

“MY HAND IS READY, MAY IT DO HIM EASE”:
SHAKESPEARE AND THE THEATRE OF DISPLAY

Michael Mangan
University of Exeter

1.1. Prologue: the past is another country—and so is the present

In his introduction to *Shakespeare in the Present*, Terence Hawkes reclaims, in the face of historicist mistrust, “presentism” as a critical strategy in Shakespeare Studies. It must be, he argues, a theorized strategy, not a simple assumption or assertion that Shakespeare is our contemporary. It must be a strategy which “will not yearn to speak with the dead [but will aim] to talk to the living” (4).¹ I find Hawkes’ words heartening, since in performance theatre is always and necessarily presentist. Hawkes recognizes this, and goes on to stipulate that “placing emphasis on the present can’t help but connect fruitfully with the current realignment of critical responses that stresses the *performance* of a play as much as its ‘reference’... Presentism thus highlights what has been termed drama’s ‘performative’ function” (5). Hawkes’ broader thesis—that presentism makes it possible to reverse the chronology of causality, to ask questions about the influence of the present upon the past—resonates with the re-creative act of making theatre, which has

Ilha do Desterro	Florianópolis	nº 49	p.195-213	jul./dez. 2005
------------------	---------------	-------	-----------	----------------

always needed to negotiate the influence of the present upon the past as well as *vice versa*, in its search for what Milhouse and Hume call “producible interpretations”.²

In the theatre, Shakespeare has been played in what used to be called “modern dress” ever since the days of the first Globe, when the Lord Chamberlain’s men, like their colleagues in rival companies, played the parts of long-dead kings and earls while wearing the just-out-of-fashion cast-off clothes of the contemporary London aristocracy. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, following a spate of “historically accurate” productions from Chronegk and the Meininger company onwards (productions which were largely designed to restore the Bard’s intentions to centre stage) the default design position became the historicized one. Consequently, to choose anything other than a basically Elizabethan costume and setting was always possible, but had the effect of making some sort of interpretive statement about the play’s meaning. Theatre design and scenography have moved on from there in more recent years, and the theatrical semiotics of the everyday has become more sophisticated. Modern dress no longer seems shocking (does it?). Even so, the point where the visual image intersects with the spoken text is still where the creative spark of meaning is most clearly seen to flash. With this in mind, then, I want to take a single, highly gestural, moment from one Shakespeare play and dress it up in some very modern-day clothes.

Kate/Katherina’s final speech in *The Taming of the Shrew* ends with the following advice to her “sisters”

Then vail your stomachs, for it is no boot
And place your hands below your husband’s foot.
In token of which duty, if he please,
My hand is ready, may it do him ease. (5.2.177-80)

At which point, traditionally, she offers to do just that—to put her hand beneath her husband’s foot. Let us experiment with a presentist reading of this dramatic *gestus* by way of an imaginary design suggestion. Let

us place the scene in a contemporary fetish club—in London, New York, L.A., or Sydney.³ Let us give Petruchio all the leather regalia of an SM “top”—complete with a whip to crack and handcuffs hanging from his belt.⁴ And let us give Kate (definitely “Kate”, the diminutive name by which Petruchio addresses her) a correspondingly submissive outfit—in rubber perhaps, or, if we are being completely stereotyped, with a hint of the maid’s uniform about it. And let us imagine the look that passes between them as being the collusive look of two people playing (extremely well) the game of sadomasochistic submission and dominance, speaking to each other an erotic language of power and sexual role-play which they understand fully and the bystanders do not. And—if you wouldn’t mind—now hold that thought, while I explain what I’m trying to do here.

1.2 Concept and etymology

The phrase in my title, “theatre of display”, is taken from Marjorie Garber’s provocative, playful, and serious essay “Fetish Envy” (1990). In this, Garber argues that “fetishism is a kind of theatre of display—and indeed that theatre represents an enactment of the fetishistic scenario”; she concludes with the judgement that fetishism is “foundational to theatre itself” (56). Garber focuses largely on questions of cross-dressing. This paper will take both a wider and a narrower approach in order to explore some of the implications of Garber’s contention in order to ask questions both about fetishism as a “theatre of display” and about the strategies of presentism as an approach to Shakespeare: it will look both at the larger question of theatre and the concept of fetishism, and also explore the possibilities inherent in applying the notion to a particular play.

