Amalgam:

A Multidisciplinary Research Journal

Lauren Rivera (English)

Bridget Clement (History)

Hollan Staker (English)

Shiloh Stone (History)

Whitney Litherland (English)

Amalgam

The Multidisciplinary Journal of the University
of Southern Indiana's College of Liberal Arts

Table of Contents

Preface

"No matter how one may think himself accomplished, when he sets out to learn a new language, science, or the bicycle, he has entered a new realm as truly as if he were a child newly born into the world."
-Frances Willard, *How I Learned to Ride the Bicycle*

Over the past six years, the *Amalgam* has proudly displayed the growth of students through their academic pursuits in the USI College of Liberal Arts. While the topics and styles vary among featured works, this year's volume truly represents the transcendence of students into new realms through their scholarly endeavors. However, without the direction and support of many people within the USI College of Liberal Arts, this intellectual transcendence would not have been possible. The faculty advisors—Dr. Kearns, Dr. Harison, and Dr. Hitchcock— are extended great thanks and appreciation for their work with this year's submissions. We would also like to extend our gratitude to Dean Aakhus and the Liberal Arts Council for their support and the funding of the *Amalgam* for the sixth consecutive year.

In the sixth issue of the *Amalgam*, students of various disciplines within the College of Liberal Arts reveal their ability to reach new realms of learning. Lauren Rivera explores gender roles and expression in the world of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. Next, Bridget Clement investigates the impact of the Irish potato famine of 1845-1850 on nationalism in Ireland. Delving into the realm of rhetoric, Hollan Staker explores woman, the body, and women's writing. Shiloh Stone travels the streets and the history of Paris as he considers how the Revolutionary years shaped modern-day Paris. Finally, entering the temporal realm, Whitney Litherland examines the role of time in the formation of tragedy in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*.

Many thanks are extended to students who submitted essays for publication. The *Amalgam* continues to serve as an exemplary representation of students' outstanding scholarly growth in the College of Liberal Arts. We look forward to continue traveling with students to new intellectual realms.

Erin Schmitt

LAUREN E. RIVERA

GENDER AND GENDER ROLE EXPRESSION IN
MACBETH

Accepted modes of gender roles and gender expression change over time. Things as simple and accepted as women wearing pants in this culture might not have been accepted by earlier cultures so easily. While accepted ways of expressing gender are constantly changing within cultures, it is possible to fashion an approximate idea of what certain time periods expected from males and females based on analyzing how men and women in literary works behave. In a way they act as time capsules, preserving social attitudes concerning how men and women were expected to behave. Such is the case with Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. It is a play that puts much emphasis on the characters' genders. *Macbeth* shows how characters express gender characteristics properly, as in the case of Macduff and Lady Macduff, and how twisted or diseased gender expression, such as that of Macbeth, Lady Macbeth, and even that of the witches, can have serious and potentially fatal consequences.

According to the article "'Male and Female Created He Them': Sex and Gender in *Macbeth*" by William T. Liston, the gender-determined interactions between men and women and husbands and wives create the most memorable scenes in the play. According to Liston, the play's beginning and ending battle scenes rely less on the "direct, unreflective physical action" which defines men, than do scenes which include men and women interacting together, as women in this time period were not present on the battlefield, a place ruled by men as a single gender (Liston 233). This means that, by placing the bulk of the play in the homes of the characters where both men and women would be comfortable, Shakespeare is allowing the men and women in the play to interact naturally. The familiar surroundings allow them some measure of equality, which enables Shakespeare to present aspects of the personalities of the characters which might not otherwise be seen in locations such as battlefields where gender inequality would prevent women from either being present, or in front of other characters where women might not be able to speak to their husbands freely.

While Liston's assertion is certainly interesting, it is impossi-

ble to prove such a thing as why people are interested in a particular play. What he might be trying to get at in saying that the interactions between men and women in the play are the most memorable parts is that there seems to be a preoccupation with gender in general in *Macbeth* to which much of the play is devoted. Gender takes an important role in the play from the start. Within the first fifteen lines, a man is assigned worth based on his masculine skills as a soldier. Malcolm describes a captain who fought by his side and helped keep him safe during battle as "a good and hardy soldier" (1.2.4). This early focus on the gender qualities of the captain sets a precedent for the rest of the play to focus on gender in addition to the fact that the play begins and ends with battle, considered a pursuit for men to show bravery and valor. While the focus on the captain's masculinity sets a precedent for focus on gender, the literal framing of the rest of the gender-focused content of the play between two battles adds to the effect. This framing of the play inside such a classical example of a male pursuit as battle may be responsible for the effect Liston described.

Not long after Malcolm's description of the captain, the captain himself, in telling the story of Macdonald's rebellion, also uses language that assigns certain qualities to a gender. In speaking of a minor, temporary success in Macdonald's campaign, the captain attributes it to luck or fortune, commonly anthropomorphized as a woman. In reference to the temporary nature of Macdonald's luck, he says fortune "Showed like a rebel's whore" (1.2.15). This kind of language, while generally derogatory toward women, also implies that women are not to be trusted. As Macdonald is a rebel, fortune is to be considered his "whore" according to the captain. Along the same lines, fortune seems to be defined by Macdonald, the man she is attached to. Since he is not to be trusted as a rebel, his "whore" is not to be trusted either. By making fortune into a woman, and that woman into a "whore" for a rebel, the captain is implying that as a woman, fortune's moral character is defined by the man she is with, rather than by anything she does herself.

Liston also claims that the witches Macbeth and Banquo meet in the third scene of the first act confound the definition of masculinity established in the previous scene, citing the fact that their beards obscure from Banquo and Macbeth the fact that they are likely women (233) (1.3.43). While the appearances of the

witches confuse Macbeth and Banquo, it seems a bit much to suggest that they completely undermine the definition of masculinity. If Macbeth and Banquo had been threatened by their ambiguous gender appearances, they likely would not listen to and believe what the witches tell them. That, however is not the case, as Macbeth later remarks about what they told him of his future: "Glamis, and Thane of Cawdor./The greatest is behind" (1.3.114-115), implying that Macbeth, at least, believes their words to be true.

That being said, the appearance of the witches is never mentioned in the scenes in which they appear alone. Only in the presence of the opposite gender are their appearances mentioned. Clearly Macbeth and Banquo are somewhat uncomfortable about the confusing gender of the witches. In addition to that, the ambiguous gender identity of the witches implies a certain amount of gender bias on Shakespeare's part. The witches are meant to be women though they have beards.

By bringing attention to the fact that the witches have beards, Shakespeare is suggesting that something is wrong with them. Bearded women are unnatural, and by giving these women beards, he is insinuating that this masculine quality they have has somehow corrupted them. By not appearing the way women are expected to appear, Macbeth and Banquo as well as the audience are given a visual cue to expect the women to be strange. In this instance, their strangeness comes from their ability to predict the future, a skill which Banquo and Macbeth seem to believe in despite the unnaturally manly appearance of the witches.

In her article "'Be bloody, bold and resolute': Tragic Action and Sexual Stereotyping in *Macbeth,"* Carolyn Asp says that Lady Macbeth decides "to reject her feminine sensibility and adopt a male mentality because she perceives that her society equates feminine qualities with weakness" (153). This claim certainly seems to be true from nearly the moment Lady Macbeth enters into the play's action. In the fifth scene of the first act, Lady Macbeth is seen reading a letter from her husband telling her of the witches' prediction that he is to become king. As a dutiful wife, Lady Macbeth is excited by the news, and plans to help her husband in any way she can. In response to this news, she wishes for her husband to arrive home soon so that she can begin helping him, saying:

Hie thee hither,

> That I may pour my spirits in thine ear
> And chastise with the valour of my tongue
> All that impedes thee from the golden round (1.5.23-26).

This speech of Lady Macbeth's is the first indication that Lady Macbeth is not a typical submissive woman. This speech is both semi-erotic and feminizing to her husband, making her the masculine aggressor. The act of pouring something into his ear makes him a receptacle for her, which is usually the position of the woman. In addition, the tongue can be seen as a kind of phallus, with Macbeth once again situated as the feminine partner in his wife's plan. The use of the word "valour" to describe Lady Macbeth's tongue applies a certain amount of masculinity to her, since male soldiers are typically described by the word. Finally, Lady Macbeth's attitude in this speech is masculine. In addition to implying that she will penetrate her husband, Lady Macbeth has also adopted a protective, dominant attitude toward her husband. She plans to proactively help him in pursuing the crown, or "golden round," and to remove any obstacles in the way of his achieving the position of king.

One of Lady Macbeth's most damaging scenes occurs at the end of Act I when she is trying to convince her husband to kill Duncan so that he can become king in his place. She first says "When you durst do it, then you were a man" (1.7.50), questioning her husband's directness of action, which challenges Liston's definition of a man, and therefore her own husband's masculinity. But perhaps even more damaging to her character than that, she goes on to say:

> I have given suck, and know
> How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me:
> I would, while it was smiling in my face,
> Have pluck'd my nipple from his boneless gums,
> And dash'd the brains out, had I so sworn as you
> Have done to this. (1.7.54-59)

In these six lines alone, Lady Macbeth violates what it means to be a woman as well as what it means to be a mother. According to Carolyn Asp, women are associated with weakness and deference to their partners rather than equality (159). Lady Macbeth, in questioning

her husband's masculinity, is assuming a position of strength in the relationship rather than deferring to her husband's decision as she would be culturally expected to do. In mentioning that even as she has tenderly loved the baby she has suckled, she would still have violently killed it if she had claimed she would do so, she is again assuming a strong position. In addition, according to Stephanie Chamberlain, only "virtuous" women in that time period were to be trusted to be good candidates for nursing their babies. If non-virtuous women nursed their babies, they could harm them or alter them negatively through the milk. The very act of breast-feeding was supposed to calm the mother and make her want to protect the child (74-75). If that is the case, then Lady Macbeth is clearly not the typical virtuous and respectable mother of her time. She chose to breast-feed her own baby rather than using a wet-nurse, but even the supposed bonding-inducing act of breast-feeding would not stop her from doing harm to her baby if she wanted to. Even if she said the words without meaning them, she is speaking callously of killing an innocent child who also belongs to her husband. These few lines are arguably even more damaging to her character than the lines in which she asks spirits to be "unsexed" and to have them "take my milk for gall" (1.5.39-46). While these lines imply that she wants to have her femininity removed, the claim that she would smash her smiling baby's skull implies violence, which was reserved for men, as Liston previously claimed, rather than the more feminine passive desire to have something taken from her.

By the time the fifth act arrives, Lady Macbeth has begun sleepwalking out of guilt. She eventually commits suicide. In "'Documents in Madness': Reading Madness and Gender in Shakespeare's Tragedies and Early Modern Culture" by Carol Thomas Neely, Lady Macbeth's suicide is described as not being "purifying and involuntary" and is said to be prefaced by "religious despair" (Neely 327). As Lady Macbeth is sleepwalking, she claims to still smell the blood of the king on her hands, saying "All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand" (5.1.42-43). Neely's claim that her problem is a religious one implies that it is caused by something she has done that is unnatural, such as acting like a man. Even though she did not physically kill anyone, she cannot seem to move past the fact that it was done at her urging. Only after suffering from madness, does she once again acknowledge her-

self as possessing feminine attributes, referring to her "little hand" that is metaphorically stained with blood. Her conduct in this scene, which leads up to her eventual suicide is a stark contrast with her formerly strong and somewhat masculine personality in previous scenes. Only once she feels that she is being punished for the results of her masculine conduct does she begin to act like a woman again.

While Lady Macbeth acts like a woman only after she suffered extreme guilt in her quest to lose her femininity to better help her husband become king, Lady Macduff accepts her femininity as part of herself. Though she is a relatively minor character, the difference between her and Lady Macbeth is important to note. In the scene where she learns that the murderers are approaching, Lady Macduff wonders why she is being targeted but accepts that sometimes good people are considered threats, wondering why she "put up that womanly defence/To say I do no harm" (4.2.75-79)? In this scene, she both accepts her womanliness and understands more about the world than Lady Macbeth seems to. That is why, even though she is killed, and "the innocent, and innocence are destroyed" (Liston 236) with her, she does not suffer from the same torment Lady Macbeth does before her death.

When her husband finds out about her death, his response is "She should have died hereafter" (5.5.17), meaning that she was eventually going to die anyway. At this point in the play Macbeth seems to care very little for his wife. He is far different from the man whose masculinity she questioned after his uncertainty surrounding the assassination of the king earlier in the play. At this point, he hardly has any emotion left to spare for her. According to Eugene M. Waith in his article "Manhood and Valor in Two Shakespearean Tragedies," Macbeth is "so completely the soldier that she wanted him to be, that he is neither frightened by the "night-shriek" nor greatly moved by the news of her death. Death has no meaning for him (268)."

How did Macbeth become this way? The first mention of Macbeth's masculinity occurs in the second scene of Act 1. During this scene, he is called "brave Macbeth" by the captain and there is a graphic description of his defeat of Macdonald including the phrase "valour's minion" in reference to Macbeth and in reference to Macbeth's slaying of Macdonald, he says Macbeth "unseamed him from the nave to th' chops" (1.2.16-22). These descriptions reflect the

previously mentioned idealized masculinity based on soldierly aggression. In this case, his expression of masculinity is accepted.

By the second scene of Act 2, after having his masculinity and resolve questioned by his wife in the previous, Macbeth manages to find the courage to kill the king (2.2.14). This is the point which marks his change from noble soldier to over-masculine man. According to Waith, Macbeth subscribes to the notion of masculinity as being defined by soldierly strength and valor, though there is more to manhood than that, as defined by Macduff later in the play. In the next scene, Macbeth's unbalanced shift into over-masculinity is revealed to Banquo, Malcolm, Lennox, Macduff, and Donalbain who are investigating the murder as he attempts to explain why he killed the two guards, saying:

> Who can be wise, amazed, temp'rate and furious,
> Loyal and neutral, in a moment? No man:
> Th' expedition of my violent love
> Outrun the pauser, reason. (2.3.105-108)

Here, Macbeth is attempting to use his masculinity to explain his reasons for killing the guards, even going as far as to equate violence with love. He even admits that he had no balance of emotions whatsoever at the time of the attack, admitting only to rage and love, using battlefield virtue as a crutch in a domestic situation.

Further proof of Macbeth's hyper-masculinity occurs in Act 4 when the witches show him apparitions, and he decides to heed the warnings of the apparitions and defend himself against Macduff. He plans to kill him, but upon finding out that he has left for England (4.1.158), decides to have Macduff's wife and children killed. He claims "The very firstlings of my heart shall be/The firstlings of my hand" (4.1.1163-164), or that he will begin immediately act on his instincts. This is much like the claim he falsely made about killing the king's guards. While at that point, he claimed to have acted on such soldierly instincts in order to take blame away from himself for the murder of the king and to make himself look noble, here Macbeth actually vowing to act on soldierly instinct marks his final shift into the complete, unfeeling soldier described by Waith. When he next appears in the play, he has become the unfeeling soldier who reacts very little to his wife's death at the beginning of Act 5.

