Actes des congrès de la Société française Shakespeare

13 | 1995

Le Monde vert : rites et renouveau

‘Very reverent sport’: Hunting in *Love’s Labour’s Lost*

Edward Berry

Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/shakespeare/1299>

DOI: 10.4000/shakespeare.1299

ISSN: 2271-6424

Publisher

Société Française Shakespeare

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 November 1995

Number of pages: 107-119

Electronic reference

Edward Berry, « ‘Very reverent sport’: Hunting in *Love’s Labour’s Lost* », *Actes des congrès de la Société française Shakespeare* [Online], 13 | 1995, Online since 01 January 2007, connection on 27 April 2019.
URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/shakespeare/1299> ; DOI : 10.4000/shakespeare.1299

SHAKESPEARE

LE MONDE VERT : RITES ET RENOUVEAU

Société Française Shakespeare

Actes du Congrès 1994

sous la direction

de

M.T. JONES-DAVIES

Ouvrage publié avec le soutien de

PARIS

LES BELLES LETTRES

1995

*Tous droits de traduction, de reproduction et d'adaptation réservés
pour tous les pays.*

© 1995 Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres,
95 bd Raspail 75006 Paris

“Very Reverent Sport” : Hunting in *Love's Labor's Lost*

In the final scene of *Love's Labor's Lost*, Marcade, a messenger from the French court, bursts upon the festivities of the young aristocrats with an announcement of the death of the Princess' father, the King of France. The news stuns the Princess and her companions, disrupts their merriment, thwarts the amorous desires of the young suitors, and destroys the anticipated comic resolution of the play. A uniquely unsettling event in Shakespearean comedy, the announcement of this death has provoked considerable critical discussion. Another death occurs in *Love's Labor's Lost*, however, that of a deer shot by the Princess. This death, in contrast, seems insignificant and inconsequential : it provokes only a few comments from minor characters in the play, and has received little attention from the critics¹. Yet if one pauses to consider it, the death of the deer is in its own way as shocking as that of the French king. It occurs not in a distant court but in the very heart of the play's ostensibly restorative green world, the park of Navarre. It results, moreover, not from natural causes — the king dies from lingering illness and old age — but from a sudden act of violence, an act that the Princess herself calls a murder (IV.i.8)². To probe the meaning of this invisible and apparently inconsequential “murder”, I suggest, may open up some new perspectives on the play's satiric relationship to court society, its treatment of the character of the Princess, and its unsettling ending. It may also lead us to some broader questions about Shakespeare's green worlds and his attitude towards the ritual of the hunt.

Hunting played too an important and complex a role in Elizabethan society for me to attempt a survey of the practice here³. What I should like to focus on, and what has not been appreciated in criticism of *Love's Labor's Lost*, is the extent to

which Shakespeare's treatment of the hunt embodies a contemporary critique of the sport. Perhaps the quickest entry into this critique is provided by a single comment by one character, Shakespeare's endearingly pompous curate, Nathaniel. In Act IV, Scene ii Nathaniel, Holofernes the schoolmaster, and Dull the constable engage in a dizzying debate about the nature of the deer the Princess has just killed. While much scholarly effort has been expended on the mock pedantry and misunderstanding that characterize this disagreement, the statement that initiates it, Nathaniel's pious approval of the hunt, has for the most part escaped notice. "Very reverent sport truly", he says, "and done in the testimony of a good conscience" (IV.ii.1-2). Why, we might ask, does Nathaniel call hunting a "reverent" sport? And why is a curate's approval a natural and appropriate way for Shakespeare to open a scene in which a few village worthies chat about the sporting activities of their social betters?

The word "reverent" in Nathaniel's phrase contains two complementary meanings. First, it refers to the social status of the sport, the participants in which are worthy of reverence or respect. Secondly, it refers to the spiritual quality of the sport, which is "godly" or worthy of a blessing; this meaning is emphasized by the phrase "done in the testimony of a good conscience", which, as many editors have noted, alludes to 2 *Corinthians* (i. 2). Nathaniel thus applauds the hunt for the social stature and, most importantly, for the godliness of its participants. Like his colleagues, Nathaniel is an admiring and respectful member of the commonwealth, a sympathetic supporter of the powers that be.