The concept, like many complex terms in cultural analysis, is sometimes quite strictly and narrowly defined; sometimes applied more broadly. (Perhaps it might be more accurate to say that there is both a strong and a weak sense of the word). This is a consequence, in part at least, of the word’s own complex and rather confused

etymology, inherent within which are a series of intercultural contradictions, paradoxes and ambiguities. Its origins lie in eighteenth-century imperial attempts (and failures) on the part of Western travellers to understand the cultures and religious practices of Central West Africa. The accounts of early Portuguese encounters with tribal Africans talked of their use of *feitiço*—a charm—and the West African pidgin term *fetisso* seems to be a later development of this. The word was employed as a pejorative term, to refer to the use of “power objects”, usually small figures which are seen as having the mystical—or magical—ability to protect their wearer from evil influences; they are imbued with spiritual potency, deriving from an animistic sense that they embody the spirit (at least in the case of the crucifix) of a deity. Linking this with their own ideas about witchcraft and magic, Western commentators inevitably interpreted this as evidence of the primitive and idolatrous nature of such African religious practices, as opposed to the presumed absolute truth embodied in Christian doctrine.

During the nineteenth-century colonisation of Africa, this contributed to the ideological construction of the African subject as a superstitious and inferior heathen who, in the words of the hymn “bows down to wood and stone”. In fact, these early explorers, traders, missionaries and proto-ethnologists consistently oversimplified and misunderstood the nature and variety of West African fetish beliefs and practices. Ironically, there is evidence to suggest that some of the tribal fetishes described by the early Portuguese adventurers were themselves constructed in imitation of crucifixes seen by tribesmen in encounters with even earlier Christians. The notion of the “fetish”, then, is surrounded by semantic and semiotic confusion from the moments of its first usage in European thought. It is a term which marks the failure of one culture to understand another, one indeed which “is firmly anchored in the space between cultures, one of the most potent zones of misunderstanding” (Mack 54).

2.1. Cultural theory

Over the last few years the word has found its way into our mainstream cultural and critical/analytical vocabulary. Borrowed from anthropology, the word was inflected in significantly different ways by both Marx and Freud. In volume one of *Capital*, Marx uses the term metaphorically, introducing the concept of commodity fetishism. He argues that "when goods are produced for exchange on the market they come to be seen not only as articles of utility, with a 'use value', but also as inherently valuable objects with special 'mystical' qualities ... Marx describes this as fetishism because, as in religion, a human product... acquires a life of its own, and enters into relations both with other things of its kind, and with the human race" (Gamman and Makinen 28).

Freud's rather different notion of sexual or pathological fetishism is closer to the way in which the word is now understood in everyday usage. Freud defines fetishism in terms of erotic arousal which becomes focussed upon an inanimate object or a part of the body rather than upon a person. In his 1927 paper on the subject, he gives a psychoanalytic explanation of pathological sexual fetishism in terms of its subconscious origin in a disavowal of male castration anxiety:

In every instance, the meaning and the purpose of the fetish turned out, in analysis, to be the same. It revealed itself so naturally and seemed to me so compelling that I am prepared to expect the same in all cases of fetishism. When now I announce that the fetish is a substitute for the penis, I shall certainly create disappointment; so I hasten to add that it is not a substitute for any chance penis, but for a particular and quite special penis that had been extremely important in early childhood but had later been lost. That is to say, it should normally have been given up, but the fetish is precisely designed to preserve it from extinction. To put it more plainly: the fetish is a substitute for the woman's (the mother's) penis

that the little boy once believed in and—for reasons familiar to us—does not want to give up. (152-53)

