Intermedial issues inscribed in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*

Anna Stegh Camati*

Abstract: Of the several Shakespearean texts that make use of metatheatre, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595-1596) is particularly engaging because if focuses not only on the play within the play, but also approaches notions of textual appropriation and intermedial proceedings which establish a dialogue with contemporary critical perspectives. The issues raised in the mechanicals' plot relate to the concept of medial transposition, considering that Shakespeare inscribes the main steps for adapting a dramatic text from page to stage within the play itself. Many of the concerns of contemporary media and performance studies are actually addressed in the play, among them the representation of reality, the role of the audience in creating meaning and the nature of dramatic illusion.

Keywords: William Shakespeare. Metatheatricality. Intermediality.

Bless thee, Bottom. Bless thee! Thou art translated
(SHAKESPEARE, 2003, p. 58).

Shakespeare creates an intriguing multiplicity of meta-theatrical devices in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (1595-1596): besides the play within the play, staged by an amateur group of workmen, the story of mounting a theatrical production gains life in the mechanicals' plot, one of the four narrative strands of the frame-play, in which Peter Quince, an internal playwright, who can be seen as a parodic double of Shakespeare himself, assigns roles, rehearses the cast and adapts from page to stage the playtext he has written. Moreover, Quince and his group exhibit dramatic conscience and reflect on issues, such as the representation of reality, the role of the audience in creating meaning and the nature of dramatic illusion.

* Centro Universitário Campos de Andrade (Uniandrade) – Curitiba – PR – Brasil. *E-mail*: ascamati@gmail.com

In this study, I will show that, in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Shakespeare inscribes the mechanisms of textual transcendence and the three main steps of stage adaptation – conception, presentation and reception – within the playtext itself. Special attention will be given to intra and intermedial procedures, inscribed throughout the playtext, which anticipate a series of theoretical premises devised by contemporary media and performance studies.

Theoretical perspectives on textual appropriation and stage adaptation

Shakespeare is not only the most adapted and most performed dramatist of all times, but he was also a highly skilled and imaginative adaptor who "transferred his culture's stories from page to stage and made them available to a whole new audience" (HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 2).

The appropriation of a single text or of multiple textualities, used as pre-texts or pretexts to create a new work, was a recurrent practice in early modern times. Shakespeare knew that any text, transposed into a new historical and geographical context, required transformation. Whenever he adapted an ancient narrative, dating back to oral tradition or to written stories of his own and foreign cultures, he used to introduce changes of perspective, ambience, atmosphere, plot and characterization, according to the demands of the *Zeitgeist* of his time. In this sense, he showed an awareness of the creative and critical possibilities of textual transcendence (GENETTE, 1997). Furthermore, the inscription of the process of adaptation in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* provides evidence that Shakespeare also knew that the transposition of a playtext from page to stage is a complex intermedial transaction, involving acts of mediation, interpretation and representation.

Patrice Pavis (1992) discusses problems related to translation for the stage and reflects upon the series of concretizations of a theatre text from conception (dramaturgical concretization) to production and reception (stage and receptive concretizations). He contends that "the translator and the text of the translation are situated at the intersection of two sets to which they belong in differing degrees" (PAVIS, 1992, p. 136), since the appropriation of a source by a target text involves a two-way dialogue situated at the crossroads of different situations of enunciation and cultures. He believes that the translator must realize that "the real situation of enunciation (that of the translated text in its situation of reception) is a transaction between the source and target situations of enunciation that may glance at the source, but has its eye chiefly on the target" (PAVIS, 1992, p. 138). Elsewhere Pavis (1998, p. 14) rejects the fidelity discourse, when he maintains that the stage is an arena of negotiation where

> *[...] all imaginable textual manoeuvres are permissible: cuts, rearrangement of the narration, stylistic polishing, the use of fewer characters or locations, a dramatic focus on strong points [...] the addition of external texts,* montage *and* collage*, different endings and changes in the* fabula *as required by the staging. [...] To adapt is to entirely rewrite the text, using it as raw material.*

The process of staging a play can be seen in the light of the concept of medial transposition (a subcategory of intermediality according to Irina Rajewsky), because in performance the spoken words are turned into situations and into

http://dx.doi.org/10.5935/1980-6914/letras.v19n1p103-112

visual, aural, gestural and corporal components. In this respect, Rajewsky (2005, p. 51) points out that