Hunting was a "reverent" sport in Elizabethan society in the social sense because it was restricted to the ruling elite. Although theologically justified in the period by an appeal to *Genesis* (ix.2-3), in which humanity as a whole is given power over the natural world, hunting was strictly controlled by the monarch, whose authority encompassed the forests and the beasts within them. Most of the handbooks for gentlemen in the period, both those on hunting and those on broader educational matters, including Elyot's *Governor* and Castiglione's *Courtier*, approve of hunting not merely as a recreation for the nobility but as a training ground for the noblest of actions, that of war⁴. Hunting was therefore a sport that represented the power of the monarchy in both a military and social sense, a power from which the common people were explicitly excluded. In *Love's Labor's Lost*, the com-

moners are merely commentators, not hunters. "Away", says Holofernes, as he leads Nathaniel and Dull from the hunt to their festive dinner, "the gentles are at their game, and we will to our recreation" (IV.ii.165-67).

Although Nathaniel and his companions show no signs of begrudging the sport of their betters, some Elizabethans did. The most powerful attacks on hunting came from two parties that were rarely allied, the humanists and Puritans. Humanists such as Erasmus, More, and Agrippa all condemned hunting as part of a broad satirical attack on the predisposition of kings and aristocrats towards war⁵. Common to the humanist position is the belief that the violence of the hunt incites irrational violence in men, transforming them into savage beasts themselves. More's *Utopians*, for example, impose the "whole activity of hunting, as unworthy of free men, upon their butchers", who are slaves⁶. Agrippa calls hunting an "intolerable sport" and finds in it, as Sir Philip Sidney was to do later, the origin of tyranny⁷. Humanists often singled out the ritualistic nature of the sport for particular mockery.

Although they may have had little else in common, the Puritans shared with the humanists an opposition to hunting. For the Puritans, sporting activity and ritual of any kind were both suspect, whether in the form of hunting, popular pastimes and festivities, or the celebration of the Mass. Although they generally tolerated hunting as a means of protection or securing food, the Puritans condemned it as an aristocratic sport. In *The Anatomie of Abuses*, Phillip Stubbes expresses the Puritan viewpoint with unusual succinctness :

If necessitie or want of other meats inforceth us to seek after their [animals'] lives, it is lawfull to use them in the feare of God, with thanks to his name : but for our pastimes and vain pleasures sake, wee are not in any wise to spoyle or hurt them. Is he a christian man or rather a pseudo-christian, that delighteth in blood ?⁸

According to Stubbes, hunting should be conducted only in necessity, and in fear and gratitude towards God. For him, the question of hunting's potential "reverence" is one of purpose and frame of mind; to use Nathaniel's phrase, he looks for "the testimony of a good conscience". The wanton destruction of animals, he contends, is not only sinful in itself but leads to

uncharitable actions towards fellow human beings. Both humanists and Puritans, as Keith Thomas has observed, were less concerned with the rights of the animal hunted than with the effect of hunting on human society⁹.

To many in the Elizabethan period, then, hunting was an aristocratic sport or ritual without a defensible reason for being, either social or spiritual. An original ritual ideal, one might say, the reverent sacrifice of an animal necessary to protect or feed the community¹⁰, could no longer be invoked to justify the ritual that actually existed — one that constituted a blatant assertion of royal power and class privilege. This was a ritual of social separation not social communion, and of power over nature rather than a reverent use of it. A striking example of this kind of ceremonial hunt is one in which Queen Elizabeth participated at Cowdray in 1591, probably only a few years before the first performance of *Love's Labor's Lost*. I choose this episode not only because it represents a typical ceremonial hunt but because it is exactly the kind of hunt that Shakespeare asks us to imagine in his play.