Later on in Act 5, Macbeth is still overly confident about his

strength and ability to run and defend the kingdom completely alone, despite the fact that the predictions of the apparitions are coming true and the soldiers carrying limbs from Birnam Wood are advancing on him. He says that even if they lose, "At least we'll die with harness on our back" (5.5.50), showing that nothing matters to him now but fighting on principle. At this point, he is so completely a soldier, his wife's idealized version anyway, that he has lost sight of everything but battle. He doesn't care if he dies and loses the kingdom; he just wants to fight. When Macbeth finally is killed, it is by the hand of Macduff, who reveals that he was "from his mother's womb/Untimely ripped" (5.10.15-16) and can therefore kill Macbeth. Despite being intimidated by this fact, Macbeth decides to fight Macduff anyway, in part due to Macduff's urging: "Then yield thee, coward" (5.10.23). Despite the fact that Macbeth acts according to his definition of masculinity, he still ends up dying at Macduff's hand. This can be attributed to Macduff displaying a more acceptable version of masculinity. According to Waith, "he is a complete man: he is a valiant soldier, ready to perform "manly" deeds, but 's neither ashamed of "humane" feelings nor unaware of his moral responsibilities" (267).

　　While Macduff shows that he has valor on the battlefield as he faces Macbeth, he is also distinctly different from Macbeth in terms of his acknowledgement of his family. After learning of his family's killing, Macduff is able and unafraid to show his emotions. Even when Malcolm urges him to seek revenge as a man, he tells him he first has to "feel it as a man" (4.3.222). This shows that Macduff has emotional depth, and though he is on a mission to stop Macbeth's tyranny, he has not lost all other parts of himself than his soldierly valor. His admission that he must "feel" his loss implies some femininity, but in being able to admit it, Macduff is showing that he has found a balance between the feminine and masculine aspects of himself, and that he is *comfortable* with both the femininity and the masculinity in himself. The scene in which Macbeth learns about his wife's death parallels this scene, but the contrast is clear: Macduff has embraced all aspects of himself while Macbeth has eradicated all parts of himself but hardness.

　　Gender dynamics are an important part of *Macbeth*. The characters such as Macduff and Lady Macduff who accept the positions society has placed on their genders and embrace balance in

expressing them are more successful in the play. Even though Lady Macduff is killed, she experiences none of the emotional and psychological torture before her death that Lady Macbeth does from casting away her femininity and attempting to act as a man would, trying to help her husband seize power from the king. While Macduff is considered a true soldier, the definition Macbeth tried and succeeded to live up to, he is also not afraid to express tenderness, grief, and emotions other than those attributed to soldiers. That is why Macduff prevails and kills Macbeth in battle at the end of the play. Macbeth, though he knows Macduff's victory has already been predicted by the apparitions, continues to act as the consummate soldier, never accepting defeat though he knows he has little chance of winning. Characters such as the witches, who express no clear gender roles are regarded with confusion by Macbeth and Banquo and are kept mostly outside of the main action of the play.

WORKS CITED

Asp, Carolyn. "'Be Bloody, Bold and Resolute': Tragic Action and Sexual Stereotyping in 'Macbeth.'" *Studies in Philology* Vol.78, No. 2. (Spring, 1981): 153-169. Online.

Chamberlain, Stephanie. "Fantasizing Infanticide: Lady Macbeth and the Murdering Mother in Early Modern England." *College Literature* 32.3. (Summer 2005): 72-91. Online.

Liston, William T. "'Male and Female Created He Them'": Sex and Gender in "Macbeth.'" *College Literature* Vol. 16, No. 3. (Fall 1989): 232-239. Online.

Neely, Carol Thomas. "'Documents in Madness': Reading Madness and Gender in Shakespeare's Tragedies and Early Modern Culture." *Shakespeare Quarterly* Vol. 42, No.3. (Autumn 1991): 315-338. Online.

Shakespeare, William. "Macbeth." *The Norton Shakespeare*. 2nd Edition. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt.   New York: Norton. 2008.

Waith, Eugene M. "Manhood and Valor in Two Shakespearean Tragedies." *ELH* Vol. 7, No. 4. Dec., 1950): 262-273.Online.

BRIDGET CLEMENT

IRISH NATIONALISM AND THE IMPACT OF THE IRISH
POTATO FAMINE

INTRODUCTION

 Potatoes were the staple to the diet of the poorer classes in Ireland: the small farmers, tenant farmers, and landless laborers. Tenants often made their rent payments with a portion of their potato crop.[1] Before the famine, Irish families would often go hungry during the summer months to make sure they had enough potatoes to pay that year's rent. From 1845-1850, a devastating fungus, *phythophtora infestans*, infected the potato crop causing it rot and become inedible devastating the poorer class of Ireland.[2] *The Nation*, a nationalist newspaper, reported in 1845 that "1 out of 20 families will have no potatoes left by Christmas."[3] The *Freeman Journal*, another newspaper, reported that,

> *Famine does not arise from the inability of the poor to purchase it; the masses of people, therefore, most took sustenance to the potato crop and not the grain crop, which however abundant, must necessarily be out of reach of men, who without employment must be without money.*[4]

The famine was devastating to the Irish population. By the time the famine ended in 1850, one million people had died of starvation or disease while another two million had emigrated to Britain, the United States, and Canada. The population of Ireland had never been as high as it was during pre-famine Ireland.[5]

 As the Irish starved and tried to fight off disease, they observed the grain-filled fields of their British landlords and wealthy neighbors. They would look upon the fields filled with envy and resentment. The landlords would export their grains rather than sell them domestically. This practice outraged many Irish who were paying extremely high prices for food. While the Irish poor starved and were picked off by disease, the majority of the British landlords had abandoned the country to avoid disease. The Irish felt betrayed resulting in increased demands for a "free Ireland." Many Irish blamed the British for their subclass status and used the famine as a catalyst to fuel anti-British sentiments and Irish nationalism. There

were some revolts during the famine, but most of the population was too weak from hunger and disease to engage in a successful attack on the British. Pre-existing British laws and political theories concerning the Irish, hardships suffered by the Irish poor throughout the Irish potato famine of 1845-1850, and British policy concerning the famine caused Irish nationalism to intensify.

BRITISH POLICIES CONCERNING IRELAND BEFORE THE FAMINE

The British had annexed Ireland as a colony during the 1530s. In order to cement Ireland's colony status, the British Parliament dissolved the Irish government, dethroned the Irish king, and enacted the Penal Laws. These laws confiscated civil rights from Irish Catholics: they prohibited Catholics from joining the army or navy, participating in commerce, voting, holding office, purchasing land, attending schools, or sending children abroad to be educated. The Settlement Act confiscated Irish Catholic land and distributed it to the Scottish and the British. Irish Catholic landownership decreased from 64 percent to 8 percent.[6] Those who violated the Penal Laws faced strict consequences, which created an English tradition of distributing harsh punishments for petty crimes and terrorizing Catholics.[7] The blatant discrimination of Catholics by the British invigorated Irish nationalism.

The Poor Laws also fueled anti-British sentiment in Ireland. The British took the Poor Laws of industrializing Britain and applied them to rural, agrarian Ireland. In Britain, the goal of the Poor Laws was to single out the paupers from the laboring poor; however, the vast majority of Ireland's population was poor. Many members of Parliament knew that the Poor Laws were not easily transcribed over to Ireland, but they argued that agricultural rationalization, fiscal restructuring and population clearances were necessary to improve Irish society. England believed the only way to achieve progress in Ireland was to eliminate the tenant class and create a landless labor pool which would free up land for commercial agriculture.

The Poor Laws divided Ireland up into several unions. These unions were each required to provide a "workhouse" which would be paid for by Irish landowners. The workhouses were supposed to provide food and shelter for those who were unable to

fend for themselves. Only whole families could enter a workhouse, and to do so they had to give up all their rights. Once a family entered, the husband and wife were divorced to try to prevent them from having additional children, and the family members were separated into different groups. Critics of the Poor Laws claimed that the laws aimed to prevent destitution rather than manage poverty. The Poor Laws in Ireland essentially created pauperism where there was none before.[8] The Poor Laws were widely loathed by the Irish poor, who would do all in their power to avoid entering the workhouses. The brutal treatment of people admitted into these workhouses fueled anti-British sentiments.

The Corn Laws, enacted in 1815, were also another major cause of anti-British sentiment in Ireland. The Corn Laws placed heavy duties on import corn (grains and cereals). Although the measure was very beneficial for farmers, it made food prices in both Britain and Ireland soar. Since most members of Parliament represented land owners' interests, they were reluctant to repeal the bill, even after the devastating effects on the working class.[9] When the famine hit in Ireland, the effects of the Corn Laws were devastating. Although there was plenty of food in Ireland during the famine, excluding potatoes, the Irish were unable to afford it. The fields of the landlords and large farmers were plentiful with wheat. Unfortunately, all of this food was exported to Britain rather than feeding the Irish people.[10]

IRISH NATIONALISM BEFORE THE FAMINE

Nationalist feelings were stirring in the few decades preceding the famine. One of the most evident examples of this was the Ribbon Societies. Ribbonism, as it was called, was a reaction against the anti-Catholic laws of Parliament. These Ribbon Societies were often composed of people of the rural agrarian tenant-farmer class. Their main goal was to use violence to prevent landlords from evicting tenants. The British feared these societies and would send in people to infiltrate meetings. People suspected of being a members of a Ribbon Society were often harshly punished. Many were hanged or more commonly transported to Australia.[11] The callous punishments of suspected members only further fed Irish nationalism.

Mitchel, an Irish nationalist and critic of the British, claimed

that Britain' ultimate goal was to repress the Irish people. In his book, *The Last Conquest of Ireland (Perhaps)*, published in 1882, he argues that British laws were designed to oppress the Irish because representatives in Parliament could only be Protestant and that representation was mostly based in northern Ireland (which was where the majority of Protestants resided). He also identified other repressive practices: Parliament established a tax to support the Anglican Church which was levied on landlords and passed down to tenants, nationalized education erased Irish history from the curriculum, and sheriffs were nominees of the crown.[12] Mitchel was considered a nationalist hero by much of poor Ireland and his words had a profound effect on people's ideologies.

Although the Whig Party was partly considered a party for the working class in Britain, it was disdained by most of the Irish poor. The party largely did not represent the interest of Ireland. In "A Letter to the Members of the Whig Association," Feargus O'Connor believed that the Whig Party had delayed all measures of reform that were promised to the Irish. He claimed that their political gains were due to the people, yet they ignored the interests of those who elected them. He dared them to, "…point out one single Whig enactment tending to increase comforts or lessen burdens of the poorer class in Ireland."[13]

THE IRISH EXPERIENCE DURING THE FAMINE

Ballykilcline, a small community with one hundred farms, exemplifies the adverse effects of Whig policy. The population was mostly made up of small farmers and laborers. Most of Ballykilcline's land was owned by people who lived outside of the community, so when tenants were evicted, the eviction was often not enforced. Although Ballykilcline was a decent sized town for its time, it can no longer be found on a modern Irish map. During the famine, this was a common occurrence. Towns were wiped off the map due to starvation, disease, evictions, and/or forced emigration sponsored by the landlords.[14] In 1847, all of Ballykilcline's residents were evicted with many of them forced to immigrate to Canada.

Malnutrition of the Irish poor left them susceptible to disease and illness. In Ireland, disease and illness killed ten times as many people as starvation alone. Most common were hypothermia, dehydration, arrhythmia, infections, typhoid fever, relapsing fever,

cholera, and dysentery.[15] Fever spread throughout the countryside rapidly. The former hospitality of the Irish people toward strangers had disappeared due to fear of catching the fever. Disease spread through unclean water, polluted water, and dirty living conditions. Many people caught diseases by eating animal carcasses because they were so hungry. Richard Delaney from County Wexford said that the Irish would leave an onion in the window sill and that, "they would split the onion in two, put it in the windowsill, and if the onion turned green, they knew that there was fever in the house." Irish folklore portrays the onion as a vegetable that is able to detect illness, including fever.[16] Fever hospitals were often set up next to workhouses. Many people would enter these fever hospitals just to have a decent burial, later finding out that people were buried unceremoniously in a large ditch without a priest's blessing. Johnny Callaghan described the burial process; "From the window, there were a few boards slanting down the boards into the pit and lime was put over the corpse."[17]

THE BRITISH RESPONSE

When reports of the famine reached Britain in 1845, the British were largely unsympathetic. British thoughts of the famine tended to be influenced by ethnic divisions and prejudices. The British blamed the Irish for depending too much on potatoes, having too many children, not working hard enough and listening to the poor advice of priests. To many in Britain, the famine was seen as an act of God to reduce the population to a realistic number.[18] *The Nation* stated, "We have no domestic government or legislature to provide such a remedy; and, as for the English government is not Ireland their store-farm… So long as this island is a "foreigner's farm" that remedy is out of the question…"[19] The British initial response infuriated many of the poor Irish who thought the opinion was overly harsh.

The Prime Minister of Britain, Sir Robert Peel, was more sympathetic to the Irish cause. He set up the Scientific Commission to determine the cause of the failure of the potato crop. The cause of the blight was a fungus called *phythophtora infestans*. The Scientific Commission, however, determined that the potato failure was due to wet rot. In order for the potatoes to be edible, all the Irish had to do was "dry out" their potatoes. The Irish poor readily followed the

Commission's advice. They soon discovered that it was extremely harmful to eat the "dried out" potatoes. Those who tried suffered extreme stomach cramps and bloody diarrhea.[20]

Robert Peel quickly realized that his Scientific Commission was largely unsuccessful and tried to find other ways to assist the starving Irish. Peel had personally disliked the Corn Laws because they increased food prices. He also believed that the protectionist measures of the Corn Laws contradicted the Whig Party's free-trade ideology. Peel believed that if the Corn Laws were repealed and grain imported into Ireland, the Irish would be able to purchase food thus making the famine less severe.[21] He knew that the Corn Laws would be hard to repeal because the majority of Parliament represented land interests. He found a loophole in the Corn Laws and was able to import grain from India in January 1846; however he ordered it not be distributed until April. This outraged many Irish who believed that the grain should be distributed immediately since the majority of people were starving. On the day that the grain was scheduled to be distributed, the lines to the warehouses were extremely long and became chaotic and violent once the doors opened. Those who were able to purchase the grain quickly realized that it was not what they had hoped for. The grain was raw and the Irish did not possess the special mill to process it. The Indian grain was quickly nicknamed "Peel's Brimstone" because it was coarse and would cause stomach pains and bleeding to death when it punctured the intestines.[22] Meanwhile, Peel eventually gathered enough support from fellow party members to repeal the Corn Laws in June of 1846. However, this proved to be so controversial with the British public that Peel resigned the next day. Once grains were "legally imported" they were ground to be made edible. However, by the time the grain reached Ireland, most of the population could not afford it.[23] Even though the British had finally passed legislation offering some aid to the poor of Ireland, for many Irish it was too little too late; nationalist feelings within Ireland intensified.