The implicit assumption, that sexual fetishism is an exclusively male attribute, was held by classical Freudian theorists in the teeth of evidence to the contrary. Oddly, the Lacanian psychoanalytic reaction, which in wider terms replaced the penis by the phallus and the anatomical/biological model of psycho-sexual development by the representational/symbolic model, largely left this assumption intact, attributed (like Freud) the ownership of desire to men. Recent work by feminist theorists, however, has all but destroyed Freud's phallogocentric assumption. Developing, revising and occasionally conflating these initial insights of Marx and Freud, cultural theorists, scholars and critics have used the term as a way of exploring a wide variety of cultural and historical issues. This has resulted in a steady stream of books and articles about fetishism and cultural theory: books on (for example) fetishism and nineteenth-century French and English literatures,⁵ fashion and fetishism,⁶ fetishism and the imagination,⁷ fetishism and consumer culture,⁸ fetishism and Jean Cocteau,⁹ fetishism and Henry Fielding,¹⁰ fetishism as cultural discourse,¹¹ the work of art as fetish,¹² fetishism in Marlowe's *Edward II*,¹³ Shakespeare as fetish,¹⁴ fetishism in popular culture,¹⁵ and, in the work of too many writers to list, fetishism and film theory from Laura Mulvey onwards.¹⁶ Across this range of work the word has occasionally been used with a strictly Marxian inflection, more frequently with a strictly psychoanalytic one, and most often in the way that I intend it to be understood here: as something which brings together the socioeconomic and the psycho-sexual, and which indicates and includes a broad continuum of sexual identities, orientations and behaviours in which the concept of power is foregrounded: from fixation on some kind of *objectum sexualis*, through the transgendered, to the sadomasochistic.

2.2. Foundational to theatre itself?

It is in this context, in an article which concentrates on female-to-male crossdressing in Shakespeare, that Garber contends

that fetishism is a kind of theater of display—and indeed, that theater represents an enactment of the fetishistic scenario. Thus Freud's "penis", the anatomical object, though understood through Lacan's "phallus", the structuring mark of desire, becomes reliteralized as a stage prop, a detachable object. No one has the phallus... [The transvestite in Shakespeare is] not an accident of historical contingency but the necessary intervention that makes fetishism not only possible but foundational to theater itself. (*October* 47,56)

What are we to make of this provocative claim? I find myself in a spirit of cautious agreement with Garber that there may indeed be something about the fetishistic gesture that *is* fundamental to theatre, although my emphasis would be different from hers. She argues her case from a position which is rooted in Freudian/Lacanian theory, and makes female-to-male transvestism the key to her argument. My own understanding would depend less on the isolation and foregrounding of f2m transvestism in Shakespeare, and would turn less on the question of who, if anybody, has the phallus. It is more related to the broader sense of the word outlined above.

Similar points have been made before in a slightly different vocabulary: theatre semioticians from Shakespeare himself onwards have alerted us to the idea that theatrical representation operates in a way which is essentially metonymic: the single bush stands in for the entire forest of Arden, one man makes the imaginary puissance of a thousand soldiers – and so on. Metonymy is also the mode by which the classical sexual fetishism of the *objectum sexualis* operates, since it too maintains a focus upon the significant part (the foot, the knee) or associated item (the clothing) rather than attempting to encompass the

whole. Yet metonymy is a weak term, and it omits what is surely the essential feature of performance, the influence of the audience in the process. Theatrical representation is more accurately described as a fetishistic process rather than a metonymic one, since the term more powerfully evokes the ritualistic investment of what happens on the stage with the psychic power which gives it the meaning in the first place. To the extent that the theatrical experience is essentially an erotic one, then it is a fetishized eroticism, in which the desiring which takes place between audience and stage is heavily encoded. Theatrical meaning depends upon displacement, the ways in which an object, or an attribute, or a process is singled out in some way and invested psychically with power, whether that power is seen as magical, ideological or erotic. This sounds, at first hearing, like the old idea of theatrical metaphor or symbol; but in fact it is not. With metaphor and symbol the tendency is always to look beyond the signifier to the signified; fetishistic displacement, in contrast, focusses more intently upon the signifier itself and attributes the power of the signified to it. This, I believe, is a quintessentially theatrical mode of knowing. But beyond that, the interpretation of meaning depends upon a series of sub-codes which are always culturally specific, and which may be local or even personal and secret. Fetishistic meaning thus effectively becomes a code in itself. It is the system—or series of systems—which govern the very structures and processes of displacement, and which make possible the expression and interpretation of theatrical meaning.