At eight in the morning on a Monday, the Queen rode with her train into the park at Cowdray to a "delicate Bowre" which had been prepared for her. In the bower musicians played, while a nymph, "with a sweet song", presented the Queen with a crossbow to shoot at the deer. The song celebrates the Queen as a goddess of beauty and chastity, and as a huntress whose eyes are like arrows, killing all the lovers who cannot help but look at her: "Strike one, strike all, for none at all can flie, / They gaze you in the face although they die". The hunt at Cowdray, in short, literalized one of the chief myths of the Elizabethan court, transforming the Queen into the goddess Diana, a huntress who kills both lovers and deer. At the end of the day, this goddess-queen had killed "three or four" of the about "thirtie" deer herded into a paddock as her targets. In the evening she amused herself by watching from a turret while sixteen bucks were pulled down with greyhounds¹¹.

The hunt in *Love's Labor's Lost*, like that at Cowdray, is a ceremonial event, featuring a huntress of royal status, who shoots from a stand as the deer are driven into her presence. This is a kind of hunt that was deemed particularly suitable for ladies, for it required less exertion than the chase across forest and fields. The setting in both cases is a park, a kind of tamed and enclosed wood, the sole purpose of which was the protection of herds of deer, raised for the hunt. Such parks were green worlds in a rather

special sense. Neither forests nor gardens, they might be called forests *as* gardens, wilderness civilized for courtly entertainment. In such environments courtiers and ladies could socialize in an urbane natural setting, compete in contests of wit, angle for the favor of the reigning noble or the Queen, and kill without physical exertion. At the center of these cultivated green worlds was death — personified at Cowdray by the Virgin Queen, whose eyes dart arrows, and at Navarre by the Princess of France. Against such a background Nathaniel's complacent approval of the Princess' hunt as a "very reverent sport" becomes grotesquely inappropriate.

The Princess herself, paradoxically, takes a satiric view of the hunt, combining elements of both the humanist and Puritan objections. She acknowledges the violence of her role, that of playing "the murderer" in ambush (IV.i.8), and she calls attention to the fact that she hunts more "for praise than purpose" (1.29), a statement that acknowledges the Puritans' emphasis upon the cruel frivolity of the sport. In lines that function as "choric commentary", moreover, she treats the quest for praise in hunting as an example of the destructive quest for fame in all human activities¹² :

And out of question so it is sometimes :
Glory grows guilty of detested crimes,
When for fame's sake, for praise, an outward part,
We bend to that the working of the heart ;
As I for praise alone now seek to spill
The poor deer's blood, that my heart means no ill.
(IV.i.30-35)

Like Erasmus and More, the Princess sees behind the hunt the desire for glory ; like the Puritans, she emphasizes the lack of charity in her action. The unconscious puns on "deer" and "heart" in the final line ("The poor *deer's* blood, that my *heart* means no ill") suggest the bond of kinship between human and animal that underlies the need for reverence in the taking of life. In the ensuing lines, the Princess probes more deeply into the vanity that underlies the hunt, noting that she will be able to take credit whether she hits or misses the deer. If she wounds it, she will take praise for her accuracy ; if not, for her mercy. In either case, she says, she will enhance her reputation.

Shakespeare has embedded in his text, then, a contemporary satirical perspective on hunting, a perspective, moreover, that

provides a framework for the whole of Act IV. Although the development of the hunting motif in the several scenes of Act IV is complicated, its central core is the connection between hunting and human vanity, which turns every action into a kind of hunt, an irreverent sport. Behind the vanity, in most cases, lie threats of aggression, often sexual, which are sublimated into attacks of wit. After the Princess leaves the stage, for example, Boyet and Rosalind remain, and Boyet's question, "Who is the shooter?" (l. 108) triggers off a verbal sparring match in which "shooters" are likened to "suitors" and hunting to the pursuit of the cuckold's horns; the contest is joined by Maria and Costard and eventually becomes so openly obscene as to elicit Maria's laughing protest, "Come, come, you talk greasily, your lips grow foul" (l. 137). For Rosalind, Boyet, Maria, and Costard, the hunt merely provides an excuse for a playful competition in sexual puns, a contest that concludes with Costard awarding victory to himself and the ladies: "Lord, Lord, how the ladies and I have put him down" (l. 141). Costard's phrase "put him down" captures tersely the mixture of sexuality and aggression that characterizes the dialogue as a whole. The wordplay of hunting, like the hunt itself, is a sport of dominance and destruction — of putting victims down.