> *[...] the intermedial quality has to do with the way in which a media product comes into being, i.e., with the transformation of a media product (a text, a film, etc.) or of its substratum into another medium. This category is a production-oriented, "genetic" conception of intermediality; the "original" text, film, etc. is the source of the newly formed media product, whose formation is based on a media-specific and obligatory intermedial transformation process.*

Although Rajewsky does not mention the theatre in her discussion of medial transposition, Pavis' theoretical perspectives provide clarity that a stage production is an intermedial transformational process. This view is corroborated, in *A Theory of Adaptation*, by Linda Hutcheon (2006), whose double definition of adaptation – as a formal entity or product and as a process of creation and reception – is inscribed in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, as will be demonstrated in this essay.

Peter Quince, a working class playwright with "small Latin"

In the second scene of the first act (1.2.1-104), Shakespeare introduces an amateur company of actors formed by workmen of the guilds, among them Snug, the Joiner; Bottom, the Weaver; Flute, the Bellows-Mender; Snout, the Tinker; Starveling, the Taylor and Peter Quince, the Carpenter.

Like Shakespeare, Peter Quince exerts the positions of playwright, rehearsal director and actor, eventually taking minor roles in the plays he writes. He proudly announces that he is the author of a new play, based on a classical Latin source, which he retitled as "The most lamentable comedy, and most cruel death of Pyramus and Thisbe". In fact, the playtext he presents to his group is an interlingual, downsized translation of "Pyramus and Thisbe", a narrative poem he encountered in the fourth book of *Metamorphoses* (16 b.C.), by Ovid (43 b.C.-17 a.D).

Considering that Quince's source text dates back to ancient times, his abridged translation for the stage of the Latin text ought to take into account "both source and target text and culture, assuming that the transfer simultaneously involves the source text's semantic, rhythmic, aural, connotative and other dimensions, necessarily adapted to target language and culture" (PAVIS, 1992, p. 137). However, due to his general limitations, "small Latin" and dictionary-dependence, the main tenets of textual appropriation and translation for the stage, issues in which Shakespeare excelled, are completely absent in Quince's playtext.

Anthony B. Taylor (2003, p. 56) argues that many hilarious speeches in the mechanicals' plot of *A Misdummer Night's Dream* are literal appropriations of Latin syntax and other features of the Latin language by Peter Quince, who tanslates a great number of phrases and false cognates *ipsis litteris* into English, which suggests that he composed "the play with a copy of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* open before him at the story of Pyramus and Thisbe".

Elsewhere, Taylor rejects the presupposition that Shakespeare aimed at ridiculing Arthur Golding's 1567 translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, a work highly regarded by Elizabethan writers. He asserts that there is clear textual evidence in Shakespeare that most of the awkward linguistic constructions of

Quince's playtext were supplied by a ballad on Pyramus and Thisbe written by I. Thomson in *A Handful of Pleasant Delights*. To exemplify this point, he quotes the narrative passage relating to Thisbe's dropping of her veil, retextualized by Quince as "her mantle she did fall,/ Which Lion vile with bloody mouth did stain" (5.1.141-142), claiming that the term 'lion' refers back to Thomson, because in Ovid's (or Golding's) "Pyramus and Thisbe" there is no lion. "Ovid identifies the beast that frightens Thisbe as *Lea* or *Leaena* and Golding follows him, referring in his translation to a 'Lionesse'. Thomson is unusual in referring to the beast as a 'lion'" (TAYLOR, 1990, p. 59). Furthermore, the reference to Pyramus as a "most lovely Jew" (3.1.89) in Quince's playtext can be considered an in-joke, since it suggests that such an absurdity is the result of the carpenter's misunderstanding of the Latin text and of his effort to find a literal equivalent of *iuvenum pulcherrimus*, which means "the most lovely young man" (TAYLOR, 1990, p. 61).