In this broad sense, then, I would argue for the importance of the term in any consideration of theatrical representation. In a similar way, the relationship between Shakespeare the cultural icon, the product of the Shakespeare industry and a classical Marxian commodity fetishism seems uncontentious: his own quasi-magical transformation into an “inherently valuable object with special ‘mystical’ qualities” has been sufficiently written about.¹⁷ What happens, though, when we begin to apply this very “present” notion of fetishism to our interpretation of individual plays?

2.3. Interpretive strategies

Different plays may invite, or elicit, different kinds of interpretive strategies, and it is unlikely that any single contemporary critical/theoretical position—presentist, psychoanalytical, deconstructive, new historicist—will find that it fits all plays equally well. (Psychoanalysis, to take a very crude example, has traditionally had a field day with *Hamlet* but has, on the whole, been less illuminating about *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.) As far as presentism is concerned, it may be that those plays which are most likely to stir us to respond in a presentist mode are those which we find most uncomfortable. Post-holocaust Shakespearean studies, for example, have struggled with *The Merchant of Venice* precisely because of the ways in which that play makes us aware of our historical situatedness. In terms of gender politics, *The Taming of the Shrew* has spoken to a generation of feminists and post-feminists in a very different way from that in which it spoke to their predecessors precisely because it has thrown into stark relief the differences and disjunctions between past text and present structures of belief. And, of course, one consequence of this has been a fierce historicisation of the play: an insistence (I have done this in some of my own previous writing on *The Shrew*) that to understand it we have to read it in its contemporary context, to invoke Filmer's *Patriarcha*, *A Godly Form of Household Government*, *A Homily of the State of Matrimony* and other such contextualising documents. But what would a presentist approach to this play look like: one which is "informed by a heightened awareness of our situatedness", and which looks for ways in which this engagement with our historical specificity might inform our understanding of previous sexualities?

3.1 A theatrical sexuality

It is at this point, of course, that we return to the concept of fetishism. In terms of gender and sexual politics, fetishism, too, is a relatively new kid on the block. There seems to be something particularly presentist

about fetishism itself. Its own “situatedness” is to do with a style of sexual orientation and gender identity which has only comparatively recently been foregrounded and articulated. To re-frame the Kate-Petruchio relationship in terms of an increasingly self-aware relationship between two people who are exploring, and eventually claiming, the SM roles of dominant and submissive certainly gives us a producible interpretation of the play, and one which effects “a recuperation of Kate as a woman with agency rather than as a victim” (Taunton “Patterns”). The centrality of role-playing to the fetishism of sadomasochism—that most theatricalized of sexualities—is matched by the centrality of role-playing in *The Taming of the Shrew*. This is not uncommon in Shakespearean dramaturgy, of course, but *Shrew* is one of the plays in which the concept is particularly relentlessly exploited and explored. Indeed the main body of the play is ALL role-playing, since it is the “pleasant comedy” played out for the supposedly therapeutic benefit of Christopher Sly. And within this metatheatrical framework are enacted familiar Shakespearean comic themes of disguise, imposture and rôle-playing: lovers disguise themselves as schoolmasters, passing pedants impersonate wealthy fathers, and masters and servants exchange places, and Lucentio cries “Let me be a slave to achieve that maid”.