In the next scene, which begins with Nathaniel's comment on the reverence of the sport, the hunt provides an opportunity for the curate, schoolmaster, and constable to comment on the recreations of their betters. This scene too becomes a verbal contest, in which the pedantical verbiage of Nathaniel and Holofernes is set against Dull's inarticulate yet unshakable conviction. The scene as a whole travesties the conventional aristocratic celebration of hunting and its technical vocabulary. The point of debate among the three commoners is the age of the deer that the Princess has killed, an issue that is important to the "reverence" of the sport because the more fully mature and majestic the animal, the more noble the kill. Holofernes begins by asserting that the deer was "*sanguis*, in blood" (IV.ii.3-4) — that is, fully mature, in the full vigor of health, and therefore, to adopt Nathaniel's terminology, capable of providing "very reverent sport" and great praise to the Princess. Both Holofernes and Nathaniel seem to misunderstand the hunting term, however. Nathaniel takes "in blood" to refer to the age of the deer, for he objects that it was "a buck of the first head" (l. 10) — that is, a buck about five years old. Holofernes then protests with the pedantical Latin expression "*haud credo*"

(l. 11) or, "I cannot believe it", a statement that is misheard by Dull as "old grey doe" and vigorously denied ; to kill such a weak specimen would not be dignified but shameful. Dull insists that the deer was a "pricket" (l. 12), a buck of two years — that is, a kill more reverent than an old grey doe but not as reverent as a buck of the first head¹³.

It is characteristic of the play that this debate is never resolved, and that we never discover the true age of the Princess' deer. This uncertainty in itself undermines the Princess' notion of pursuing hunting as a means of winning fame or reputation, for it shows clearly that one's reputation depends upon the fickleness of others' perceptions. Has the Princess killed a heroic or an average specimen ? We cannot tell. Dull might be said to have the final word in the debate, but only because Holofernes deflects the conversation into another kind of self-display, that of making a poem, a contest in which he is the only competitor and therefore destined to win.

The poetic monstrosity that results, Holofernes' epitaph on the death of the deer, reduces the question of the deer's age to one of mere verbal convenience. The word "Princess" in the first line of his poem demands the alliterative word "pricket" : "the preylful Princess pierc'd and prick'd a pretty pleasing pricket" (l. 56). Whatever the stature of the deer, it is less important to Holofernes than poetic self-display. The suffering and death of the deer, moreover, are completely trivialized in his poem, for its wounds merely provide inspiration for Holofernes' poetic embellishment. As his poem unfolds, the deer's age and injuries vary simply to meet changing poetic needs. The sore pricket becomes a "sore", a deer of four years, or adding a letter, a "sorel", one of three years. When the "l" in "sorel" is transformed into the capital "L" representing the Roman numeral fifty, and a second "L" is added to make one hundred, the number of wounds on the deer killed escalates accordingly. Holofernes' epitaph on the death of the deer thus conveys no sense of "reverence", to use Nathaniel's term, but serves merely to feed the vanity of the speaker, whose verbal pyrotechnics suggest the unfeeling violence of the sport itself. As a parody of an epitaph, Holofernes' poem pricks the bubble of reputation both for the unfortunate deer and the Princess, whose kill is lost altogether in the sweet smoke of his rhetoric. So much for the conventional aristocratic notion, questioned earlier by the Princess herself, that hunting wins both praise and fame.