The insertion into the mechanicals' plot of a working class playwright, who has limited knowledge of Latin, immediately reminds us of Ben Jonson's laudatory poem, entitled "To the Memory of My Beloved Master William Shakespeare, and What He Has Left Us", printed in the First Folio (1623), where he states that Shakespeare was a great writer even though he "had small Latine, and lesse Greeke"[1]. This affirmation seems to be a kind of infamous joke that circulated during Shakespeare's lifetime (SCHOENBAUM apud TAYLOR, 1990, p. 63), a provocation which explains the insertion of parodical and satiric strategies into *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

In this regard, Shakespeare's creation of a parodic double of himself, who appropriates a classic text, but has no idea of how to make his play readable in his own language, can be seen as an good-humored caricature of himself. Moreover, the answer Shakespeare provided to his colleagues, who held a mistaken opinion about his linguistic competence, was the creation of the play *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. In an interview, Peter Brook (apud KUSTOW, 2006, p. 187) declared that "there are plays that are perfect in their form. [...] I think that *A Midsummmer Night's Dream* is a perfect, Mozartian construction, where you can't cut a note of the score without harming it".

THE INSCRIPTION OF THE ADAPTATION PROCESS IN *A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM*

In three of the four scenes that compose the mechanicals' plot, Shakespeare reflects on theatre and theatricality. Peter Quince's ineptitude in terms of writing a playtext, based on a classic source, is compensated by his openness and *expertise* in relation to adapting his work for production. Shakespeare not only concentrates on the play within the play, but inscribes and thematizes, within the frame play, the collaborative processes of creation and construction of a stage production, from conception to presentation and reception, flaunting the complex intermedial transactions involved in the crossing from page to stage theorized by contemporary critics.

1 In fact, there is evidence throughout his work that Shakespeare could read Latin. In *The Rape of Lucrece*, for example, a narrative poem written for the Earl of Southampton, he "not only used the *Fasti* for which there was no current English translation, but also consulted the Latin notes on the text by Paul Marsus in the standard edition of Ovid's poem" (TAYLOR, 2003, p. 60).

http://dx.doi.org/10.5935/1980-6914/letras.v19n1p103-112

In the second scene of the first act (1.2.19-25), Peter Quince, the author of the playtext "The most lamentable comedy, and most cruel death of Pyramus and Thisbe", assembles his company of rude mechanicals to assign roles and distribute the written parts of the interlude he intends to present "before the Duke and the Duchess, on his wedding-day night" (1.2.5-6). The initial roles Quince sets down are: Nick Bottom as Pyramus; Francis Flute as Thisbe; Robin Starveling as Thisbe's mother; Tom Snout as Pyramus' father; Quince himself as Thisbe's father; and Snug as the Lion. As becomes evident in their discussion on characterization and stage properties, Quince, as leader of the group and rehearsal director, is in charge to rewrite and reshape the playtext whenever necessary. One of the problems addressed in this scene relates to the dangers of representing violence on the stage instead of having it reported by a messenger as in Greek theatre. When Bottom, the Weaver, who will play Pyramus, is eager to play the lion's part too, asserting that he will roar so well that the Duke is going to say "Let him roar again; let him roar again" (1.2.68-68), Quince replies that this would frighten the Duchess and the ladies so much that they would shriek, which would be enough for all of them be hanged. Their discussion ends with Quince inviting his group to meet him in the woods, out of town, by moonlight. He dismisses the cast, but not before explaining his choice of the rehearsal space: "there we will rehearse, for if we meet in the city, we shall be dogged with company, and our devices known. In the meantime, I will draw a bill of properties, such as our play wants. I pray you fail me not" (1.2.95-99).

The action of the second scene of the mechanicals' plot (3.1.1-114) is set in the woods where the workmen meet for rehearsal. Quince refers to the chosen place as scenic space, when he states: "This green plot shall be our stage, this hawthorn-brake our tiring house; and we will do it in action, as we will do it before the Duke" (3.1.1-5).