3.2 Masters and slaves

This last point is particularly significant, on two levels: firstly, because it reminds us of the shared vocabulary between the discourses of SM and of Elizabethan social relations. On the one hand, master/servant and mistress/maid relationships were part of everyday reality. On the other, the distinctly erotic overtones of slavery (which belong equally to the sonnet sequence and the contemporary fetish scene¹⁸) are to be heard in Lucentio’s cry. Secondly, though, Lucentio’s exchange of clothes with Tranio establishes an ongoing structural motif in the play. *The Taming of the Shrew* is, of course, structured according to comic conventions, but they are as much the conventions of master/

servant comedy as they are of romantic comedy; these consist of elaborations and variations on the kind of *lazzi* which derive from Roman comedy and which were superbly exploited within the Italian *commedia dell' arte*. We are given the flavour of this with Petruchio's first entrance—a slapstick (sic) comic exchange between master and servant on the theme of beating and being beaten:

PETRUCHIO Here, sirrah, Grumio, knock, I say.

GRUMIO Knock, sir? Whom should I knock? Is there any man has abused your worship?

PETRUCHIO I say, knock me here soundly.

The central conceit of the play is the structural transfer of these knockabout master-servant routines, which we first see played out between Petruchio and Grumio, to the romantic-comedy plot between Petruchio and Kate. Romantic comedy played out as master-servant routines sounds very much like a description of consensual SM.

3.3 Kate

An SM reading of *Shrew* sees the play in terms of Kate's journey from the frustration of her actual societal role as an oppressed woman (symbolized by the genuine public humiliation of her father's open attempt to dispose of her on the marriage market, making her, as she puts it "a stale ... amongst these mates", 1.1.58) to the point where she finds a paradoxical liberty in the submissive role-play of a consensual sadomasochistic relationship with Petruchio. There are a series of key steps along the way: Kate's response to her initial humiliation is to claim the dominant role: tying and torturing her younger sister, (making, as Bianca complains, a "bondmaid" of her), then gender-bending by manifesting a physical superiority over the male suitors, beating and humiliating Hortensio. In Kate's interactions with Petruchio, however, not only does the power shift: so does the mode of Kate's discourse, as

an element of playfulness emerges. This is evident even in their first meeting, which consists of an erotic battle of words between them. This is followed by a series of humiliation and denial games. These are stage-managed and controlled by Petruchio, but they contrast with the initial humiliation scene insofar as they are set up *as* games, small scenes in which Kate is cast as rebellious slave/servant to Petruchio. Reluctant at first, eventually Kate comes to understand that when power and dominance are played as games rather than inherited as societal and ideological necessities, a kind of freedom is achieved. And since “one of SM’s major givens [is] that it is the submissive that is in control” (Taunton “Patterns”), she joins in the game on terms that only *seem* to disadvantage her, accepting Petruchio in the rôle of master to her own submissive.

3.4 Petruchio

As with most readings of *The Shrew*, this interpretation focuses on Kate (who is usually regarded as psychologically the more interesting figure of the lead couple). Petruchio, too, can be seen to grow into this relationship, however. If our first encounter with him is as the dominant master (in social rather than sexual terms) of Grumio, this is not entirely how he first enters into his wooing of Kate. He tells the audience that he intends his courtship to be a spirited one, based on role-play; but the terms in which he describes his intentions show that he, too, has not yet worked out what his role will be. He will, he assures the audience

[...] woo her with some spirit when she comes.
 Say that she rail; why then I'll tell her plain
 She sings as sweetly as a nightingale:
 Say that she frown; I'll say she looks as clear
 As morning roses newly wash'd with dew:
 Say, she be mute, and will not speak a word;
 Then I'll commend her volubility
 And say she uttereth piercing eloquence:

If she do bid me pack, I'll give her thanks,
As though she bid me stay by her a week:
If she deny to wed, I'll crave the day
When I shall ask the banns and when be married. (2.1.169-80)

The role with which Petruchio seems to be about to experiment is by no means a conventionally dominant masculine one: on the contrary, he seems to be preparing himself to tease Kate with his coy submissiveness. But in the ensuing battle of wits he discovers that this role will not work: it turns out that Kate is not attracted to submissive men, and Petruchio eventually claims the role of dominant after all:

And therefore setting all this chat aside
Thus in plain terms: your father hath consented
That you shall be my wife
.....
Thou must be married to no man but me
For I am he am born to tame you, Kate. (2.1.261-3, 268-9)

And from this moment on, it is his job to manage the "scenes"—a task he does with gusto, and which leads to Kate's final acceptance, symbolized by the famous speech in which the moment with which we started, "My hand is ready, may it do him ease", becomes a stylized gesture of a fetishized sexuality, marking the mutual consent of the playful sadomasochistic relationship.