For the King of Navarre and his young companions, the episode of the hunt provides a satiric setting for their own massacre at the hands of love. Berowne opens Act IV scene iii with a line that frames the action that follows: "The King he is hunting the deer : I am coursing myself" (Il. 1-2). When he observes the King entering with a love-sonnet in hand, he remarks to himself, "Shot, by heaven ! Proceed, sweet Cupid, thou hast thump'd him with thy bird-bolt under the left pap" (Il. 22-24). The entire scene, in which each Berowne watches unobserved as each of his companions betrays his love for one of the women, might be called one of ambush, with the final victim being Berowne himself. Having forsworn themselves while hunting, the young men finally transform hunting into open warfare, for which it provides the traditional training ground : "Saint Cupid, then!" shouts the King, "and, soldiers, to the field ! " (l. 363). The Princess's satiric linkage between hunting and vanity provides an apt comment not only on the love of the young men but on their initial devotion to their little academe. In the opening line of the play, the King commits himself to the pursuit of "fame, that all hunt after in their lives" (I.i.1). Hunting after fame in books, the young men become eventually both hunters and hunted in love. In both study and love, the metaphor of the hunt, with its overtones of narcissism and aggression, shapes the overall action of the play.

One of the play's many paradoxes is that the one character who consciously satirizes the hunt, the Princess, includes herself among the satirized, mocking her own vanity along with all the others. In this she is like Berowne, whose mockery is also self-reflexive. She is like Berowne, too, in the discrepancy between her emotions and her actions. Berowne knows that he will be unable to keep the oath the King asks him to swear at the beginning of the play, yet he pledges his word nonetheless. The Princess knows that she hunts with no purpose but vanity ; she feels compassion for the deer; and yet she kills. She suffers a guilty conscience but participates nonetheless in a social ritual her mind and heart oppose. Her action, ironically, receives the pious blessing of Nathaniel, who finds the hunt "very reverent" and "done in the testimony of a good conscience".

Like most of the heroines of the romantic comedies, the Princess is often idealized by critics, taken to be a clear sighted, playful, and emotionally mature center of value in the play. She is that, in part. The killing of the deer, however, underlined by the

unconscious irony in Nathaniel's blessing, marks the Princess out as a target among all the others, only for more sophisticated satire. Like Berowne, she is ruefully conscious of her own folly at moments, but this consciousness does not guide her actions. Her satiric assaults on others, moreover, like Berowne's, often betray a delight in verbal mastery rather than any desire to entertain, educate or reform. In the words of Holofernes's poem, she is a "preyful Princess." When she first meets the King of Navarre, she mocks him for welcoming her not to the court but to the fields (II.i.91). In the scene before the hunt (IV.i.), she befuddles the poor forester by accusing him of not recognizing her beauty. In this scene too she orders the seal of Armado's letter broken so that she can mock the contents, despite her knowledge that the letter is addressed not to her but to Jaquenetta.

The Princess characterizes her mockeries as "sport", but her use of the word invokes notions of violence rather than reverence. When she learns that the young men are coming as wooers in the guise of Russians, she proposes the wearing of masks so that "sport by sport" will be "o'erthrown" (V.ii.153) and the wooers sent "away with shame" (l. 156). When Boyet says that her plans for the women to avert their faces when the men address them will "kill the speaker's heart", she answers, "Therefore I do it" (ll. 149-151). Later in this scene, she urges the King to watch the pageant of worthies because "that sport best pleases that doth [least] know how" (l. 516). This is so, she explains, because "Their form confounded makes most form in mirth, / When great things laboring perish in their birth" (ll. 519-20), a remark that Berowne correctly takes as a "right description of our sport" (l. 521).

The Princess's image of a mirth that comes from watching "great things laboring" only to "perish in their birth" captures with chilling effect the aggression that drives the festive merriments of all the nobles. The mirth described here is akin to that evoked in Hobbes's description of laughter as a feeling of "sudden glory" — a mirth that is both egotistical and insidiously life-denying. How can one find amusement in watching the act of birth become an act of death? The Princess' ability to be amused by abortive birth reaches beyond the conventions of comedy, extending in a dark and troublesome way the implications of the play's title, *Love's Labor's Lost*. As observers of a play that enacts the lost labor of its title, moreover, audiences themselves are

implicated in the same problematic laughter described by the Princess.