THE IRISH EMERGENCY ACT AND PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

In the summer of 1846, the Irish Emergency Act was passed. This act provided Ireland loans to be used for public projects, such as building bridges and dams. The British had hoped that

by offering meager wages for these projects, few people would apply; however, since there was little employment to be found it Ireland, the number of job applications was overwhelming, delaying the projects.[24] John Mitchel claimed that this aid was not good enough. He stated that the grants and administrative privileges were awarded by the Commissioners of Public Works, not the Irish.[25] Once jobs were rewarded, the workers were required to work ten to twelve hours a day six days a week. The working conditions were often brutal for the workers, who suffered from malnutrition and lacked proper shoes and clothing. Many workers had to walk five to seven miles in order to reach the worksite. At the worksite, the workers were often whipped in order to increase their pace. When workers died, they were often replaced by wives or oldest sons. Workers' payments were also often delayed due to a coin shortage in Ireland, nor were their wages adequate due to the high price of food: It took five days of work to purchase three days' worth of food.[26] The brutality of the overseers combined with meager wages and delayed payments increased the Irish's frustrations with the British government.

During the summer of 1846, there was a lot of hope that the blight would not strike again. Many people, both British and Irish, believed that the blight would not survive the winter and an abundant harvest was predicted. The new Prime Minister, a conservative Lord John Russell, quickly ended the importation of Indian corn. The Secretary of the Treasury, Sir Charles Trevelyan, announced that the public works programs could close mid-August. Early August produced heavy rains which aided the spread of fungus spores and the blight struck harder than it had the year before. Many Irish were desperate. They had sold all of their possessions and did not have any money to purchase food. Trevelyan was forced to keep the public works projects open. However, to prevent landlords from taking advantage of the workhouses they increased the amount of money the ratepayers would have to pay to keep the workhouses running. This proved to be ineffective because the taxes were spread across so many people that individual landlords did not feel they would greatly affected.[27]

The winter of 1846 proved to be very harsh. Ireland, which rarely receives any snowfall, was hit by a blizzard. Most of the Irish had sold their clothing, coats, and hats in order to raise money for

food to survive the prior year. They were not properly dressed for the cold, unforgiving weather. Many were snowed in and were forced to trap mice, rabbits, and badgers, which tend to be disease vectors. Many workers who were employed by public works died of hypothermia due to improper clothing.[28]

EVICTIONS

In addition to the constant search for food, the Irish poor were in constant fear of being evicted. Since the tenants were unable to pay their rents, landlords found their income drastically reduced. Many landlords realized that it would be more profitable to evict all their tenants and use the formally leased land for cash crops. When a landlord decided to evict his tenants, he would call in soldiers and the local sheriff. Once the tenants were evicted, the landlord would usually raze the house to prevent them from reentering. Knowing that evicted tenants would most likely be admitted into the poor houses, landlords would often pay for former tenants' emigration to the United States or Canada because it was cheaper than paying for one year to keep them in the workhouse. Landlords would try to find the absolute cheapest fares, often with "coffin ships" which would allow more people on ships than the government deemed safe. These ships have often been compared to slave ships from Africa.[29] Although lots of people were thankful for the paid emigrations, many saw them as a plot for landlords to rid themselves of their Irish Catholic tenants.

Ballinglass Evictions are a prime example of the harshness of landlords to their tenants. On March 23, 1846 Lord Londonderry evicted 76 families, or three hundred people, from his estate. Many of the evicted tenants were able to pay their rents and had them ready. Londonderry however, had decided it was more profitable to use the land for cash crops. Many tenants, though angered by the unjust evictions, left peacefully. Many retreated to ditches for shelter. Londonderry was intent on driving all the tenants from his land. The soldiers followed his orders and mercilessly drove the tenants out of the ditches.[30] John Mitchel was outraged by Londonderry's actions. In his book, he addressed the issue by blaming the high eviction rates on the British claiming that there was no security guaranteed to tenants. The tenants were completely at their will of landlords and could unjustly be disposed of at any time.[31] *The Nation*

interpreted the event, as well as the numerous other evictions occurring on the island, as the British pauperizing the Irish poor.[32] Access to land was the only form of survival. Once land was taken from the Irish, they had no means of obtaining food and were forced to surrender their rights to enter the workhouses.

Ballykilcline exemplifies one effect of eviction: like some other towns, it was wiped off the map permanently. Evictions notices had traditionally been ignored by the residents of Ballykilcline. The landlord, Lord Roscommon, rarely visited his estate and hardly managed it. However, once the famine struck, Roscommon became worried about his estate, so he hired Denis Mahon to manage his estate. Mahon was harsh when dealing with evicted tenants and became widely hated by the people of Ballykilcline. In May 1847, eviction notices were sent to all but two families leasing on the estate. They were offered free passages to Canada as long as they were up to date with their rent, which excluded the majority of the tenants. Those who took advantage of the free passage left for Canada shortly after. Many of the former residents of Ballykilcline had heard rumors (which turned out to be false) that the coffin ship Roscommon had sent his tenants on had sunk at sea. This outraged the former residents of Ballykilcline and three men retaliated by assassinating Mahon. One of the men was hanged while the other two were transported to Australia.[33] The majority of Irish population viewed the three men as national heroes fighting for the Irish cause.

"SOUPERS" AND RISE OF IRISH-CATHOLIC NATIONALISM

Since many of the members of British Parliament were opposed to importing Indian grain to feed the starving Irish, they turned to a new solution. The Soup Kitchen Act was passed and the first government-run soup kitchen opened in June of 1847. Soup kitchens were deemed the most effective answer to the "Irish problem" because soup was somewhat nutritious, inexpensive, and easy to make in large quantities. The arrival of the government-run soup kitchens became a way for laborers to receive food without giving up their rights to enter a workhouse. However, soup did not prove to be as nutritious as the potato and an all soup diet cause scurvy and dysentery. People would wait in line for hours in order to receive soup. Many died in line waiting for their turn to eat while a

few died of being trampled. Some people who had not had anything to eat for weeks died of shock due to a sudden intake of food.[34]

Although the Irish did support the Soup Kitchen Act, they despised the private-run Soupers. The vast majority of the Irish were Catholic and took much pride in their religious identity. The Soupers were Protestant who were overly zealous about their religion and saw the famine as the perfect time to evangelize.[35] The Soupers took advantage of the starving Irish population and would offer unlimited servings of soup as long as one would convert to Protestantism. They would try to break the Catholics of their rituals by offering soups with meat on Fridays. Some Irish were so desperate that they would "temporarily" renounce their Catholic religion in order to obtain food, but most detested the Soupers, many teaching their children that it would be better to die than take soup from a Protestant. In response to the ploys used to trick people to renounce their faith, wives of large farmers and landlords began to run their own soup kitchens to combat the Soupers. They were willing to give up their time and income to combat the perceived heresy.[36] The Irish viewed attack on their religion by British Protestant "missionaries" as another way to oppress and degrade Ireland. Catholic Ireland loathed the callousness of the Soupers and many people joined the growing nationalist movement, Young Ireland, in response to the blatant undermining of the Irish majority religion, Catholicism.

IRISH NATIONALIST UPRISINGS

In response to the British failure to provide more food, there were a few scattered nationalists uprisings, including the Limerick Revolution of January 20, 1846. *The Nation* reported that 1,200 -1,500 men assembled on the lands of Sir Capel Molyneaux of Knockssentry to prevent the serving of eviction notices. The insurgents camped out for 48 hours, many of them armed with guns or farming implements. Troops were called in from Limerick City to put down the rebellion. Initially, the insurgents tried to face the 200 soldiers. When the soldiers charged however, the insurgents quickly realized that they were not well enough equipped to defeat the British. The insurgents quickly retreated and the rebellion was over.[37]

More nationalist feelings were displayed when William O'Brien, a leader of Young Ireland, wrote an anti-British article in

The Nation. He stated that there would be no famine in Ireland if they were allowed to self-govern. Ireland would have closed off the ports, like many other countries had done when faced with famine, in order to feed their people. Aid would have been offered immediately rather than delayed due to ethnic prejudices or overly emphasize liberal politics. He blamed the British for the premature deaths of thousands who had died in the famine. He also accused the British of monstrosity by placing property rights over human lives.[38]

Young Ireland, modeled on movements such as Young Italy, took advantage of the anti-British sentiment caused by the famine. Young Ireland's membership increased rather drastically during the famine years. The entire blame for Ireland's hardships was placed solely on Britain's shoulders. According to Susan Campbell Bartoletti in her book *Black Potatoes*, Young Ireland, inspired by the revolutions of 1848 occurring on the continent, tried to stage their own rebellion. They asked the French if they would be willing to assist the Irish in their endeavor, but the French refused due to political instability at home. Once the French declared that they would offer the Irish no help, the morale of Young Ireland was damaged and many members went home feeling defeated. The British still feared a potential revolt and sent 10,000 troops to Dublin to serve as a deterrent.[39]

The increase in British troops forced Young Ireland's leader, William O'Brien, to make a difficult decision: either drop the rebellion or start the war immediately. O'Brien chose to start the war immediately due to the arrival of many young, unemployed men who were excited by the arrival of additional British troops. Upon learning that Young Ireland was unable to provide these men with food or payment, many soon quickly deserted.[40]

On July 29, 1848 the British soldiers continued to approach Ballingary, the place where O'Brien's troops were camped out. The two hundred rebels waiting in Ballingary had barricaded the streets and prepared for battle, even if only 20 possessed a firearm. The local police grew nervous and barricaded themselves in the home of Widow McCormick, a wife of a successful farmer, while she was out running errands in town. The rebels charged the house and fighting quickly broke out. McCormick, upon approaching her home, was horrified because her five children were in the house. She begged O'Brien to cease fire for the safety of her children. O'Brien gave in

to McCormick's pleas and stuck an agreement with the head police officer. It was agreed that if the rebels ceased their rebellion that none of the rebels would be pursued legally. One of the police, who was still excited from the battle, resumed fire. The rebels panicked believing that the agreement had been made and retreated. By the end of the battle, two rebels were dead and one was wounded. All of the children within the home were safe. The police revoked their word and O'Brien was arrested. He was originally supposed to be hanged for treason but the British government did not want him to be made into a martyr. He was instead transported to Australia for life.[41]

CONCLUSION

The Irish did not fail at Ballingarry due to lack of determination, but mostly due to weakness caused by disease and malnutrition. The events of the potato famine served to fuel anti-British sentiment and bring to light the need of Irish self-rule. Although the events at Ballingarry proved to be embarrassing, the famine was starting to cease. Although the blight struck again in 1848 and 1849, it only affected small areas and a small amount of the crop. By 1850 the worst of the blight had passed.[42]

Some of the nationalistic goals of the Irish were obtained during the famine. Land was unintentionally transferred back to the Irish. The British landlords were burdened by high amounts of debt due to the revisions to the Poor Laws. The Encumbered Estates Act allowed the debt-stricken landlords to sell their land without first paying off their debt. Although the intention was for British to buy the land, many were unwilling to due to the complications caused by the famine. Instead the vast majority of the purchasers of the cheap land were Irish landlords, businessmen, and large farmers. The new landlords were often more sympathetic to their tenants.[43] The return of land to the Irish was a cause to celebrate for many. For the first time in centuries, Irish landownership increased drastically. The influx of Irish Catholic landowners allowed for Irish interests to be better represented in Parliament.

The famine was a time of great hardship for many of the Irish people. Not only were a third of the Irish population victims of the famine, either through death or emigration, but many Irish traditions, including the Gaelic language and Irish folk beliefs, were

permanently weakened. The Irish were not willing to forgive the British for the famine and Irish nationalism grew immensely during the years after the famine all the way up to Irish independence in 1921. Anti-British sentiment was passed down through families as they shared the stories of the famine with their children and later their grandchildren. The famine was solely attributed to the British and many Irish would never forgive them for it.

NOTES

[1]Susan Campbell Bartoletti, *Black Potatoes: The Story of the Great Irish Famine, 1845-1850* (Boston: Houghton Company, 2001): 29-31.

[2] Brendan Cathaoir, *Famine Diary (* Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1999): 9-10.

[3]Cathaoir 10.

[4] Cathaoir 10.

[5] Cathaoir 10.

[6] Polly Radosh, "Colonial Oppression, Gender, and Women in the Irish Diaspora," *The Journal of Historical Sociology* 22 no. 2 (2009): 269-291. www.ebscohost.com.

[7] Thomas E. Hachey and Lawrence J. McCaffrey, eds., *Perspectives on Irish Nationalism* (Lexington, K.Y.: University of Kentucky Press, 1989): 2.

[8] David Nally, "That Coming Storm": The Irish Poor Law, Colonial Biopolitics, and the Great Famine," *Association of American Geographers. Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 98, no. 3 (2008): www.//proquest.umi.com.

[9] Iain McLean and Camilla Bustani, "Irish Potatoes and British Politics: Interests, Ideology, Heresthetic, and the Repeal of the Corn Laws," *Political Studies* 47 no. 5 (1999): www.proquest.umi.com.

[10] McLean.

[11] M.R. Beames, "The Ribbon Societies: Lower-Class Nationalism in Pre-Famine Ireland," *Past & Present* 1, no. 97 (1982):. http://jstor.org.

[12] John Mitchel, *The Last Conquest of Ireland (Perhaps)*, ed. Patrick Maume (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2005): 19-20.

[13] Feargus O'Connor, "Letter to the Members of the Whig Association," In *A Series of Letters From Feargus O'Connor, Esq., Barrister at Law, to Daniel O'Connell, Esq.* ed. H. Hetherington 1. (Farmington Hills, MI: Gale, 2005).

[14]Robert James Scally, *The End of Hidden Ireland* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995): 3-4.

[15] Bartoletti, 95.

[16] Bartoletti 99.

[17] Bartoletti 102.

[18] Bartoletti 35-36.

[19] Cathaoir 9-10.

[20] Bartoletti 36-40.

[21] McLean.

[22] Bartoletti 42-44.

[23] Bartoletti 42-44.

[24] Bartoletti 46-49.

[25] Mitchel 105.

[26] Bartoletti 46-49.

[27]Bartoletti 51-53.

[28] Bartoletti 61-63.

[29] Bartoletti 107-116.

[30] Cathaoir 145.