4.1 Recuperation

I doubt if the reading which I am suggesting here is one which would gain unanimous support from those whom I see as allies in the field of gender-aware criticism. For some critics, radical as well as reactionary, the emphasis which queer theory has placed on SM in recent years has frequently been seen as a problem. For the

reactionary critics it is simply inappropriate, but for many radicals it is at best a dilution and at worst a betrayal of the original impulses within the gender politics of feminist and gay criticism. And certainly a blanket application of queer theory to the Shakespearean *corpus* seems to pose as many problems as it solves. Even so, I would argue that such a reading of this particular play is not only producible but psychologically plausible, sustainable in terms both of the narrative and the language of the play, and generically apt in that it offers the comedically appropriate happy ending to the play—in terms, moreover, which do not depend upon an audience's implicit acceptance of an Elizabethan patriarchal model.

One side-effect of the SM *Shrew* might be to provide sadomasochism with the kind of cultural validation which comes from an alignment with the iconic (fetishized?) cultural figure of Shakespeare. This is, of course, a common phenomenon in the cultural and political fields: Shakespeare, like the Bible, has been pressed into service by all sorts of causes. It is equally likely, though, that the equation could work the other way round, so that it is Shakespeare who is validated by the cultural cool of SM discourse.¹⁹ In recent years, Shakespeare enthusiasts have often felt that Shakespeare the misogynist (like Shakespeare the capitalist, Shakespeare the monarchist, Shakespeare the anti-semitic) has needed protection from the moral claims of a present-day perspective. This "recuperation" of his gender politics by way of a new mode of sexual discourse (albeit a controversial one²⁰) sits comfortably enough within a tradition of criticism which seeks to rescue him from any apparent alignment with present-day reactionaries, or with past barbarities. And while a purely textual scholarship may demand that the historicity of Shakespeare's position be allowed to speak unalloyed, any criticism which takes seriously the idea of "producible interpretation" will tend to look for what we share rather than what separates us: few theatres wish to stage productions whose main point is how *irrelevant* a play is.

4.2 Questions

One of the differences between the academic and the stage director is that the director has to make choices and stick with them and their implications: to play a scene one way is to abandon the possibility of playing it another. Ambiguity is possible but its range is limited; even in the most "open-ended" of productions, meaning cannot multiply endlessly. So there is always a question for the practitioner: what is being lost when we decide to adopt *this* interpretation rather than that one? In the case of this reading of *The Taming of the Shrew* what is being lost is a cultural and historical specificity which informs the play throughout. It is the specificity which juxtaposes the story of Kate and Petruchio against the unyielding backdrop of *Patriarcha*, *A Godly Form of Household Government* and *A Homily of the State of Matrimony*, texts in which domination and submission are not erotic games but theological imperatives and social absolutes. And so, having argued the case for such a "queer" interpretation (or staging), I want to finish by raising a few questions about it. These questions arise from the memory that when Shakespeare plays overtly with the discourses of sadomasochism ("Being your slave, what should I do but tend / Upon the hours and times of your desire?", Sonnet 57), the effect is rather different from what we have in *The Shrew*. The very fact that Shakespeare can "put on" this voice in the sonnets serves to emphasize the extent to which, historically, the play is rooted in a very different kind of psychosexual politics. Does it matter that we lose that, if in the process we find a new and resonant meaning which takes its force from our own situatedness? Would it be possible to envisage a producible interpretation in which the relationship between historicism and presentism is not "either/or" but "both/and"? And if so, how? I cannot yet see it in production terms, but the suspicion is growing that presentism, this new kid on the block of Shakespearean studies, is most effective not as an alternative to historicism but as a dialectical partner to it. Might it be that the choice between speaking to the dead and talking to the living is a false one after all?