As has been mentioned in the previous section, Quince himself is responsible for the hilarious humor of misused words in his play, which derives from for his incompetent reading of the Latin text ("small Latin"), however, during the process of adaptation for the stage, he concentrates all his efforts to make sure the interlude will not be laughed at. He eagerly corrects his actors, when they mispronounce words:

QUINCE: Speak Pyramus; Thisbe, stand forth.
BOTTOM: *The flowers of* ***odious*** *savours sweet –*
QUINCE; **'Odorous'! 'odorous'!**
BOTTOM: ***Odorous*** *savours sweet;*
So hath thy breath, my dearest Thisbe dear.
But hark, a voice! Stay thou but here awhile,
And by and by I will to thee appear. *[Exit.]*
[…]
FLUTE: Must I speak now?
QUINCE: Ay, marry, must you; for you must understand he goes but to see a noise that he heard, and is to come again.
FLUTE: *Most radiant Pyramus, most lily-white of hue,*
Of colour like the red rose on triumphant briar,
Most briskly juvenal, and eke most lovely Jew,

As true as truest horse that yet would never tire;
I'll meet thee, Pyramus, at Ninny's tomb.

QUINCE: **'Ninus'** tomb, man! Why you must not speak that yet; that you answer to Pyramus. You speak all your part at once, cues and all. (3.1.77-95, my emphasis)

Quince also shows resourcefulness and flexibility in terms of the overall conception of the production, when, despite having written the parts of Pyramus' Father and of Thisbe's Father and Mother, he eliminates these roles and recasts Snout and Starveling as "Moon" and "Wall", respectively. He takes great liberties to adjust his text for performance: he cuts some scenes and adds others, makes interpolations, creates new characters, inserts new speeches, writes several prologues and an epilogue, and discusses many of the concerns addressed by contemporary theatre and performance studies with his group of actors.

As far as the nature of dramatic illusion is concerned, paradoxically, the artisans tend to over and/or to underestimate the imaginative potentials of the audience. On the one hand, they fear the audience will think what it sees to be real, mistaking shadows for reality and, on the other, they wonder whether the spectators are able to imagine what they do not see. To avoid these threats, they determine to explain, by means of several prologues, that everything in the play is fiction, deciding to let the audience know that Pyramus is not Pyramus and that he does not really kill himself in the end of the play:

BOTTOM: There are things in this comedy of Pyramus and Thisbe that will never please. First, Pyramus must draw a sword to kill himself; which the ladies cannot abide. How answer you that?

SNOUT: Byrlakin, a parlous fear.

STARVELING: I believe we must leave the killing out, when all is done.

BOTTOM: Not a whit; I have a device to make all well. Write me a prologue, and let the prologue seem to say we will do no harm with our swords, and that Pyramus is not killed indeed; and for the more better assurance, tell them that I, Pyramus, am not Pyramus, but Bottom the weaver. This will put them out of fear.

QUINCE: Well, we will have such a prologue; and it shall be written in eight and six. (3.1.8-23)

This strategy of breaking the dramatic illusion can be related to Bertolt Brecht's (2005, p. 147) theoretical perspectives, specifically those concerning the difference between identifying with the character and showing the character. The latter is an epic device, which consists of stepping in and out of the role – a common resource used by Shakespeare in his dramaturgy. At the end of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, for instance, Puck, an elf who enjoys playing practical jokes on mortals, steps out of his role and addresses the audience as a choric figure, delivering the epilogue of the frame play:

PUCK: [To the audience]
If we shadows have offended,

Think but this, and all is mended,
That you have but slumber'd here
While these visions did appear.
And this weak an idle theme,
No more yielding but a dream,
Gentles, do not reprehend:
If you pardon, we will mend. (5.1.409-416)

When the mechanicals discuss the lion's part, the interpolation of another prologue is suggested to tell the audience that nobody will get hurt. Snout must avoid wearing an illusionistic costume and, in case this strategy does not work, he must interrupt his roaring with a gentle speech, reminding the audience that he is really an actor playing a role. This Brechtian estrangement effect will completely destroy the dramatic illusion:

SNOUT: Will not the ladies be afeard of the lion?
STARVELING: I fear it, I promise you.
BOTTOM: Masters, you ought to consider with yourself; to bring in (God shield us!) a lion among the ladies is a most dreadful thing; for there is not a more fearful wild fowl than your lion living; and we ought to look to't.
SNOUT: Therefore another prologue must tell he is not a lion.
BOTTOM: Nay, you must name his name, and half his face must be seen through the lion's neck; and he himself must speak through, saying thus, or to the same defect: 'Ladies', or 'Fair ladies, I would wish you', or 'I would request you', or 'I would entreat you, not to fear, not to tremble; my life for yours! If you think I come hither as a lion, it were pity of my life. No, I am no such thing; I am a man, as other men are': and there, indeed, let him name his name, and tell them plainly he is Snug the joiner.
QUINCE: Well, it shall be so…(3.1. 26-45)