[31] Mitchel 113.

[32]Cathaoir 145.

[33] Scally 105-108.

[34] Bartoletti 73.

[35] Bartoletti, 74.

[36] Bartoletti 73-78.

[37] Cathaoir 25.

[38] Cathaoir 41-42.

[39] Bartoletti 140-145.

[40]?

[41]Bartoletti, 147-151.

[42] Bartoletti 168.

[43] Bartoletti 155-157.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bartoletti, Susan Campbell. *Black Potatoes: The Story of the Great Irish Famine, 1845-1850.* Boston: Houghton Company, 2001.

Beames, M.R. "The Ribbon Societies: Lower-Class Nationalism in Pre-Famine Ireland." *Past & Present* 1, no. 97 (1982): 128-143. http://jstor.org.

Cathaoir, Brendan. *Famine Diary.* Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1999.

Hachey, Thomas E. and Lawrence J. McCaffrey, eds. *Perspectives on Irish Nationalism.* Lexington, K.Y.: University of Kentucky Press, 1989.

McLean, Iain and Camilla Bustani. "Irish Potatoes and British Politics: Interests, Ideology, Heresthetic, and the Repeal of the Corn Laws." *Political Studies*, 47 no. 5 (1999): 817-837. www.proquest.umi.com.

Mitchel, John. *The Last Conquest of Ireland (Perhaps).* Edited by Patrick Maume. Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2005.

Nally, David. *"That Coming Storm": The Irish Poor Law, Colonial Biopolitics, and the Great Famine.*" *Association of American Geographers. Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 98, no. 3 (2008): 714-733. www.//proquest.umi.com.

Nicholson, Asenath. *Annals of the Famine in Ireland in 1847, 1848, and 1849.* New York: E. French, 1851. www.eurodocs.com.

O'Connor, Feargus. "Letter to the Members of the Whig Association." In *A Series of Letters From Feargus O'Connor, Esq., Barrister at Law, to Daniel O'Connell, Esq.* ed. H. Hetherington 1. Farmington Hills, MI: Gale, 2005.

O'Grada, Cormac. *Black '47 and Beyond: The Great Irish Famine in History, Economy, and Memory.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Radosh, Polly. "Colonial Oppression, Gender, and Women in the Irish Diaspora." *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 22 no. 2 (2009): 269-291. www.ebscohost.com.

Scally, Robert James. *The End of Hidden Ireland.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

HOLLAN STAKER

GOT TO FIND ME A *BODY* TO WRITE

Over and over Hélène Cixous urges women to "write woman" (1525), "writing their bodies" (Bizzell and Herzberg 1522). But how does one write a *body*? What connections does a body have with rhetoric? Is "woman" a universal truth to be achieved, alighted upon—can she really be put to paper? Or is she a spoken rhetoric only? Cixous emphasizes the rhetor above the rhetoric, begging the questions what is woman, what is woman's rhetoric, and, with these "dizzying, precipitous flights between knowledge and invention" (1536), how can we be sure/how do we know what we know? Dissecting her dialogue with herself in "The Laugh of the Medusa" and her dialogue with Catherine Clément in "A Woman Mistress," one cannot help but realize the ties to (and the perpetual cutting of the ties of) our dear dialectic of dialectics, Plato, his *Phaedrus*, and his disdain for writing. Compared with other woman writers, Cixous travels the furthest in her attempt to individualize, to separate from God and man, and as the emphasis pulls away from the universal and the mind, rhetoric perches first on scripture and duty, then on the impersonality of writing (as shown in selections of works by Virginia Woolf), and then lastly (not necessarily "finally"), restlessly, on the unknowable, the body, the individual—not a return to senses but a final declaration that woman must write them— "at every instant" (Cixous 1536).

After reading "A Woman Mistress," one cannot but consider the thought that Plato's discourse is hardly a discourse at all, dominated by the voice (but never wholly the face) of Socrates, the only speaker to convince; all he speaks is agreed upon and Phaedrus sits, used merely as a support, probed to answer only in that way of which Socrates is already sure. He spoke *in order* to secure for himself a certain response, particular and predetermined, a clear end ever in mind—hardly the free-flowing speech he argues for in his crushing of the written works. Whether inventing lovely nothings, veiling the face of the author, or speaking in the name of another, Socrates demotes the role of the body in rhetoric; it, in fact, becomes a hindrance to the soul's seeking of universal truth (one need only think of the biblical term "the flesh" to see the vile connota-

tions coupled with the body).

Ripping away from this predecessor, Cixous argues a knowledge from every particle that is woman. Her discourses become a different set of discourses, marked, specifically in the latter work mentioned, by a true discussion—two strong women debating truth, often with opposing views, spoken to be heard, not to convince but to be *considered*. One might argue that this pattern of discourse brings no resolution, acquires never a conclusion, but exists as only two people stuck in their wave on the ocean, rising and falling ever in the same spot. But Cixous does not advocate for a universal truth; there is no single right or wrong—there are a thousand of them. They speak *as* a response, not with an end in mind but as an end of mind—the beginning of the body, *their* ethos…alive:

She doesn't 'speak,' she throws her trembling body forward; she lets go of herself, she flies; all of her passes into her voice, and it's with her body that she vitally supports the 'logic' of her speech. Her flesh speaks true. She lays herself bare. In fact she physically materializes what she's thinking; she signifies it with her body…body without end, without appendage, without principal 'parts.' If she is a whole, it's a whole composed of parts that are wholes, not simply partial objects but a moving, limitlessly changing ensemble. (Cixous 1528, 1533)

Here, introduced finally, one sees rhetoric lived. This speaking the body (and with the body) seems to ride up alongside Plato's call for spoken rhetoric, but Cixous knows the world she lives in; if there were no disparities among genders, woman could be woman—talking and writing her body as she pleases. As it is, writing must be the means by which woman "must invent the impregnable language that will wreck partitions, classes, and rhetorics [men's shackling rhetoric]" (1530). And the verbal is not to be neglected.

Cixous is not the leader of this verbal movement, however. Christine de Pizan and Margaret Fell both open up the rhetoric of women to conversation in general, "creating a revised version [of rhetoric] that presented discourse as modeled on conversation rather than public speaking" (Donawerth 181). Whether standing between her husband (the prince) and his people or barons or between her mistress (if she is of lower position) and those she might slander her mistress to, woman becomes a mere mediator in Pizan's

The Treasure of the City of Ladies, a worker of peace. Conversation becomes the tool by which she has most influence. "Reasons...understanding thoroughly...bearing in mind...ponder[ing] long and hard...feel[ing] pity...[and] urg[ing]" continue to be elements of rhetoric, now recognized as available to women (546-7); the function of Pizan's work is even similar to the function of rhetoric in classical times and for her contemporaries. To begin, a woman is to please—"she   will not fail them [the subjects] in anything she can do," and after displaying her reasons before her lord, "so sensibly will she report it to the subjects that they will feel satisfied with the prince and with her, and they will thank her most humbly" (546). Woman is also to teach (Pizan thoroughly displays that the vice of slander from hatred, opinion, and envy that should be avoided at all costs). And lastly, woman must move (as is displayed in "the proper duty of a wise queen and princess" to "pacify...men" and move them from their "hot-headed[ness]" and their "great desire...to avenge themselves" to the "peril" of their kingdom) (547). Her freedom to speak is only impeded thus: she must not speak (to her husband) until spoken to (by the subjects) in a way, and her words must not be empty (slanderous)—she must even remain silent about the truth if it be dishonorable to "the greater lady...more...celebrated" (549) (a blatant support of the hierarchy of the day...perhaps).

Pizan, in her work *The Book of the City of Ladies*, reverts back to the obscurity of the author demonstrated by Socrates in Plato's *Phaedrus*, but while Socrates is ultimately ashamed of what he says next and seeks to distance himself from his words, the Novella of Pizan's story hides her beauty from her father's class that she is teaching to protect the men being distracted (545)—promoting the education of women (providing herself with credibility) while recognizing their natural tendency to smear concentration when desired. Margaret Fell took a different path, and not only hid entirely behind scripture but considered her very origin to be the Spirit within her, again creating a kind of distance between the author and the words being said—they were not, after all, *her* words. Fell also takes the opportunity to redefine "preaching as conversation, prophecy, and advice, rather than public lectures...reconceived as sharing rather than lecturing...in private rather than in public space" (areas where women, as she shows in scripture, are accepted) (Donawerth 193).

Although Pizan is mostly concerned with how a woman might bring her husband, through her speech, to the best decision for his kingdom or how she might best uphold the honor of herself, her husband, and her superiors, she dots her work with strong references to "the Church," (546) "[t]he Scriptures," (547) and God's explicit commandments (548). Though Pizan "failed to recommend learning and knowledge to the women of her world," her work stands as a stepping stone for future women rhetoricians thanks to her assertions of how "knowledge most gives [her] the delectable taste and savor of it which [she] find[s] only in the little interconnections and parts of learning (since [she] cannot attain to anything higher)..." (Bell 175). And Fell floods her work with countless references of women in scripture, refuting arguments, clarifying the Word, justifying her opening her mouth—as if she cannot give a sermon until she proves with titling "Elizabeth's brief greeting to her pregnant cousin Mary...'Elizabeth's *Sermon* concerning Christ' [emphasis added]" showing that this too is preaching and thus acceptable for women in the church (Donawerth 194). Fell does nothing but show she is proved in speaking, as her words are examples from the Word of God and from the Spirit speaking through her.

With hindsight, one realizes the ethos these women created through scripture and one's womanly duty, and the necessity of this ethos in the tradition of a phallocentric society. In direct oppostion, Cixous tries her best to remove herself from this, basing her ethos in womanhood, calling for the killing of "the false woman who is preventing the live one from breathing" (1527). There is a switch in the focus. The medieval feminine rhetoric emphasizes spoken hierarchical rhetoric and practically portrays the very removal of the body: it is hidden behind a veil, a man, and/or a Book. In the modern and postmodern rhetoric of Cixous, feminine rhetoric celebrates itself; it opens itself up for inspection, and urges women to write woman, to write their bodies—to individualize, to look/ search/write within. The individual is revealed, "more than naked underneath the seven veils of modesty" (1531). But how did we jump from this determinable rhetoric with clear instructions and a stable definition (where good rhetoric was performing one's social and religious duty when called upon or keeping one's mouth closed when appropriate and bad rhetoric is slanderous speech), to this

new rhetoric of practical conversation, to Cixous's rhetoric of the unknown, the body with all its little parts and functions, illnesses and improvisations, sexual desires and complex ideas, and obvious disdain of the woman Pizan promotes—the woman "who gives only in order to" (1533), whose focus is on those surrounding her, whose rhetoric can only be described by her relationships (by men mainly and hierarchy)? How does one move from a rhetoric that boldly hides to one that strips back the layers itself? From one focused on everything and everyone else to a rhetoric centered on self (not necessarily self-centered)? In between the non-personal stance and one very personal, lies Virginia Woolf, who we may call the impersonal writing rhetorician.

Woolf veers down a path of seeming neutrality. She takes a cue from Cixous by weaving woman's necessary aggression into "the Angel of the House"—the compelling, eager-to-please, selfless, "pure," socially constructed and fed Angel, but one whose wings cast their "shadow" (a symbol of darkness) on the rhetoric and the very heart of the one she monitored (1252). She does not deny the distinct disparities of feminine experience in rhetoric; she instead acknowledges these unwritten thoughts, dreams, and desires of woman which overwhelm her when she alights upon them, discovering her own self and the towering consciousness of what people (men) will say of her truth. Woolf admits bluntly her uncertainty of overcoming this block to her "experiences as a body," (1255) yet she criticizes some for their too personal use of writing (specifically the novel) as a springboard for their "personal cause[s]...personal discontent or grievance,...[asking them] to resist the temptation to anger" (1258); "nor does art's meaning begin and end with the autobiographical" she says (Fernald 171). "Instead, because being 'personal' for Woolf was more limited, she wrote about thinking as a deeply personal act in her criticism and was not tempted to take the short cut through her private life" (168). Hers is a rhetoric still defined by those around her, but without neglecting the woman within.

Woolf seems to hold the written word as supreme, able to hide the reader at first from seeing the author and leaping to assumptions of culturally constructed gender issues, appearing to wish women to move past the blinds of the personal and "to the writing of essays and criticism, of history and biography"—areas tradition-

ally dominated by the masculine (1260). But the rhetoric of Woolf reflects a hiding quality about it [in "A Room of One's Own" "Woolf's use of a narrator inhibits us from being distracted by Woolf the personality and allows us to enter into a sympathetic relationship with the persona" (Fernald 177)—a slightly altered mirroring of Pizan's veil while teacher her father's pupils?] and does not suggest a great shift, but gradual shifts. Indeed the narrator takes her money earned with the publication of her first piece and buys a Persian cat, which in turn only brings animosity in the relationships close at hand (though this is also symbolically interpreted to show the resistance of society to women possessing the finer things in life...money, a room of one's own, rhetoric, etc.) Although some might claim Woolf's works at once complain of and create this sense of "other" in her rhetoric, showing a desire to be viewed with the same seriousness as men's works, yet playing the game which tells one what not to think of and thereby making them dwell on that very thing, this is merely an effort not to generalize truths based solely on her individual "experimental style" (Bizzell and Herzberg 1248).

Rhetoric and the rhetor have taken many forms for women throughout the traditions (and the "anti-traditions"), from a focus and an ethos rested in God (the creator of man first, woman *second*...invariably a *Him*), to the slightly less outward focus on writing the impersonal, to a final (but not ending) call to self seeking in both writing and the spoken rhetoric of the individual—an ever changing, breathing, a living word, a living logic, that *is* woman, and which cuts free from the master conversationalist (of masculine rhetoric) Plato. Cixous, in her stage, seems to recognize (or convince herself of) the impossibility of neutralization and pushing for the one "who want[s] all of me with all of him" (1535), paving a little more of the road for future feminist writers, (after all, we all build on top of everyone else) and mirroring the individualized ideas of the time—of humans at the center and crux of life and a rhetoric as varied as the parts of a woman's body. All the questions are not answered (perhaps even answerable), but we are at a beginning.

WORKS CITED

Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg, ed. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present.* 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's 2001.

Cixous, Hélène. "The Laugh of the Medusa." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present.* Ed. Patricia Bizzel and Bruce Herzberg. 2rd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's 2001. 1524-1536

Donawerth, Jane. "Conversation and the Boundaries of Public Discourse in Rhetorical Theory by Renaissance Women." *A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 16.2 (Spring 1998): 181-199.

Fernald, Anne. "*A Room of One's Own*, Personal Criticism, and the Essay." *Twentieth Century Literature* 40.2 (Summer 1994): 165-189.

Pizan, Christine de. "The Book of the City of Ladies." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present.* Ed. Patricia Bizzel and Bruce Herzberg. 3rd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's 2001. 544-545.