Notes

1. Hawkes, *Shakespeare in the Present* (London, Routledge, 2002), p. 4.
2. See Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume, *Producible Interpretation: eight English plays 1675-1707* (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985) *passim*.
3. This is simply a mental experiment, an attempt to give visual form to an interpretive move. It is not a proposal for a physical staging, and any production which did engage with the ideas in this paper would have to do so in more subtle terms than I have offered here. The spirit in which the image is offered may be judged in terms of its origin, which was in the context of some studio work on the play with students in Aberystwyth in 2002, which chimed with Nina Taunton's two articles (see References). I already knew Taunton's interpretation, and had initially dismissed it; on re-reading, however, it came to seem more and more resonant.
4. Petruchio's handcuffs may be a modern fantasy, but the whip was traditional enough: it can be traced back to Kemble's elaboration of Garrick's version of the play in the early nineteenth century. See *Shrew*, ed. Morris, pp. 98-9.
5. Emily Apter, *Feminizing the Fetish: Psychoanalysis and Narrative Obsession in Turn-of-the-Century France*, (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990); Naomi Schor, "Fetishism and Its Ironies", *Nineteenth Century French Studies*, 17:1-2 (1988): 89-97. Judith Pike, "Exquisite Corpses: The Fetish of the Female Dead Body in Late Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Literature", *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52 (1992); James McLaverty, "Comtean Fetishism in *Silas Marner*", *Nineteenth Century Literature* 36:3 (1981): 318-336.
6. D. Kunzle, *Fashion and Fetishism*, (Towota, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1982).
7. David Simpson, *Fetishism and Imagination* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982).
8. Robert Cagle, Robert "Auto-Eroticism: Narcissism, Fetishism, and Consumer Culture" *Cinema Journal* 33:4 (1994): 23-33.
9. Daniel Gercke, "Ruin, Style and Fetish: The Corpus of Jean Cocteau", *Nottingham French Studies* 32:1 (1993): 10-18.

10. Terri Nickel, "Pamela as Fetish: Masculine Anxiety in Henry Fielding's *Shamela* and James Parry's *The True Anti-Pamela*", *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 22 (1992):37-49.
11. Emily Apter and William Pietz (eds), *Fetishism as Cultural Discourse* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1993).
12. Pierre Bourdieu et. al. "The Work of Art as Fetish: The Production of Belief", *Text and Context: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 2 (1) (1988): 3-56.
13. David Thurn, "Sovereignty, Disorder, and Fetishism in Marlowe's *Edward II*", *Renaissance Drama* 21, (1990): 115-41.
14. Marjorie Garber, "Shakespeare as Fetish", *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41:2 (1990): 242-250.
15. R.B. Browne, *Objects of Special Devotion: Fetishes and Fetishism in Popular Culture* (Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1982).
16. Laura Mulvey "Some Thoughts on Theories of Fetishism in the Context of Contemporary Culture", *October* 65 (1993): 3-20.
17. See, for example, Garber, *Shakespeare as Fetish*.
18. See, for example, Shakespeare's Sonnets 57 & 58.
19. Nina Taunton, after all, talks of her reading as providing "a recuperation of Kate as a woman with agency rather than as a victim" (Taunton, *op.cit.*).
20. Since much of this paper has referred to the incorporation of SM-fetish discourse into mainstream cultural discourse, it is perhaps salutary to remind ourselves, by way of balance, just how controversial this discourse still is in an age where sexual 'deviance' may still be demonized. Not only is sadomasochistic sexuality still prone, in the popular imagination, to confusion with sexual abuse, its legal status remains problematic in many countries. In the UK, for example, it was as late as 1990 that the high-profile police operation, "Operation Spanner", led to the successful prosecution and subsequent imprisonment, for periods of up to 4 years, of 16 gay men for consensual sadomasochistic acts. UK law has not changed. See <http://www.spannertrust.org/documents/spannerhistory.asp>.