To cope with the audience's lack of imagination, Quince and his group reflect on the issue of representation of reality, mainly as concerns lighting and setting. Their first option is for realism, but this solution is rejected in favor of the non-realistic idea of turning the moon into a character. Quince suggests that a man "must come in with a bush of thorns and a lantern, and say he comes to disfigure or to present the person of the Moonshine" (3.1.55-57). The same concept is applied for the creation of setting; they decide to present the Wall in person as well. This time Bottom shows awareness of the manipulation of signs, when he ponders: "Some man or other must present Wall; and let him have some plaster, or some loam, or some rough-cast about him, to signify wall; and let him hold his fingers thus, and through that cranny shall Pyramus and Thisbe whisper" (3.1.63-67).

While the second scene of the fourth act (4.2.1-43) is very short, dealing with Bottom's return from the forest after his release from Puck's magic spell that transformed him into an ass, the action of the first scene of the fifth act (5.1.106-348) encompasses the play within the play, watched by the onstage audience (the three couples: Duke Theseus and Hippolyta; Hermia and Lysander; Helena

and Demetrius), who interrupt the performance to make comments on the *mise en scène*.

In the play within the play, the mechanicals, besides their dual reality as rude workmen and actors, appearing on stage in their physical presence and in the part they portray, assume yet another role in the play within the play, thus "adding a third identity which itself is constructed in the context of a third level of time, space, characterization and action" (FISCHER; GREINER, 2007, p. xi). Not only do the characters of the interlude display dramatic conscience, but the actor-spectators within the play, participating in the action with their reactions, are responsible for new improvised speeches and interpolations. There is a moment when Pyramus gets annoyed with one of Duke Theseus' comments, so much that he steps out of his role as Pyramus and answers back as Bottom, the Weaver, flaunting his triple identity artisan/actor/character:

Enter PYRAMUS
THESEUS: Pyramus draws near the wall; silence!
PYRAMUS: *O grim-look't night! O night with hue so black!*
O night, which ever art when day is not!
O night, O night, alack, alack, alack,
I fear my Thisbe's promise is forgot!
And thou, O wall, O sweet, O lovely wall,
That stand'st between her father's ground and mine;
Thou wall, O wall, O sweet and lovely wall,
Show me thy chink, to blink through with mine eyne.
[*Wall stretches out his fingers.*]
Thanks, courteous wall: Jove shield thee well for this!
But what I see? No Thisbe do I see.
O wicked wall, through whom I see no bliss,
Cursed be thy stones for thus deceiving me!
THESEUS The wall methinks, being sensible, should curse again.
PYRAMUS: No, in truth sir, he should not. 'Deceiving me' is Thisbe's cue: she is to enter now, and I am going to spy her through the wall. You shall see it will fall pat as I told you; yonder she comes. (5.1.167-185)

In this regard, Shakespeare thematizes the process of reception within the frame play and reflects on the role of the audience in creating meaning within his most beloved comedy.

Final remarks

During the rehearsal scene, when Bottom is metamorphosed into an ass by Puck, Quince's perplexed discourse "Bless thee, Bottom. Bless thee! Thou art translated" (3.1.113-114), quoted in the epigraph, can be seen as a general reference to different kinds of translation processes which involve transformation, among them textual transcendence and stage adaptation inscribed in the playtext *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. In this respect, Shakespeare can be seen a forerunner for providing an insight on intermedial perspectives, which were later reworked

and rearticulated by contemporary critics, among them Linda Hutcheon and Irina Rajewsky. Likewise, the reflections of the artisans on the representation of reality, the role of the audience in creating meaning and the nature of dramatic illusion anticipate problems discussed by theatre critics and practitioners in our time, such as Patrice Pavis and Bertolt Brecht.

The tragic Latin narrative poem "Pyramus and Thisbe", transcoded, by Peter Quince, into the tragicomical playtext, titled "The most lamentable comedy, and most cruel death of Pyramus and Thisbe", can be seen as an "extensive transposition of a particular work or works" (HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 7), involving a shift of genre and "a change of frame and therefore context: telling the same story from a different point of view" (HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 8), which evidently results in a different interpretation.