Pizan, Christine de. "The Treasure of the City of Ladies." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present.* Ed. Patricia Bizzel and Bruce Herzberg. 3rd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's 2001. 546-551.

Woolf, Virginia. "Professions for Women." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present.* Ed. Patricia Bizzel and Bruce Herzberg. 3rd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's 2001. 1253-1256.

Woolf, Virginia. "Women and Fiction." *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present.* Ed. Patricia Bizzel and Bruce Herzberg. 3rd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's 2001. 1256-1260.

SHILOH STONE

PARIS: HOW THE REVOLUTIONARY YEARS SHAPED A MODERN DAY CAPITAL, 1782-1889

Mais Paris est un Véritable océan. Jetez-y la sonde, vous n'en con-
naîtrez jamais
la profondeur…. Il s'y rencontrera toujours un lieu vierge, un antre
inconnu,
des fleurs, des perles, des monstres, quelque chose d'inouï, oublié
par les plongeurs littéraires.
Honoré de Balzac (1835)

October 19, 2010 marked the sixth day of action where thousands of French citizens took to the streets in protest of a pending law to raise the national retirement age from 60 to 62. One sign, written on cardboard and photographed for the newspaper Libération, heralded back to the French Revolution as it read, "Look carefully at your Rolex, it's time to Revolt."[1] Paris was the site of the greatest mobilization in France, with estimates ranging from 60,000 to 330,000 protestors.[2] The idea of protesting in the streets of Paris is nothing new; indeed, this has been a French tradition since the Great Revolution of 1789. Paris has been a hotbed for protest, uprisings, revolt, and, most significantly, revolution. Why, in a city known for such splendor and beauty, is Paris still linked to these violent words? Why, in a city that draws millions of tourists a year, do we still reference the events of yesteryear?

How does Revolution change Paris? This question, which has long been debated by scholars, is important because of the historical impact upon the city of Paris brought by the Revolutions of 1789, 1830, 1848, and 1871. Paris went through drastic transformations throughout the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to create the modern-day capital so many adore today. These transformations are tied to the Revolutionary years and emanate from the Enlightenment philosophies that pervaded the city's cafes, clubs, and streets. The urban reform that happened in the decades after 1789 under persons like Prefect of the Seine Baron Haussmann was also partly designed to address the "gap" that existed between the promises of the Enlightenment and Revolution and the conditions

of everyday life – the nineteenth century's "Social Question."[3]

Enlightenment ideas were a source of change for Paris, bringing a separation from an old way of thinking into a new world of "reason" and contributing directly to the Revolution of 1789. As an historian of the French Revolution, William Doyle has written: "All power, all authority, all institutions were now provisional, valid only so long as they could be justified in terms of rationality and utility."[4] These ideas of rationality and utility "really did represent the triumph of the Enlightenment and ushered in the mental world in which we still live."[5]

These new values of reason and rationality were soon turned to re-making Paris – the urban, organic setting that needed to reflect the great ideas and traditions evolving from the Revolutionary years. This paper analyzes the transformation of Paris as an extension of the Revolutionary ideas of wholesale, yet rational change. I intend to demonstrate that the Revolutionary era – from shortly before the Great Revolution of 1789 until the Centennial of 1889 – made Paris the city we see today.

PRE-REVOLUTIONARY PARIS

In her essay on Paris, historian Jeanne Gaillard bluntly stated that "the Paris of the nineteenth century [was] still a Medieval Paris," an issue which stemmed from the concentration of people, employments, and all other urban elements in the center of the city, "preventing a harmonious spread throughout Paris."[6] This mass concentration of people over many centuries made nineteenth-century Paris an unpleasant, filthy, and foul city.

What a contrast it must have been to see so many aesthetically pleasing buildings and monuments surrounded by so much dirt and trash! Highlighting the contrasts in the eighteenth century, Voltaire wrote of "the poor, often dying of contagious diseases…buried…pell-mell," and vapors that were "pestilential in the heat of the summer after the rains; and almost next to this garbage heap [were] the Opéra, the Palais Royal, [and] the royal Louvre."[7] Voltaire then finished his criticism of the city by writing, "In vain does the example of so many European towns put Paris to the blush; and it will never reform."[8]

Pre-Revolutionary Paris was criticized by many other thinkers and writers, as David Garrioch points out. He quotes Jean-

Jacques Rousseau's novel *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, saying that Paris was "dominated simultaneously by the most sumptuous opulence and the most deplorable misery."[9] Garrioch also cites several tourists' descriptions of Paris that "there can [not] exist anywhere on earth a hell more terrible than to be poor in Paris;" or, that Paris "was certainly not the new Jerusalem" but that upon entering the city he had "fallen into hell."[10]

These vivid descriptions of Paris as "misery" and "hell" leave no room to doubt the conditions of the city at the time of the Revolution of 1789. One contemporary who wrote many descriptions of Parisian life was Louis-Sébastien Mercier. Mercier spent the years 1781 to 1788 studying Paris in preparation for writing his Tableau de Paris, a description of "public and private behavior, dominant ideas, the public mood, and everything that has struck me in this odd assemblage of silly and sensible, but constantly changing" city.[11] Mercier recognized Paris' great problems and that, if she was to become a world-wide role model, the city needed to be reformed. While Mercier's portrayal of Paris is much like those of contemporaries, in reading his account one also understands his love of the city and his desires for a great change so that the burdens of the masses of poor might be lessened.[12]

Two connected questions should be posed about the problems of pre-Revolutionary Paris: first, what were the problems that Mercier and others recognized in their great city? Second, did these problems make Paris a hotbed for revolution and struggle? The answer to the first question – the most common problems that shaped Paris before the Revolution of 1789 – can be summed up as: the width and safety of the streets; health, cleanliness, and safety; and the massing of people in the city center. The answer to the second question, on the other hand, is much more difficult to summarize; however, it will develop as it is explored here.

The first problem was the width and safety of the streets. Throughout Le Tableau de Paris, Mercier often returns to the issue of the dangers caused by the narrowness of the streets, which provided no walkways for pedestrians. He wrote: "Often…a carriage will swing out without warning, cutting across the street diagonally, and at speed; the danger is upon you too soon, you can do nothing save jump for your life, and that at random, since you cannot guess whether the coachman will turn left or right."[13] Visitors to Paris

reported similar experiences. F.W. Blagdon, an Englishman well acquainted with Paris before and after the Great Revolution, wrote of an experience he had in Paris pre-1789. He described the "narrow, crowded streets" that lacked "foot-pavement" and wrote that "on one occasion…I myself narrowly escaped unhurt, when a decent, elderly woman was thrown down, close by my feet, and had both of her thighs broken."[14]

Because pedestrians had no freedom of movement, they seemed to be risking their lives every time they took to the streets. They were constantly dodging carriages or escaping the "running hounds" racing in front of the carriages as a warning, but which instead were a nuisance.[15] But pedestrians were not the only ones in danger. Many streets were not wide enough to accommodate more than one carriage at a time. David Garrioch points out that because of the narrow streets, "if two vehicles tried to pass it was common for the wheels to lock," and that these incidents "took a heavy toll in human and animal life."[16] Thus, accidents between carriages were a common occurrence. Mercier felt it important to point out that most of the carriages running the streets of Paris belonged to the "well-to-do" (much like the Rolex-wearer of 2010 referenced by the protestors) who thought they were the "sole proprietors of the public roads" and who never cared about "the actual dangers to which their unseemly whims expose other citizens."[17]

The second problem of pre-Revolutionary Paris had to do with the health, cleanliness, and safety of the city. Paris was a dirty city, full of mud, unpleasant sights and smells, and disease. Mercier wrote: "The old name for Paris was Lutetia, Mudville."[18] Though he may not have known the meaning of Lutetia, to Mercier the only logical translation was "Mudville" because Parisians were daily walking through mud laced with straw, as well as human and animal excrement. This made the streets slippery and unpleasant to traverse. The smells from the cemeteries, the marketplace, along with animal and human odors, plagued the nostrils of anyone who entered the city. One late eighteenth-century architect, Claude Ledoux, described the tight quarters from the closeness of all the buildings and wrote that these conditions "compresse[d] the lungs, restrict[ed] the senses, and recycle[d] the contagious air currents."[19] All of these problems together affected the health of the Parisians who then had to fight off the sickness and disease which accompanied the filth.

Safety was another concern. Not only was there a fear of being hit by carriages on the streets, but pedestrians had to be aware of the potential of flying objects from the windows above them. Garrioch described the efforts of police to protect the citizens from hazards as "repeatedly [enjoining]" the people "to stop emptying chamber pots out the windows."[20] Mercier commented that "the Commissary of Police can do nothing if the disgusting stuff has come from the gutter; there is a fine for throwing anything out of the window, but the gutter is privileged."[21]

Another common concern with safety was the more serious criminal acts. Thieves were common on the streets of Paris. At night, Paris attempted to light the streets with candles hung on poles, but the lighting was not always effective and did not penetrate the shadows or alleys. Under the cover of darkness, many criminal acts took place in the city, including prostitution, which brought with it "risks of violence and abuse, of venereal disease, and of arrest" for all those involved.[22]

The final problem faced by pre-Revolutionary Paris was the large concentration of people in the city center, an issue that persisted well into the next century. In describing the Paris of 1830-1840, Jeanne Gaillard wrote that the urban "crisis…[arose] because of the crowding of the population in the central areas of the capital."[23] Though she was writing of a later period, Gaillard's description holds true for pre-Revolutionary Paris, where the overcrowding of the city center tied together all the other concerns of the city. Garrioch described the congestion in this way:

Paris amplified problems because it concentrated people. A larger population in one place meant more dramatic consequences when an epidemic struck. It meant a greater likelihood of adulterated food…and higher levels of water pollution, because the drains discharged into the same water courses that provided drinking waters….The tuberculosis that ravaged the population was directly linked to the poor nutrition and cramped and damp living conditions.[24]

Because of these problems, life was a constant struggle for ordinary Parisians, who grew tired of the misery. They saw the life of ease that the monarchy and nobility lived and wondered why they, the majority, had to suffer while the minority of the population did not. Added to this were the growing numbers of pamphlets,

books, and newspapers that bespoke of Enlightenment ideas and which listed "among their readers…thousands of Parisians who now believed in their right, not only to be well governed, but to have some sort of say in how government took place."[25]

By the end of the eighteenth century, Parisians were ready for change. Up until July of 1789, there was almost no hint of revolution or the struggles that were to follow. Therefore, Mercier believed that "the chance of any serious rising seems altogether remote."[26] But the French historian André Castelot was able to see in hindsight what Mercier could not predict. Castelot wrote:

On the Eve of the Revolution there was confident talk in shops and workrooms of metaphysics and the new ideas. The people had begun to read. Works of philosophy and politics had reached the street…. From this came a disorder that increased and finally carried all before it. Restif de La Bretonne (a contemporary of Mercier and a well-known writer on Paris before and during the Revolution) explained it: 'The workers in the capital have become unmanageable because they have read in our books a truth that is too strong for them.'[27]

The change that would follow from the crowds of "unmanageable" citizens of Paris would from that time forward shape the history not only of France, but of the modern world. These crowds were in essence fulfilling the ideas of Rousseau, who "taught that human society was hopelessly corrupt and corrupting, and that only total change could redeem it."[28] This change would come in the form of revolution, and Paris, with her unsettled citizens, was the perfect place to carry it out. Though Mercier lacked the foresight to predict the Revolution, he correctly characterized the roll Parisians would play in the events of 1789 and after: "There is nothing in our people's own tradition to supply the want; and their violence would be the more cruel, since they lack in themselves all power to control it. We are not practiced rioters, we Parisians, and possibly for that reason an outbreak…would assume alarming proportions."[29]

Urban Reformers

A new tradition was born in 1789, as thousands of angry Parisians took to the streets to display their displeasure with the monarchy and soon-to-be "ancien régime" which ruled them. Louis-Sébestien Mercier's description of the Parisians would hold

true as the Great Revolution of 1789 turned into France's First Republic and eventually into the Terror of 1793-94. A Revolution won out, and the Enlightenment ideas that had preceded it helped create a new "mental world" based upon "rationality and utility."[30] How would Paris change to make life easier for the Parisians? The success of the Revolution may have brought a new form of government, but, as evidenced by the subsequent Revolutions of 1830, 1848, and 1871, the problems of Paris were not entirely solved by the principles of the Enlightenment. Soon a new "revolutionary" type – the modern urban reformer – would be born. This new urban reformer would extend the Revolutionary ideas of rational change to transform Paris into a modern-day capital.

Historians and others have long sought how to define the role of these urban reformers as key figures in the revolutionary changes witnessed by Paris. Karl Marx took up Paris' history of revolution in order to formulate his ideas about capitalism, communism, and the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the workers. He saw urban reform as a means to advance capitalism, and its transformations of Paris as a form of counter-revolution designed to hold down the working class. Marx wrote of the changes in Paris:

> The more production comes to rest on exchange value, hence on exchange, the more important do the physical conditions of exchange-the means of communication and transport-become for the cost of circulation….While capital must on one side strive to tear down every spatial barrier…and conquer the whole earth for its market, it strives on the other side to annihilate this space with time.[31]

Marxist theories have influenced many of those scholars who have attempted to explain how the modernization of Paris took shape. One such scholar, David Harvey, wrote: "I argue that the very existence of money as a mediator of commodity exchange radically transforms and fixes the meanings of space and time in social life and defines limits and imposes necessities upon the shape and form of urbanization."[32] Harvey further argued that these urban reformers became "professionals" who felt "a vested interest in the concept of homogeneous, abstract, and objective space" that needed to be "annihilated" for capitalistic expansion.[33] He wrote:

> The dilemma … was that the republican bourgeoisie had to open its space in order to achieve its own bourgeois revolution…. It was for this reason that the reoccupation of central Paris by the popular classes took on such symbolic importance. For it occurred in a context where the poor and the working class were being chased…from the strategic spaces and even off the boulevards now viewed as bourgeois interiors.[34]

In this way, Harvey, echoing Marx, portrayed the transformations of Paris and the work of the urban reformers as a class struggle. Most of the transformations that took place in Paris in the nineteenth century were completed by Prefect of the Seine Georges Haussmann between 1853 and 1870. Harvey saw Haussmann's work as a "bourgeois revolution" designed to push the lower classes out of central Paris and into the peripheral faubourgs on the periphery. But Harvey's Marxist interpretation of the urban reformer is not the only explanation of the changes in nineteenth-century Paris. Roger Gould, an historical sociologist, interpreted the changes not as a separation into distinct class segments, but as a transformation into "community." He wrote:

> The rebuilding projects of the 1850s and 1860s had changed Paris in a way and on a scale that neither it nor any other French city had ever experienced. The product of these changes was not, however, the class-divided city feared by liberal critics of the Empire….What the renovations in the center and annexations on the periphery had created, rather, was a city of residential neighborhoods – urban villages in which the relative absence of industrial production permitted social attachments…to the spatially defined community, rather than to craft or class.[35]

Gould did not describe the works of the urban reformers as a formal class struggle; nor did he argue that their work "redefined [Paris] along strict class lines."[36] On the contrary, urban reform was a modernization of the idea of community marked by the growing power of "an assertive and centralizing state authority."[37] The urban reformers' focus, then, was to transform Paris into a modern-day capital city that would be the envy of the world and would highlight the Enlightenment ideas of uniformity and rationality as they

revolutionized medieval Paris.