The Princess' chief targets throughout the play are the young men. Like Elizabeth at Cowdray, she is the object of male desire, but she kills. Although not an Amazon, like the huntress Hippolyta in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, she threatens male dominance with her aggressive wit and disturbs the patriarchal order. She kills the deer with a literal arrow and the King with a metaphoric one. Before she goes off to the hunt, she is questioned by Boyet about her admission that she "for praise alone" seeks "to spill / The poor deer's blood, that [her] heart means no ill". (IV.i.34-35). "Do not curst wives hold that self-sovereignty / Only for praise' sake", asks Boyet, "when they strive to be / Lords o'er their lords?" (II. 36-38). To which the Princess replies, "Only for praise — and praise we may afford / To any lady that subdues a lord" (II. 34-40). The word "subdues" crystallizes the complex nature of the threat the Princess represents to the adolescent male ego: the mastery represented by this "curst" wife is at once psychological, physical, and sexual. A similar mastery is evoked in the unconscious innuendoes of Holofernes's song, with its unconventional application of familiar male terms for sexual aggression to the Princess: "The preyful Princess pierc'd and prick'd a pretty pleasing pricket".

The subversive laughter of the Princess comes to a sudden halt upon Marcade's announcement of the French King's death. Although her characterization in this final scene is not entirely clear, there are hints that her father's death shocks the Princess into a new state of mind. She speaks of her "new-sad soul" (V.ii.731) and apologizes to the suitors for "the liberal opposition of our spirits" (l. 733). When the King attempts to continue his suit, moreover, she is for once at a loss for words; her mocking wit leaves her, and she can only say "I understand you not, my griefs are double" (l. 752). If there are signs of reform in the Princess's language, however, they are left tantalizingly vague.

The ineffectual efforts of the King and Berowne to reform, on the other hand, are certainly clear, and both are required to endure a year's penance for their continuing folly. What destroys the romantic ending of *Love's Labour's Lost* is not the announcement of the French King's death but the unfeeling way in which the young men respond to that announcement. The King's retreat into a hermitage and Berowne's term in a hospital,

"[enforcing] the pained impotent to smile" (l. 854), are intended to produce in them "new-sad" souls that will make them worthy of marriage. Berowne's task in particular is to transform his delightful but ultimately cruel and narcissistic wit into what might be called a "reverent sport", a recreation that cures rather than kills because based on a respect for life. Whether such a transformation can be achieved remains a disturbingly open question. "To move wild laughter in the throat of death?" asks Berowne, "It cannot be, it is impossible: / Mirth cannot move a soul in agony" (ll. 855-857). Berowne's assumption that laughter is "wild" conveys the destructive energy implicit in the wit that characterizes the society of the play.

If the question of respect for life is raised most searchingly by the death of the French King, it is also raised, as we have seen, by the death of a deer in the green world at the very center of the play. Nathaniel complacently approves of the hunt as a "reverent sport". Yet the play as a whole mocks that complacency, insinuating into its language and action disturbing doubts about the prospects for reverence in any sport, so deeply engrained are the aggressive and narcissistic impulses that characterize the various entertainments of the play. Hunting is at the center of the play because it puts this question to the ultimate test, unmasking the murderousness that is sublimated in other sports: to hunt is to cause death. If Berowne thinks it is impossible to "move wild laughter in the throat of death", the likelihood of killing a deer with reverence does not seem very great. The image locates wildness not in parks for deer but in human laughter itself.

The full text of 2 *Corinthians*, to which Nathaniel's blessing of the hunt alludes, includes not only Paul's assurances to his church that his own conscience is clear, but his exhortations that they avoid the dangers of vanity, act charitably towards their neighbours, and follow the spirit of the New Law, engraved in the heart, rather than the ritualism of the Old Law, preserved in tablets of stone. The contemporary controversy over hunting touches each of these values, as we have seen, and Shakespeare's ending tests skeptically the human capacity to enact them.