Conversely, Quince's medial transposition of his playtext from page to stage can be approached from the perspective of adaptation as a process of creation, which "involves both (re)interpretation and then (re)creation" (HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 8), and from the viewpoint of adaptation as a process of reception which presupposes "an extended intertextual engagement with the adapted work" (HUTCHEON, 2006, p. 8) by the audience.

Some critics argue that when Shakespeare made fun of Peter Quince's method of textual appropriation and of the collaborative creative process of stage adaptation in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, he intended to underscore the superiority of his own theatre practice and mock the amateur theatre before him. However, his intricate metalinguistic procedures inscribed in the text, mainly the use of the code to highlight the code itself (JAKOBSON, 2005), indicate that he reflects upon his own methods of writing and staging plays in a self-reflexive, ludic and metacritical attitude. I believe that the intermedial strategies inscribed in the play indicate that Shakespeare pays homage to the amateur troupes of actors of medieval popular theatre, since this rich tradition exerted a major influence on his artistic development.

QUESTÕES DE INTERMIDIALIDADE INSCRITAS EM *SONHO DE UMA NOITE DE VERÃO*, DE SHAKESPEARE

Resumo: Entre os inúmeros textos de Shakespeare que privilegiam a metateatralidade, *Sonho de uma noite de verão* (1595-1596) exerce especial apelo, porque enfoca não somente a peça dentro da peça, mas também examina noções de apropriação textual e procedimentos intermidiáticos que estabelecem um diálogo com perspectivas críticas contemporâneas. As questões levantadas no enredo dos artesãos remetem ao conceito de transposição midiática, visto que Shakespeare inscreve em sua peça os principais passos referentes à adaptação de um texto dramático da página ao palco. Muitas reflexões teóricas desenvolvidas pelos estudos da intermidialidade e da performance são abordadas na peça, entre elas a representação da realidade, o papel da plateia na criação do significado e a natureza da ilusão dramática.

Palavras-chave: William Shakespeare. Metateatralidade. Intermidialidade.

References

BRECHT, B. Pequeno órganon para o teatro. In: BRECHT, B. *Estudos sobre o teatro*. Tradução Fiama Pais Brandão. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 2005. p. 125-166.

FISCHER, G.; GREINER, B. The play within the play: scholarly perspectives. In: FISCHER, G.; GREINER, B. (Ed.). *The play within the play*: the performance of meta-theatre and self-reflection. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi, 2007. p. vi-xvi.

GENETTE, G. *Palimpsests*: literature in the second degree. Translation Channa Newman and Claude Doubonsky. Lincoln; New York: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

HUTCHEON, L. *A theory of adaptation*. London: Routledge, 2006.

JAKOBSON, R. Aspectos linguísticos da tradução. In: JAKOBSON, R. *Lingüística e comunicação*. Tradução Izidoro Blikstein e José Paulo Paes. São Paulo: Cultrix, 2005. p. 63-72.

KUSTOW, M. *Peter Brook*: a biography. London: Bloomsbury, 2006.

PAVIS, P. Towards specifying theatre translation. In: PAVIS, P. *Theatre at the crossroads of culture*. Translation Loren Kruger. London; New York: Routledge, 1992. p. 136-159.

PAVIS, P. *Dictionary of the theatre*: terms, concepts and analysis. Translation Christine Shantz. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

RAJEWSKY, I. O. Intermediality, intertextuality and remediation: a literary perspective on intermediality. *Intermédialités*, n. 6, p. 43-64, Autumn 2005.

SHAKESPEARE, W. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Edited by Harold F. Brooks. The Arden Shakespeare. Second Series. London: Thomson Learning, 2003.

TAYLOR, A. B. Golding's Ovid, Shakespeare's "Small Latin", and the real object of mockery in "Pyramus and Thisbe". *Shakespeare Survey*, n. 42, p. 53-64, 1990.

TAYLOR, A. B. When everything seems double: Peter Quince, the other playwright in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. *Shakespeare Survey*, n. 56, p. 55-66, 2003.

Recebido em dezembro de 2016.

Aprovado em janeiro de 2017.