The numerous accomplishments of Haussmann in transforming Paris were more or less the culmination and realization of what previous urban reformers had intended to do in revolutionizing Paris. As historian Nicholas Papayanis explained: "Many plans and ideals…came out of the first half of the nineteenth century. The city dreamed of by these early planners came into existence…with Georges-Eugène Haussmann's and Napoleon III's reforms of Paris during the second half of the nineteenth century."[38]

Papayanis' analysis of the history of urban reform focuses less on the class-based motives that many historians throughout the twentieth century have tried to describe. Instead, Papayanis described the rise of urban reformers and their vision of Paris in this way:

> [T]he understanding of the modern city that emerged at this time was that the city must function as an organic unit, a unified whole, and that any planning for such a city had to begin from the comprehensive vision of all its parts. This new vision of the city combined a classic Enlightenment ideal, namely, the belief that human perfection…could be achieved through rational comprehensive planning of city space, with a police function, which reflected the need of the state and civil society for social order, regulation, and control.[39]

The idea of "rational comprehensive planning" of Paris was a revolutionary idea. The rise of the modern urban planner would take shape in the nineteenth century as reformers began organizing and centralizing their ideas on the transformation of Paris. Not only did the responsibilities of the urban planner take shape at this time, but the position of urban planner would no longer be filled by architects, but by engineers. The role of the architect has a long history in France, but its primary focus had mostly revolved around single structures and edifices. According to Papayanis, the new "urban planning text" would focus more "on comprehensive spatial design and infrastructure rather than architecture and individual buildings."[40] Because of this expanded focus "the management of space and circulation flows was precisely what the engineer, as opposed to the architect, mastered."[41]

One pre-Haussmann reformer who held the title of Prefect of the Seine for fifteen years (from 1833 to 1848) was Claude Philibert Barthelot Rambuteau. Known as the Comte de Rambuteau, this long-tenured Prefect left behind his memoirs that tell of his efforts to reform Paris. In the introduction to Rambuteau's memoirs, George LeQuin wrote: "Neither the improvements of all kinds in matters of hygiene, sewerage, and embellishments, which he introduced during his fifteen years' administration, can we describe in detail; they transformed the Paris of 1830, and were the beginning of modern Paris."[42] Most of Rambuteau's work as Prefect focused on hygiene and cleaning up Paris' streets and sewer systems to prevent the rapid spread of disease. The year before Rambuteau took office, Paris was ravaged by the effects of cholera, which killed nearly 20,000 people.[43] But Rambuteau, who had to contend with the difficult political climate of the early years of the July Monarchy (1830-1848), differed from the urban reformers who wanted a rapid, wholesale change of Paris. He wrote of his goals: "I sought, then, both to amuse Paris and to improve it as well, by constructing monuments, opening streets, making plantations and gardens, giving balls and fêtes; in short, I undertook whatever might prove beneficial as well as entertaining."[44]

Besides giving balls and fêtes, Rambuteau hoped to improve the social conditions of the poorer classes in Paris. He spent considerable time and effort in education reform, as well as trying to improve the hospitals to provide better medical care. He worked with engineers with regard to the sewer systems and streets. He told of one such occasion when a "distinguished engineer…suggested that a vast trench should be dug…from whence a conduit 16,000 meters long should start, from which the refuse might be propelled [and removed] by means of a forty horse-powered steam engine."[45]

One important fact highlighted by Rambuteau was that throughout his tenure as Prefect, Paris was still in political turmoil. Parisians were still angered by the government's inaction to improve living conditions. After a conversation with then-Prime Minister and future-President of the Third Republic Adolphe Thiers, Rambuteau quoted Thiers as saying: "You can continue Prefect of Paris some fifteen or twenty years, do good service to the city, and then retire, either voluntarily or in consequence of a revolution, leaving behind you a name that will be remembered."[46] This statement by

Thiers would prove prophetic, as Rambuteau was forced out by revolution in 1848. The impression left by Thiers and Rambuteau was that the fear of revolution, particularly a Parisian revolution, was a constant threat to the existing government of France.

Finally, Rambuteau gave an idea of the reformative works he was trying to accomplish just before the end of his career as Prefect. He wrote:

> In support of the financial measures, ratified by the Chamber in July 1848, I laid before the Council a vast scheme for the expenditure of…millions to be realized in five years. It embraced the Halles Centrales, the town-halls of the 3rd, 11th, and 12th arrondissements, the church of Sainte-Clotilde; the completion of quays and bridges, the lengthening of the Rue de Rivoli, regulations for the proper management of drainage, sewers, street-paving, &c. All this was to be finished in 1853: it was, in some sort, my last will and testament, and it was time for me to sign it.[47]

Rambuteau's proposed changes were not new ideas in 1848. Papayanis points out that "the idea of comprehensive planning and the perception of Paris as a unified entity was becoming a common element…by the end of the eighteenth century" and that the more detailed and extensive planning would become "the important accomplishment of several nineteenth-century planners."[48] These detailed plans would become the outline used by administrators such as Rambuteau and Haussmann in their transformations of Paris.

What were the detailed plans drawn up by these first modern urban planners? What problems did they seek to address? The answers to these questions relate back to the problems of pre-Revolutionary Paris. Planners recognized the influence that social problems had on the Revolution of 1789 and they attempted to address these in their designs for the capital. These problems, again, were the width and safety of the streets; health, cleanliness, and safety of the city; and the mass congregation of people in the city center. Papayanis breaks down the ideas that were developing in response to these problems into three schools of thought: functionalist, Saint-Simonian, and Fourierist. Though the three schools had different motives, all of them addressed the same issues and laid out relatively similar plans to solve the social problems that seemed to

turn Paris into a capital of revolution.

The first recognized problem was the width and safety of the streets. Papayanis wrote: "As in the case of comprehensive planning, public officials and urban thinkers recognized the centrality of the street to the life of Paris."[49] Because the streets were the most important aspect of Paris, there needed to be a unified system for improving and building the circulatory system of the city. To accomplish this, the city needed major wide roads that traversed the city north and south as well as east and west (one proposed east/west street that was completed was the Rue de Rivoli). The new circulatory system would improve communication, transportation, and commerce throughout the constantly-growing city. It would also improve the safety of the streets. Most of the issues with safety were a direct result of the narrowness of Parisian streets. Thus, by enlarging the streets and boulevards the city would be able to provide sidewalks for pedestrians.

All the important proposals regarding Paris' street system centered on the ideas of uniformity and rationality. Twentieth-century architect and urban planner Le Corbusier wrote that "a modern city lives by the straight line….The circulation of traffic demands the straight line; it is the proper thing for the heart of a city."[50] The idea of uniformity and rationality with the streets was that "they should be wide, paved, and uncluttered"[51] and that "anything found to interfere with their alignment must be demolished without distinction to persons."[52]

The second problem the reformers addressed was the health, cleanliness, and safety of the city. The major issues concerning health and cleanliness revolved around the idea of "the free and effective circulation of air" as well as "the circulation of water in the city, the construction of sewers, what to do with urban cemeteries, slaughter-houses, and hospitals, which people believed all spread disease."[53] "So that air and sunlight could circulate more freely," the widening of streets and limiting the height of existing or new structures was needed.[54]

Another key reform needed to improve health was to address the issues of sanitation and cleanliness of the city as a whole. Many reformers linked the sanitation problems to the need "for water fountains, sewers, and a water-delivery system for all Paris houses."[55] Other reformers described the need for a system of wa-

ter pipes that would provide all buildings with the water needed for cleanliness, and which, in turn, would allow sewer pipes to carry away the refuse.[56] Additionally, others saw the need to "pave the 'dirty and humid streets'" to add to the overall cleanliness of the city.[57] The main concern for reformers was that the city should be relatively clean, so that the ordinary worker or bourgeois employer could both live without undue fear of disease or death.

Finally, the safety of the city was linked to the third problem: the hordes of people in the city center. The accumulation of Parisians in the city center linked the problem of safety with health and cleanliness. This was the foremost problem that needed to be resolved if there was to be improvement in safety, health, and cleanliness. The city center continued to grow year after year, as it was flooded by French workers coming to Paris searching for jobs. The close proximity of individuals because of cramped housing made epidemics such as the cholera outbreak in 1832 difficult to control. How to deal with this mass of people was a difficult question to answer because the majority were from the working class and had to live near their places of employment.

The problem was that the new view of the city as an organic entity meant that the center should be the heart of the city. For Paris' center to be restored as "viable and healthy…a city with even and equitable development and with easy access for all to public services," there needed to be "one principle stable and vital center of commercial, judicial, political, and cultural services."[58]

To provide this "stable and vital center," the masses would have to be removed. Many reformers believed that improving circulation and traffic would allow the working poor to leave the city center to find cheaper housing on the periphery.[59] Others believed that providing public works would be the answer to drawing out the masses.[60] Still others wrote that the relocation of factories and other vocations to the faubourgs (or suburbs) would result in the workers following their employment out of the city center.[61] All of these ideas would be known to Haussmann when he took over as Prefect of the Seine in 1853 and would become a major part of the "creative destruction" he imposed upon Paris.[62]

Answering the "Social Question" was not included in many of the reforming plans for the city center. Papayanis defined the Social Question in this way: "The systematic sociological investiga-

tion by government officials and intellectuals of poverty, workers, and social unrest, and the programs designed to deal with these matters."[63] The only part of the Social Question that concerned many of the early nineteenth-century reformers in their plans for Paris was the idea of social unrest. Papayanis described one such plan when he wrote:

> It should be clear by now that Mirbel and Bareau were not primarily addressing the social problem. When it came up in their text, however, they suggested both a spatial method for taming it, in the form of better roads and order on the streets, as well as inexpensive housing for workers in the outlying districts of the city. That security and order were the key to the social problem for some planners is especially evident in Mirbel and Bareau's project.[64]

Maintaining order in the streets and ensuring the security of the city were the two main priorities of the urban planner. Because these two concerns overshadowed the need to address the issues of poverty or the plight of the workers, the displacement of the population from the city center was the most logical option, and many believed that this displacement would ultimately make life easier for the masses. But the fear of the masses continued to grow, and, as Papayanis further explained, "During the nineteenth century…the concentration of the Paris population and two revolutions in which the common people claimed the streets made barracks appear all the more urgent…to the administrative forces of society."[65]

By the time Napoleon III (1852-70) was in power and Haussmann became Prefect of the Seine, the widespread fear of the workers meant that the city center had to be cleared of revolutionary threat. Papayanis wrote: "Perhaps this fear also lurked in the recesses of the modern planner's mind, as political or social dislocation are an extreme form of disorder that would play out in the streets of a city."[66] This meant a total reformation of Paris was needed, and Haussmann was ready to carry it out. Le Corbusier would later write: "One day, Napoleon III said: 'this can't go on, it's too dangerous. I want all this cleared up; I want this impenetrable warren sliced up into sections; I want straight avenues opened up that my cannons can fire along. Then we shall see if they can still get up these revolutions of theirs.'" Haussmann obeyed those in-

structions [and] Napoleon's cannons brought new speed into city life.[67]

FORTIFICATIONS

Haussmann's creative destruction of Paris, which simultaneously opened up the streets and broke the trend of revolutionary barricade building, was the final step of the French government in restoring order and control over the Parisians. The ability to quickly disperse troops throughout the city and to fire cannons through the streets brought an end to violent revolts in Paris after the Commune in 1871. But it is worth mentioning that other attempts were made during the nineteenth century to control Parisians and to prevent future revolts. One such attempt was to fortify Paris by building a wall and other fortifications. Historian Patricia O'Brien described the wall built around Paris in 1844 as the "embastillement de Paris" or, in other words, "the fortification of Paris."[68]

The fortifying of Paris was nothing new, as walls had been built around the city since the time of the Romans. The idea to fortify Paris was a topic discussed by government leaders from the 1830s through the 1840s. The reason given by government officials for a new fortified wall around Paris was to protect the capital city from foreign invasion. Because of its controversial nature, urban reformers and many others spoke out for and against the project. Patricia O'Brien wrote:

> The most extreme critics of the government's program saw the fortification of the city of Paris as a preparation for war, but for an internal war in which the lower classes were considered the enemy. Its most extreme defenders argued that fortification was necessary because of the unreliability of the Parisian masses in the event of a foreign attack.[69]

Many on both sides of the debate wondered why preparations for war would revolve around Paris as opposed to the frontiers of France. Focusing the attention and resources of the French armies around Paris would likely incite any enemy to move towards the city. The debate for a wall around Paris would rage on throughout the 1830s. Those opposed to the wall were unsuccessful in their contrarian pleas because one major appeal by supporters was the idea of fear. O'Brien wrote:

> [The] repetition of the word 'fear' was calculated to take advantage of the apprehensions concerning the special state of the capital in the first half of the nineteenth century. Large-scale migrations from the provinces had doubled the population of Paris in fewer than fifty years....Disease, poverty, and crime had become urban obsessions in the first half of the nineteenth century, and many of those who articulated their fears about the situation judged the social order to be under heavy attack.[70]

The monarch Louis Philippe intended to use increased military presence in Paris to keep order. The wall and the presence of soldiers became "a daily reminder to Parisians of encirclement and surveillance," inducing "concern" rather than "a sense of security."[71] One of the most compelling criticisms of the wall was laid out by O'Brien when she wrote:

> Faced with the problems of 'monster' population growth, unemployment, crime, congestion, poor sanitation, and insufficient housing the government did not initiate needed projects of urban development. Nor did it make any attempt to expand adequately its administrative and municipal policing services. What it did do was propose fortification.[72]

CONCLUSION

After its completion in 1844, the wall did little to prevent future revolutions from erupting in the streets of Paris. Four years later, Parisians had had enough suffering. Once again, they, like their predecessors of 1789 and 1830, took to the streets in Revolution. The tradition which began in 1789 was supposed to inaugurate a new world where Liberté, Egalité, et Fraternité would rule and solve the city's major problems. Yet the suffering of the working classes persisted. Instead of trying to solve the Social Question and create lasting change, the government encircled the city with fortifications in an effort to keep the masses intimidated.