The conclusion of *Love's Labor's Lost* does not resolve Berowne's question or pursue its implications. Insofar as the reverence of the hunt is concerned, these issues are left for the tragedies, such as *Titus Andronicus* or *Julius Caesar* or *Coriolanus*, plays in which the sport is associated only with savage

violence. *Love's Labor's Lost*, after all, is a kind of comedy, with more good natured playfulness than the satiric focus of this paper has allowed. That said, it seems fair to say that the spirit of the deer, like Caesar's ghost, haunts the ending of the play. Whether one can kill a deer with reverence or respond with reverence to the death of a King or "move wild laughter in the throat of death" — these questions are at bottom the same question, challenging a belief in the human capacity to tame its urges towards narcissism and aggression. In this sense the play challenges traditional comic form not only by the announcement of the French King's death at the end but by his daughter's "murder" of a deer at the center. In *Love's Labor's Lost*, alone among the comedies, the green world itself is a setting for violent death.

Edward BERRY

Department of English University of Victoria

Victoria, B. C. V8P 1K3 Canada

NOTES

1. See, however, Louis Adrian Montrose, "*Curious-Knotted Garden*": *The Form, Themes, and Contexts of Shakespeare's Love's Labour's Lost* (Salzburg: Univ. of Salzburg, 1977), pp. 109-112. Montrose's approach to the hunt complements my own, I believe, although he restricts himself to brief comments on its symbolic and metaphoric significance and does not develop its relationship to criticisms of hunting in Elizabethan society.

2. All citations are to *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974).

3. The most useful general works on the theory and practice of the hunt in the Elizabethan period are John Cummins, *The Hound and the Hawk: The Art of Medieval Hunting* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1988); D. H. Madden, *Diary of Master William Silence* (London: Longmans, Green, 1907); Richard Marienstras, *New Perspectives on the Shakespearean World*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985); Marcelle Thiebaut, *The Stag of Love* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1974); and Keith Thomas, *Man and the Natural World* (London: Alen Lane, 1983). Two

studies of *As You Like It* make extensive use of the traditions of the hunt : A. Stuart Daley, " 'To Moralize a Spectacle' : *As You Like It*, Act 2, scene 1", *PQ* 65 (1986), 147-170 ; and Claus Uhlig, "'The Sobbing Deer' : *As You Like It*, II.i.21-66 and the Historical Context", *Renaissance Drama* 3 (1970), 79-109.

4. Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Book Named The Governor*, ed. S. E. Lehmberg (London : Dent, 1962), pp. 65-69 ; Baldesar Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. Charles S. Singleton (Garden City, N. Y. : Doubleday, 1959), p. 38.

5. See Robert P. Adams, *The Better Part of Valor* (Seattle : Univ. of Washington Press, 1962), pp. 15, 46-47, 99, 145-146.

6. *Utopia*, ed. Edward Surtz, S. J. (New Haven : Yale Univ. Press, 1964), p. 98.

7. *Of the Vanitie and Uncertaintie of Artes and Sciences*, ed. Catherine M. Dunn (Northridge, Calif. : Calif. State Univ., 1974), p. 260 ; *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia)*, ed. Jean Robertson (Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1973), p. 259.

8. *The Anatomie of Abuses* (1583 ; facs. rpt. Amsterdam : Da Capo Press, 1972), P5.

9. *Man and the Natural World* (London : Allen Lane, 1983), p. 151.

10. For stimulating accounts of the origin of hunting ritual, see Robert G. Hamerton-Kelly, ed., *Violent Origins* (Stanford : Stanford Univ. Press, 1987) ; the book records a symposium on ritual killing and cultural formation, featuring Walter Burkert, Rene Girard, and Jonathan Z. Smith.

11. Jean Wilson, *Entertainments for Elizabeth* (Woodbridge, England : D. S. Brewer, 1980), 89-90.

12. See William C. Carroll, *The Great Feast of Language in Love's Labour's Lost* (Princeton : Princeton Univ. Press, 1976), p. 91.

13. The terminology is conventional. In *A Treatise of the Lawes of the Forest* (1615 ; facs. rpt. Norwood, N. J. : Walter J. Johnson, 1976), John Manwood names a buck of the first year, a "Fawne"; of the second, a "Pricket"; of the third, a "Sorell"; of the fourth, a "Sore"; of the fifth, a "Bucke of the first head"; and of the sixth, a "Bucke, or, a great Bucke" (p. 43).