References

- Apter, Emily *Feminizing the Fetish: Psychoanalysis and Narrative Obsession in Turn-of-the-Century France*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990.
- Apter, Emily and Pietz, William, eds. *Fetishism as Cultural Discourse*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993.
- Bourdieu, Pierre et al. "The Work of Art as Fetish: The Production of Belief". *Text and Context: A Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 2 (1) (1988): 3-56.
- Browne, R.B. *Objects of Special Devotion: Fetishes and Fetishism in Popular Culture*. Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1982.
- Cagle, Robert. "Auto-Eroticism: Narcissism, Fetishism, and Consumer Culture". *Cinema Journal* 33:4 (1994): 23-33.
- Donald, A, ed. *Fantasy & the Cinema*. London: BFI Press, 1989.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Fetishism" in James Strachey (trans.) *Standard Edition of the Complete Works* vol. 7. London: Hogarth Press, [1927] 1961.
- Filmer, Sir Robert. *Patriarcha and other Political Works*. Ed. Peter Laslett. Oxford, Oxford UP, 1949.
- Gamman, Lorraine and Marja Makinen. *Female Fetishism. A New Look*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1994.
- Garber, Marjorie. "Fetish Envy". *October* 54 (1990): 45-56.
- _____. "Shakespeare as Fetish". *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41:2 (1990): 242-250.
- Gercke, Daniel. "Ruin, Style and Fetish: The Corpus of Jean Cocteau". *Nottingham French Studies* 32 :1 (1993): 10-18.
- Hawkes, Terence. *Shakespeare in the Present*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Kunzle, D. *Fashion and Fetishism*. Towota, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1982.
- McLaverly, James. "Comtean Fetishism in *Silas Marner*". *Nineteenth Century Literature* 36:3 (1981): 318-336.

- Mack, John. "Fetish? Magic Figures in Africa". *Fetishism: Visualising Power and Desire*, Ed. Anthony Shelton. London: South Bank Centre/Lund Humphreys Ltd., 1995.
- Milhous, Judith and Robert D. Hume. *Producible Interpretations: Eight English Plays*. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois UP, 1985.
- Mulvey, Laura. "Some Thoughts on Theories of Fetishism in the Context of Contemporary Culture". *October* 65 (1993): 3-20.
- New Formations: A Journal of Culture/Theory/Politics* vol. 19 (1993).
- Nickel, Terri. "Pamela as Fetish: Masculine Anxiety in Henry Fielding's *Shamela* and James Parry's *The True Anti-Pamela*". *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 22 (1992): 37-49.
- Pike, Judith. "Exquisite Corpses: The Fetish of the Female Dead Body in Late Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Literature". *Dissertation Abstracts International* 52:12 (1992).
- Schor, Naomi. "Fetishism and Its Ironies". *Nineteenth Century French Studies* 17:1-2 (1988): 89-97.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Taming of the Shrew*. Ed. Brian Morris. The Arden Shakespeare. London: Methuen, 1981; reprinted London: Routledge, 1989.
- Shelton, Anthony. *Fetishism: Visualising Power and Desire*. London: South Bank Centre/Lund Humphreys Ltd., 1995.
- Simpson, David. *Fetishism and Imagination*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1982.
- Taunton, Nina. 'The Turn of the Shrew'. *Skin Two* 15 (1994): 90-94.
- Taunton, Nina. "Patterns of Sodomasochism and Fashion-Fetishism in *Taming of the Shrew*" *Erfurt Electronic Studies in English* 8, (1996). http://webdoc.sub.gwdg.de/edoc/ia/eese/artic96/taunton/8_96.html 12/12/2005.
- Thurn, David. "Sovereignty, Disorder, and Fetishism in Marlowe's *Edward II*". *Renaissance Drama* 21 (1990): 115-41.