As opposed to the government's inactions on the question of reform, the birth of the modern day urban reformer took shape throughout the first half of the nineteenth-century as schools of thought developed with the goal of rationally solving the urban cri-

sis. These Parisian reformers tried to conceptualize the city as a whole. They then drew up plans intended to improve the problems caused by the deficiencies in the circulation and streets, as well as to clean up the city through opening up space and providing water and sewage systems. By centralizing the reforms, these planners believed that they could provide a better life for the lower classes as well as provide work and keep the capitalistic ventures of the bourgeoisie going.

The plans of these urban reformers would lay the foundation for modern-day Paris. Their ideas were revolutionary and attempted to highlight the Enlightenment ideals of uniformity and rationality, which they believed would solve the social ills of their day. By the second half of the nineteenth century, administrators such as the Comte de Rambuteau and Georges Haussmann were charged with the responsibility of transforming Paris. But by the time Haussmann took up his responsibilities as Prefect, Parisians were in a near-constant state of unrest, and the only solution to regain control seemed to be the "creative destruction" of Paris. Indeed, this destruction of Paris would ultimately end the pattern of bloody revolution in the streets of the great French capital after the Commune was put down in 1871. The end of revolution can be traced to the fact that Parisians could no longer barricade the streets because the new, wide boulevards provided easy movement of French troops and cannons.

As the Third Republic of France neared the centennial year of the Great Revolution, preparations were made to celebrate with the unveiling of great works of art. Pascal Ory wrote of this occasion: "The universal Expositions, created to illustrate the forward march of modernity, have, in the same step, invented the 'retrospective.' In this respect 1889 is without a doubt the most historic of all."[73] One of the greatest creations for the Exposition in 1889 was the Eiffel Tower – the "overwhelming symbol of the superiority of the modern, technological, and democratic world."[74] The Eiffel Tower was a great symbol of the modern transformations that took place in Paris over the hundred years since the Great Revolution of 1789. Paris endured many struggles that could have destroyed her, but she soon became the model of modernity because of her drastic transformations throughout the nineteenth century. Upon the completion of the Eiffel Tower in 1889, thousands

flocked to see the unveiling of the modern marvel. Since that time, millions more have ventured to Paris to climb this tribute to the French Revolutions and to reminisce on the revolutionary history of the past. But on October 12, 2010, tourists planning to visit the Eiffel Tower were disappointed as newspapers reported that "the Eiffel Tower, the musée d'Orsay, and the arc de triomphe [were] closed."[75] These closures occured due to the thousands of protestors who once again had taken to the Parisian streets, protesting, albeit peacefully, in the tradition they had inherited from the Revolutions of the past.

NOTES

[1] "Sixième journée d'action, la mobilization toujours aussi forte," *Libération*, (October 19, 2010). The referenced sign in French reads: "Regarde bien ta Rolex, c'est l'heure de la Révolte."
[2] Ibid.
[3] Nicholas Papayanis, *Planning Paris before Haussmann* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 53.
[4] William Doyle, *The French Revolution: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press 2001), 80.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Jeanne Gaillard, *Paris, La Ville 1852 à 1871* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1977), 10. Quotations translated from French, "Le Paris du XIXe siècle est encore un Paris médiéval" and "empêche de se répartir harmonieusement sur l'ensemble du territoire parisien."
[7] André Castelot, *Paris: The Turbulent City 1783 to 1871* (London: Barrie & Rockliff, 1963), 8. Castelot used this quote by Voltaire (translated by Denise Folliot) to describe the filthy conditions created by the roughly 73 cemeteries in Paris where thousands were buried in mass graves.
[8] Ibid., 8.
[9] David Garrioch, *The Making of Revolutionary Paris* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 3.
[10] Garrioch attributes the first of these quotations to a Sicilian visitor and the second to a German tourist to Paris; ibid., 3.
[11] Louis-Sébastien Mercier, *Panorama of Paris: Selections from "Le Tableau de Paris,"* trans. Jeremy D. Popkin (University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), 23.

[12] Mercier wrote that he hoped his writing "will lend new energy to the intelligence of modern administrators, and stimulate the generous compassion of some active and admirable spirits"; ibid., 27-28.

[13] Ibid., 90.

[14] F.W. Blagdon, *Paris as it was and as it is; or a Sketch of the French Capital…During the Years 1801-1802*, Vol. 1 (London: C and R Baldwin, 1803), 15.

[15] Mercier, *Tableau de Paris*, 103-104.

[16] Garrioch, *Making of Revolutionary Paris, 221.*

[17] Mercier, *Tableau de Paris,* 104. Mercier was not the only one who noticed this trend. In his *Sketch of the French Capital*, Blagdon also believed that the problem with Parisian streets stemmed from the "seigneur de la cour" who felt "justified in suffering his coachman to drive at a mischievous rate"; Blagdon, *Sketch of the French Capital* Vol. 1, 14-15.

[18] Mercier, *Tableau de Paris,* 108.

[19] Quoted in Garioch, *Making of Revolutionary Paris,* 216.

[20] Ibid., 133.

[2] Mercier, *Tableau de Paris,* 220.

[22] Garrioch, *Making of Revolutionary Paris,* 62.

[23] Gaillard, *Paris la Ville,* 9. Translated from French, "La crise…se manifeste en effet par l'entassement de la population dans les quartiers centraux de la capitale."

[24] Garrioch, *Making of Revolutionary Paris,* 46-47.

[25] Ibid., 183.

[26] Mercier, *Tableau de Paris,* 111.

[27] Castelot, *The Turbulent City,* 11.

[28] Doyle, *French Revolution,* 75.

[29] Mercier, *Tableau de Paris,* 112.

[30] Doyle, *French Revolution*, 80.

[31] Quoted in David Harvey, *Consciousness and the Urban Experience: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), 69. For the latest historiography on urban reformers, see Papayanis, *Planning Paris*, 2-11, 249-256.

[32] Harvey, *Consciousness and the Urban Experience*, 1.

[33] Ibid., 14-15.

[34] Ibid., 205.

[35] Roger V. Gould, *Insurgent Identities: Class, Community, and Protest in Paris from 1848 to the Commune* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 193.

[36] Ibid., 95.

[37] Ibid., 95.

[38] Nicholas Papayanis, *Planning Paris,* 248.

[39] Ibid., 247.

[40] Ibid., 62.

[41] Ibid., 69.

[42] Claude Philibert Barthelot Rambuteau, *Memoirs of the Comte de Rambuteau*, trans. James Brogan (New York: Putnam, 1908), xxvii.

[43] Ibid., 207. Nicholas Papayanis numbers the total deaths at 18,402; Papayanis, *Planning Paris*, 141.

[44] Rambuteau, *Memoirs*, 209.

[45] Ibid., 290-291.

[46] Ibid., 213.

[47] Ibid., 228.

[48] Papayanis, *Planning Paris before Haussmann*, 33.

[49] Ibid., 35.

[50] Quoted by Papayanis; ibid., 255.

[51] Ibid., 36.

[52] Ibid., 37. The quoted material in this sentence is attributed to Nicolas Delamare.

[53] Ibid., 45.

[54] Ibid., 101.

[55] Ibid., 96.

[56] Ibid., 149.

[57] Ibid., 95.

[58] Ibid., 179

[59] Ibid., 124.

[60] Ibid., 197-198.

[61] Ibid., 109.

[62] Papayanis notes that Haussmann's creative destruction was applauded by some of his contemporaries, such as Edmond About, who wrote: "Like the great destroyers of the eighteenth century who made a *tabula rosa* of the human spirit, I applaud and admire this creative destruction"; ibid., 150-151.

[63] Ibid., 53.

[64] Ibid., 85. Other explanations of the social issue described by Papayanis described the "dangerous, vicious, or miserable population" that needed to be removed, ibid., 189; the "influx" of workers in the center who were "menacing" to the upper class residents, ibid., 63; or the "'restless population' which 'crowds [the streets] every morning'" and who would find better health and lodgings "in the suburbs," ibid., 124-125.

[65] Ibid., 85.

[66] Ibid., 249.

[67] Quoted by Papayanis; ibid., 249.

[68] Patricia O'Brien, "*L'Embastillement de Paris*: The Fortification of Paris during the July Monarchy," *French Historical Studies* 9, no. 1 (Spring, 1975), 64-65.

[69] Ibid., 64-65.

[70] Ibid., 75.

[71] Ibid., 80.

[72] Ibid., 76.

[73] Pascal Ory, "Le centenaire de la Révolution française," in *Les Lieux de Mémoire*, ed. Pierre Nora (Paris: Quarto Gallimard, 1997), 479. Translated from French, "les Expositions universelles, créées pour illustrer la modernité en marche, ont, du même pas, inventé la 'rétrospective.' A cet égard 1889 est sans doute la plus historique de toutes."

[74] Ibid., 479. Translated from French, "symbole écrasant de la supériorité du monde moderne, technologique, et démocratique."

[75] "Paris Tourists Stranded as Strikes Cut Access to Eiffel Tower, Notre Dame," *Bloomberg* (October 12, 2010).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blagdon, F. W. *Paris as it was and as it is; or a Sketch of the French Capital….During the Years 1801-2, To a Friend in London.* Vol. 1. London: C and R Baldwin, 1803.

Castelot, André. *Paris the Turbulent City 1783 to 1871.* Trans. Denise Folliot. London: Barrie & Rockliff, 1963.

Doyle, William. *The French Revolution: A Very Short Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Gaillard, Jeanne. *Paris, La Ville 1852-1870: L'Urbanisme Parisien à l'Heure d'Haussmann; Des Provinciaux aux Parisiens; La Vocation ou les Vocations Parisiennes.* Paris: Honoré Champion, 1977.

Garrioch, David. *The Making of Revolutionary Paris.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Gould, Roger V. *Insurgent Identities: Class, Community, and Protest in Paris from 1848 to the Commune.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Harvey, David. *Consciousness and the Urban Experience: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Mercier, Louis-Sébastien. *Panorama of Paris: Selections from Le Tableau de Paris. Trans.* Jeremy D. Popkin. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999.

O'Brien, Patricia. "L'Embastillement de Paris: The Fortification of Paris during the July Monarchy." *French Historical Studies* 9, no. 1 (Spring, 1975): 63-82.

Ory, Pascal. "Le centenaire de la Révolution française." *Les Lieux de Mémoire.* ed. Pierre Nora. Paris: Quarto Gallimard, 1997.

Papayanis, Nicholas. *Planning Paris before Haussmann.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.

"Paris Tourists Stranded as Strikes Cut Access to Eiffel Tower, Notre Dame," *Bloomberg* (October 12, 2010).

Rambuteau, Claude Philibert Barthelot. *Memoirs of the Comte de Rambuteau.* Trans. Dennis Brogan. New York: Putnam, 1908.

"Sixième journée d'action, la mobilisation toujours aussi forte," *Libération* (October 19, 2010).

WHITNEY LITHERLAND

THE ENSLAVEMENT OF TIME IN
WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S *ROMEO AND JULIET*
AND BAZ LUHRMANN'S
WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S ROMEO+JULIET

From the beginning of William Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, we are told that the lovers are "star-crossed" (Prologue 6) and that their love is "death-marked" (9). The Prologue briefly summarizes events in the play and lets the audience know that Romeo and Juliet have already died, further suggesting that fate has played an active role in the course that eventually leads to their deaths. Aside from these initial remarks in the Prologue, Romeo and Juliet do not appear to be the playthings of the governing bodies in the cosmos. Instead, I would argue that the lovers are governed more by the patriarchal culture of Verona, which is, in turn, enslaved to the passing of time. Ultimately, it is the time, or lack of time, that creates and drives the tragedy of the play.

When Romeo and Juliet fall in love, they recognize the restrictions put upon them not only by the culture of Verona, but also by the long-lived feud between their fathers – restrictions which make it impossible for Montague's son to woo and court Capulet's daughter. Their errant desire does not have a place inside the patriarchy, and therefore the only option available to the lovers is to make an escape. The lovers then devise a plan in which they will secretly marry and Juliet will "follow… [her] lord throughout the world" (2.1.190). The tragedy of their story is caused not only by their planned escape from the patriarchy, but even more so by the fact that they must also escape from time. When Romeo and Juliet seek to break away, they destroy the established conventions of their culture, which causes unforeseen consequences. From here, the action of the play stumbles forward into a sprint, leaving the lovers with much less time than they hoped for.

To begin, I must explain how Romeo and Juliet and the rest of the players are enslaved to time. Obviously, the day-to-day dealings of their lives are governed by the clock. This would be the first suggestion that Romeo and Juliet cannot possibly successfully make their escape. Aside from this, each character's age plays a large part

in the way they depict and perceive time. In general, the older generation (such as Old Capulet and Old Montague) speaks of time in longer units, such as years. When Old Capulet and his cousin discuss how long it has been since they last feasted, Capulet reasons that it has been "five-and-twenty years" (1.5.35). Oppositely, the younger generation (such as Romeo, Juliet, Mercutio, etc.) considers time in shorter units, such as hours. For example, Romeo tells his cousin Benvolio that "sad hours seem long" when he is out of Rosaline's favor (1.1.154). The older generation speaks longingly of these years, while the younger generation wishes to pass through them quickly. To an extent, the impatience of the younger generation "upset[s] the time scheme of the older generation" (Tanselle 351). When forced to act with at the quickened pace of the younger generation, the older generation becomes inefficient.

The interesting thing about these depictions of time is how the players perceive or feel its passing. When Capulet cites "five-and-twenty years" have passed, he seems to feel as if these years have merely been days. He and his cousin easily slip back into the old times and feast as happily as they had before. Conversely, Romeo's "sad hours" seem to drag on for days. Juliet, too, feels that time is slow and tortuous. When she sends the Nurse to seek out Romeo and procure news, the mere three hours she waits seem to drag on through the centuries. For the older generation, time is equated with memory. For the younger generation, time becomes a emblem for the unknown of the future.

Furthermore, it is interesting that there is a distinction between the ways Romeo and Juliet respond to their own perceptions of time. There is a suggestion that Romeo is attempting to "make time subservient to the fluctuating currents of his personal sentiment" (Lucking 117). Romeo often displays a certain impatience toward time. When Romeo is sulking over Rosaline, his hours are sad, which makes them feel much longer and less desirable to trudge through. When Juliet says she will send to him the Nurse, she claims "'tis twenty year til then," yet Romeo expresses childlike anticipation for the passing of time, rather than sorrow. Juliet, on the other hand, is "desperately aware of the passing of public time, and perceives it as being incommensurate with the subjective time that … regulates her interior existence" (121). While Juliet waits for the Nurse to return with news from Romeo, she expresses disdain for

the slow passing of time. The difference between Romeo's and Juliet's perceptions of time lies in their gender. Romeo's masculine attitudes cause him to rebel against time and attempt to make himself its master. Juliet's attitudes are feminine, and instead of rebelling, and she is forced to experience time as it is laid out for her.

