of drums fills the air, their rest is silence.

Bibliography

- BERRY, Philippa, *Shakespeare's Feminine Endings. Disfiguring Death in the Tragedies*, London 1999.
- BEVINGTON, David, *Murder Most Foul. Hamlet Through the Ages*, Oxford 2011.
- CETERA, Anna, 'Be patient till the last'. The Censor's Lesson on Shakespeare, in: *Gamma. Journal of Theory and Criticism* 15 (2007): 133–151.
- DENT, Robert W., Imagination in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, in: *Shakespeare Quarterly* 15,2 (1964): 115–129.
- FOLKERTH, Wes, *The Sound of Shakespeare*, London 2002.
- HUNT, Maurice, The Voices of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, in: *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 34,2 (1992): 218–238.
- JOHNSON, Bruce, *Hamlet: Voice, Sound, Music*, in: *Popular Music* 24,2 (2005): 257–267.
- LEVERENZ, David, The Woman in *Hamlet: An Interpersonal View*, in: *Signs* 4,2 (Winter 1978): 291–308.
- MANSON, H. A., The Ghost in *Hamlet*. A Resurrected 'Paper', in: *Cambridge Quarterly* 3,2 (1968): 127–152.
- MARSHALL, David, Exchanging Visions. Reading *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, in: *English Literary History* 49,3 (1982): 543–575.
- MCDONALD, David J., 'Hamlet' and the Mimesis of Absence. A Post-Structuralist Analysis, in: *Educational Theatre Journal* 30,1 (Mar. 1978): 36–53.
- NELSON GARNER, Shirley, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. 'Jack Shall Have Jill; / Nought Shall Go Ill.', in: *A Midsummer Night's Dream. Critical Essays*, ed. by Kehler, Dorothea, London: Routledge, 2001, 127–144.
- SHAKESPEARE, William, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (The Arden Shakespeare 2nd Edition), ed. by Brooks, Harold F., London 1979.
- SHAKESPEARE, William, *Hamlet* (The Arden Shakespeare 3rd Edition), ed. by Thompson, Ann; Taylor, Neil, London 2006.
- SMITH, Bruce R., *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England. Attending to the O-Factor*, Chicago 1999.
- STOKES, Lisa, 'Who's There?'. Deconstructed Selves in *Hamlet* and *Ophelia*, in: *Nature, Society, and Thought. A Journal of Dialect and Historical Materialism* 5,1 (1992): 69–96.