It is not until Romeo and Juliet's love affair spawns unintended consequence that these various descriptions and perceptions of time have any significance. Under normal circumstances, Romeo and Juliet's desire for one another would not be of any great consequence. However, the feud between their families would prevent their marriage, so they must marry in secret. The unintended consequence of this is Tybalt's confrontation with Romeo, which results in the deaths of Tybalt and Mercutio, and the banishment of Romeo to Mantua. Because Romeo and Juliet have wed in secret, Romeo cannot explain to Tybalt why he does in fact love Tybalt as a cousin.

From the moment we meet Tybalt in Act 1, his actions label him as an instigator. When Benvolio attempts to "keep the peace" before the brawl, Tybalt spurs it on by refusing to help him (1.1.61). When Romeo refuses to duel with Tybalt and insists he loves him "better than [he] canst devise," Tybalt disregards the statement and continues to provoke a fight (3.1.64). Tybalt's death is such a pivotal point in the play that it can be argued he is an instigator of time. His death pushes Capulet to hastily arrange Juliet's marriage to Paris, which causes Juliet to seek an alternative route to get to Romeo. Because of this twist of events, Friar Laurence rushes to provide Juliet with a solution, which wears off only moments too late. As Tybalt's body lies just feet away from Juliet's in the Capulet tomb, his presence is just as potent in death as it is in life.

Romeo and Juliet's marriage and Tybalt's death, as the ultimate catalysts, force the players to inadvertently reconsider their attitudes toward time. The lovers begin thinking farther into the future than they previously had. Grotesquely, Juliet begins to consider her death, after which Romeo will be "cut … out in little stars, / And he will make the face of heaven so fine / That all the world will be in love with night / And pay no worship to the garish sun" (3.2.22-25). Not only does her speech work to foreshadow the ending of the play, but we are reminded that Romeo and Juliet expect to live and love for a very long time.

On the opposite side of the spectrum, Old Capulet stops

regarding time as passively as he initially did. He seeks to over-
shadow the sadness of Tybalt's death with the happiness of a new
marriage. Earlier, he suggested that Paris should wait to marry
Juliet, and "[l]et two more summers wither in their pride / Ere we
may think her ripe to be a bride" (1.2.10-11). Now he collapses
time and arranges Juliet's wedding to Paris to take place in just two
short days, rather than two years. Perhaps this is to be expected,
since Capulet does not regard years to be a substantial amount of
time.

        However, he now displays the same impatience Romeo did,
indicating that the generations have traded their ideas concerning
time. He repeatedly urges those around him to "make haste" in the
arrangement (4.4.14). When Juliet feigns repentance for the sin of
"disobedient opposition" (4.2.18) to her father, Capulet declares,
"[s]end for the County/ go tell him of this. / I'll have this knot knit
up tomorrow morning," further speeding up time with his impa-
titence (4.2.23). Old Capulet becomes "ineffective and doomed to
failure when forced to act with the speed of the youth" (Tanselle
361). Initially, he gives Paris permission to woo Juliet, but says that
"within her scope of choice / Lies [his] consent," but in his haste he
abandons consideration for Juliet's feelings (1.2.16-17). Now, he
says to Juliet, "Hang thee, young baggage, disobedient wretch! / …
get thee to church o' Thursday, / or never after look me in the
face" (3.5.160-162). The abrupt change in his perception of time
causes him to act quickly and rashly, without any consideration for
others.

        The speed with which the events tumble forth now allows
us to "appreciate the prophetic irony of Friar Laurence's warning:
'Wisely and slow; they stumble that run fast'" (2.3.90). Because of
this reversal of attitudes and the quickened pace of events, "Romeo
and Juliet have no choice but to run" (Axline 131). The outcome of
their relationship and their escape rests on the result of a race
against time, and they simply do not have the means to win. Romeo
arrives at the Capulet vault mere moments before Juliet awakens.
By the time her eyes open, the poison has already spread through
his veins and he is dead.

        The paradox lies in the fact that the lovers do in fact make
their escape from all opposing forces, but only through death. In
the final lines of the play, the Prince laments, "[a] glooming peace

this morning brings. / The sun for sorrow will not show his head" (5.3.304-305). The sun, whose movements indicate the passing of time, will not crawl across the sky. In other words, the tragedy has stopped time. In death, the lovers reach a kind of apotheosis. Old Capulet and Old Montague, in a guilt- and sorrow-ridden state, promise to erect golden statues of the other's child, in memory of their love. As timeless beings, the lovers can now love at the pace they themselves set.

It is interesting to compare the written work to the performance of the written work. With so many ways a director can interpret, expand on, cut out, or embellish upon a text, it is unlikely that an adaptation will contain the same ideas or perspective. However, Baz Luhrmann's film does an excellent job at displaying the theory of the lovers' enslavement to time as a driving force in the tragedy.

In *William Shakespeare's Romeo +Juliet*, director Baz Luhrmann illustrates these ideas somewhat differently than Shakespeare, but this is to be expected and welcomed. Luhrmann creates a sense of entrapment in time by framing the actual events with footage of a news report, in which the story is both introduced and concluded. Time is intentionally manipulated so that the audience gets a sense of being pulled into a time warp as the news report gives way to a "violent montage of newsreel footage, newspaper headlines, and prime-time drama flashback" (Lehmann 192).

Since the Prologue is performed as a breaking news story, we interpret it as real time, as if Romeo and Juliet have just died moments ago and their affair has made the headlines. The jump into the television set takes us through the time warp, and we are deposited into the story. It seems as if we are put directly into the back of the Montague car, as Gregory turns to the camera to yell, "A dog of the Capulet house moves me!" We are swept through the story alongside the characters, until the anchorwoman returns at the end to retrieve us to the present. This immersion heightens the audience's "sense of being unstuck in space and time" (Lehmann 192). We, too, have no choice but to run.

The entire cast, excluding Romeo and Juliet, moves at such accelerated pace that their behavior is often comical. This acceleration purposefully marks a contrast between the young lovers and their family and friends. Romeo and Juliet are both introduced directly following rather fast-paced scenes. We meet Romeo in Syca-

more Grove, where he sits in solitude writing in a journal, directly after the quick-fire brawl between the Capulets and Montagues. Juliet's introduction is preceded by the comic flourish of her mother, who can be described as "a monstrous crossbreed of Southern debutant and Hollywood diva" (Lehmann 193). This variance gives the impression that Romeo and Juliet are consciously battling against the fast pace that their culture sets for them. From Shakespeare's play, we can only expect this to have a disastrous outcome.

When Romeo and Juliet are filmed alone, they move much more slowly. In the first meeting from opposite sides of the fish tank, they slowly flirt with shy glances. So slowly, in fact, that their eyes seem to tell an entire love story in just a few moments. Luhrmann quite obviously over-stretches these sections of the film where the lovers are alone, such as this initial meeting, their marriage ceremony, and Romeo's departure to Mantua, to emphasize how little time they actually have to love one another. Visually, Luhrmann makes every moment the lovers have count. Because of this, it seems as if Romeo and Juliet have much more time together than just a few days.

When the Nurse intrudes in their meeting to pull Juliet away for a dance with Paris, the lovers begin to actively seek an escape from for themselves. They greedily grab up every second of solitude they can. The solitude almost seems like freedom from time, but Luhrmann constantly reminds us the lovers are being watched and therefore have not yet made an escape. As they sneak kisses in the elevator, we anticipate the sliding open of the door and the plunge back into the party. As they exchange affection and arrange their marriage by the pool, we are conscious that the security cameras are rolling, the guard is watching, and the Nurse is just behind the window of Juliet's bedroom. Real time consistently intrudes in their affair. Because of this, they actively seek to escape from their opposing forces. Friar Laurence marries them in a simple ceremony at the church, and it seems so picturesque that one might forget the lovers are just now tipping precariously at the edge.

Their marriage causes them to view not only time, but their entire surroundings differently. Their expressions become more delighted; the happiness in their body language is just bursting to get out. When Juliet speaks her soliloquy shortly after the wedding, she

cannot suppress her smile. When Tybalt challenges Romeo to duel, a rather delightful expression remains on Romeo's face until things turn deadly serious. The visual representation of their emotions only serves to heighten the tragedy, because their happiness is so incredibly short-lived.

Luhrmann, too, uses Tybalt as an exponent of time. The running time of the film is listed as 120 minutes (literally, the "two-hours traffic" the anchorwoman grants us in the Prologue). As discussed before, Tybalt's death acts to spur on the rest of the events in the story with rapid-fire succession. In the film, his death occurs approximately seventy minutes in. Approximately ten minutes later, Capulet collapses time and arranges Juliet's marriage to Paris for Thursday, and very shortly after, moves it one more day closer. From there, the events following can only speed up faster again to snowball to the end. Less than forty minutes after Tybalt's death, Juliet picks up Romeo's 9mm Sword, places it against her temple, and pulls the trigger. Again, it is as if Tybalt's vengeful spirit remains to send the lovers catapulting through time.

After Tybalt's death, each individual character's perception of time becomes a little clearer. Prior to this, it is very difficult to gather a firm grasp on their thoughts and ideas. Old Capulet displays this transition most prominently. Throughout the first portion of the play, Fulgencio Capulet is portrayed as a rather self-indulgent, but amiable, man. He appears very fatherly and gentle. However, the accelerated time scheme Tybalt's death imposes upon him causes some very notable changes in his behavior. When Juliet tells her father she does not want to marry Paris, he bursts into such a rage that he slaps his wife, pushes the Nurse, and shoves his daughter to the floor. His appearance becomes more and more disheveled, and he is frequently shown drinking alcohol or acting intoxicated.

Romeo and Juliet, too, are affected. They appear more emotionally distraught and act rather rashly. Romeo's frustration about Juliet's death and not receiving word from Friar Laurence is explicated with an angst-filled "Juliet!" shouted towards the heavens. Juliet, instead of simply imploring Friar Laurence for help, holds a pistol to her head and threatens him to think quickly for a solution. In his rush to enter the Capulet tomb, Romeo momentarily takes a hostage to avoid gunfire from the police force surround-

ing him. They, too, become more hurried, abandoning the slow, normal movements we noticed earlier.

Time is manipulated again as the lovers come together for the final act in the tomb. In Luhrmann's vision, Juliet begins to stir as Romeo uncorks the poison. Her eyes gaze lovingly on him for a moment, until she realizes what he is about to do. Juliet, coming up out of the drugged state, is not yet conscious enough to move quickly (or at all, really) to prevent him from drinking his death. Again, we are reminded that only seconds stand in the way of Romeo and Juliet escaping into freedom from their oppressors. We are reminded yet again of Friar Laurence's insistent warning: "Wisely and slow; they stumble that run fast."

By the time we reach the end of the film, the apotheosis reached by the lovers is much more obvious. Although Romeo's death is relatively clean, Juliet's gunshot wound should have produced a substantial amount of blood. What we actually get is only the smallest trace of blood on her temple, and no evidence anywhere else. In a sense, their bodies remain perfect, and in turn, become art. They become god-like figures for one to worship at an altar. Thus, the state of apotheosis is achieved.

The last real-time image of Romeo and Juliet is a that of their bodies wrapped around one another in Juliet's tomb. The camera slowly zooms out to frame them in a sea of candles. We leave the lovers with a brief montage of fleeting scenes from their love affair, which ends with a freeze-frame through the aquarium of their kiss. They are, literally, frozen in time. They have achieved timelessness through love.

While it could be argued that Romeo and Juliet might have survived these events were there only a few more minutes to spare, Lucking says the "circumstance that the clock is indifferent to human designs is too manifestly a universal fact of life" (Lucking 116). Romeo and Juliet simply had the misfortune of falling prey to the tyranny of time they implicitly sought to reject. As apathetic as it may sound, these things happen. Every day time works with and against us in ways that both help and hinder. We become subservient to the clock; there is no way around this, although we can try. In the end, though, we all end up like Romeo and Juliet: frozen in time, existing only so far as our story reaches out to be told.

WORKS CITED

Axline, Kim. "When Stars Fall to Earth: The Onslaught of Time in *Romeo and Juliet*." *On-Stage Studies* 21 (1998): 123-133. *MLA International Bibliography*. EBSCO. Web. 19 Nov 2010.

Lehmann, Courtney. "Strictly Shakespeare? Dead Letters, Ghostly Fathers, and the Cultural Pathology of Authorship in Baz Luhrmann's *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 52.2 (2001): 189-221. *MLA International Bibliography*. EBSCO. Web. 12 Oct 2010.

Lucking, David. "Uncomfortable Time in *Romeo and Juliet*." *English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature* 82.2 (2001): 115-126. *MLA International Bibliography*. EBSCO. Web. 10 Oct 2010.

The Norton Shakespeare. 2nd Edition. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt. W.W. Norton and Co., 2008.

Tanselle, G. Thomas. "Time in *Romeo and Juliet*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 15.4 (1964): 349-361. *MLA International Bibliography*. EBSCO. Web. 13 Nov 2010.

William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet. Dir. Baz Luhrmann Perf. Leonardo DiCaprio, Claire Danes, Brian Deheney, and John Leguizamo. 1996. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, 2006. DVD.

Contributors

Lauren Rivera is working toward Bachelor of Arts degrees in Both English and Spanish. Following graduation, she plans to attend graduate school to continue her Spanish studies. Her paper was written for English 451: Shakespeare Histories and Tragedies. Lauren's interest in her topic developed from her observations of gender dynamics in the texts she studied.

Bridget Clement is a junior working toward a major in History and a minor in Business administration. Upon graduation she plans to attend law school. Her essay was written for HIST 349: Napoleon to World War I, and was inspired by her maternal grandfather's stories of his life in Ireland during the Potato Famine.

Hollan A. Staker is a Secondary Education major in both English and German, and will graduate in the fall of 2012. Upon graduation, Hollan plans to teach English in Africa or South America through a Christian organization and do ministry work in Germany before settling back in the United States to teach high school. Her paper, written for ENG 415: A History of Rhetoric, was inspired by the work female rhetoricians across the centuries.

Shiloh Stone is a senior majoring in both History and French. In the fall of 2011 he will be attending Brigham Young University to pursue a Master of Arts in French. His paper was written for his senior history capstone class, "French Revolutions," and draws on both his fascination with history and French culture.

Whitney Litherland is pursuing a Bachelor of Arts degree in English with a concentration in Creative Writing and a minor in Literature. Following graduation, she is considering a career in editing. Her paper was written for English 451: Shakespeare Histories and Tragedies. Whitney was inspired to write her paper by both the scholarly debate over the time scheme in *Romeo and Juliet*, and its film adaptation by Baz Luhrmann.