DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 509

TE 500 480

By-Marder, Louis
Teaching Shakespeare: Is there a Method?
National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.
Pub Date Apr 64
Note-9p.
Journal Cit-College English; v25 n4 p479-487 Apr 1964
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.55
Descriptors-Biographies, Classroom Techniques, Creative Teaching, Discussion (Teaching Technique), Drama, Dramatic Play, Educational Objectives, Effective Teaching, *English Instruction, *English Literature, History, *Instructional Design, *Instructional Improvement, Literary Analysis, Poetry, Symbols (Literary), Teaching Skills, Teaching Styles, *Teaching Techniques
Identifiers-Shakespeare

A number of techniques applicable to the teaching of Shakespeare are described with some illustrations from the author's own teaching experience. Analysis of dramatic structure receives significant attention with equal space devoted to the Gustav Freytag formula and the author's own technique. Literary, dramatic, social, and personal goals in the teaching of Shakespeare are identified. The inclusion of historical and biographical materials is also discussed. (AF)

Reprinted from *College English*, April, 1964
Volume XXV, Number 4

Teaching Shakespeare: Is There a Method?

LOUIS MARDER

IF THE LIBERAL ARTS professors will cease rattling their sabres and put down their revolvers I shall be able to proceed with more ease. I know the cold stares and indignant looks that can unwelcome the proposition that we discuss the teaching of Shakespeare. At the South Atlantic Modern Language Association meeting in 1953 I introduced a resolution that we form a discussion group to look into the causes of student dissatisfaction with Shakespeare and only with difficulty secured a committee. There were murmurings about the strong hold that the George Peabody College for Teachers had in the South, and I suppose that had I made the same proposal in the Northeast I would have heard the same of the Teachers College of Columbia University.

We may as well face it. English professors who have not graduated from teachers colleges are irrevocably opposed to "method" as such, and each one is probably convinced that what he does is best—or else why would he be doing it.

Let me say at the outset that if by "method" one means the kind of indoctrination that student teachers might get by observing a class through a plate glass window transparent from only one side, I heartily agree that there is no "method" that is universally applicable. But there is method and frequently some madness in it. I taught my first Shakespeare course in 1947. By that time I was already a bardolater and had a nice collection of Shakespeareana. I was determined that my classes would be taught and would learn everything, for indeed all Elizabethan knowledge might throw some light on our interpretation of the plays. I gave a background of Elizabethan drama, gave a capsule view of some of the great writers active in contemporary literature and drama, and then lectured on Shakespeare's life by giving every date and event, and the significance of all that was known. As I left the class I heard a student who did not know I was behind him say, "Mr. Marder forgot to mention that Shakespeare went to the john in 1596." Well. . . . All of you know the feeling.

Next time I gave the course I gave some outline of drama, but no biography. I announced that we were to begin the first assigned play at the following session. Someone, as I had hoped, asked, "Aren't we going to study the life of Shakespeare?" I tried to look sheepish and said that it made no difference who wrote the plays and that frankly I was a Baconian. Needless to say there was an

Mr. Marder, associate professor of English at Kent State University, has written articles on the teaching of Shakespeare in The Shakespeare Newsletter *which he edits, and devoted Chapter 10 of his book,* His Exits and His Entrances: The Story of Shakespeare's Reputation, *to a history of the teaching of Shakespeare. He is currently preparing a book on the subject.*

astonished gasp from the class. To "defend" myself I told them that I would "prove" that Bacon was the author at our next session. And I did; and I defied them to prove otherwise by bringing in the contrary evidence. Needless to say the next hour or two we had a marvelously vital knock-down drag-out session at the end of which I admitted my imposture and proved that really I myself had written the plays. I referred them to a list of plays I had put on the board presumably as a reading list but so arranged that by drawing two vertical lines through the eleven titles my name was seen to be written out between them and with the numerical position of the letters totalling my birthday. This, I submit, is method.

Sometimes I do the biography in an orthodox manner, sometimes I don't introduce any biography until I come, for example, to a discussion of Adriana's shrewishness in *The Comedy of Errors*. Then I discuss Shakespeare's marriage in all its implications even to the possibility that the interlineation in the will leaving Anne the second best bed is a forgery. That he left Anne to go to London brings us to Shakespeare's educational background, the influence of Plautus in Latin, what were his possible occupations, etc. All discussion is for the purpose of explicating the immediate text and the plays to follow. Call this technique, call it method, call it merely teaching; the end is the same: giving the student as much background as possible without reducing his interest in, or enjoyment of the course.

If we admit, as we must, that there are goals in teaching, then there must be means to those ends. And if we admit there are means to an end, it may well be that some means are better than others. But at this point matters become complicated. What aims and ends do teachers of Shakespeare have? Is it enough to say that the goal of our teaching Shakespeare is the same as the goal for teaching all literature: the intelligent appreciation and enjoyment of what man has thought and written for posterity? Certainly that is the basis, but with Shakespeare there is so much more.

With no intention of being exhaustive we may readily admit the following goals as among those the well informed teacher is seeking to achieve in an interesting and stimulating manner:

Literary: appreciation and enjoyment of drama as a genre with its subdivisions of farce, comedy, tragedy, history, and romance; Shakespeare's language, poetry, and structure.

Dramatic: history of theatre, stage, acting, dramatic reading and interpretation.

Social: understanding of mankind and his culture through moral, religious, ethical, political, philosophical, historical, economic, and social aspects of drama.

Personal: self-development, imaginative exercise, ability to understand man under tension, the ability to laugh at life, the ability to listen, read, observe, think, speak, and write. That Shakespeare was eminently suited to illustrate these aims was admitted, to seek no later proof, by Ben Jonson in his 1623 eulogy declaring that Shakespeare "was not of an age but for all time," and by John Dryden who in his essay "Of Dramatic Poesie" (1668) wrote that Shakespeare "was the man who of all Modern, and perhaps Ancient Poets, had the largest and most comprehensive soul."

Having stated the major aims, and noted their variety, it becomes ludicrous to think that there could be *a* method of instilling all, or even those parts which the teacher might care to stress, in our students. Though there might be fifty goals or a hundred yet there might be as many methods as there are teachers. Each of these methods would have to be adapted to the teacher's ability, imagination, and knowledge, and the academic level of the students and their destination.

What then do teachers do? One teacher teaching *As You Like It* was more bored than his high school students who were daydreaming. When he suddenly thought that their daydreams were like those who "dream" of happiness in the Forest of Arden, he made all of them disclose their thoughts. The class became alive and all went well. Insofar as the discussion returned to the play, this might be acceptable. But seven years later this same teacher tried to develop a unit in *Macbeth* and concluded that for 95% of the students the play was too difficult. (G. H. Henry, "Escaping As You Like It," *E.J.*, 30 [June 1941], 443-49; and "The Growth of a Unit," *E.J.*, 37 [September 1948], 341-47).

Since Shakespeare's value is and has been appreciated for many generations, it is probably correct to say that most failures in awakening student enthusiasm are attributable to lack of "knowledge" of the subject and lack of method to apply what is known.

When we find that many teachers write articles complaining that their students are bored, that they find Shakespeare too ancient, that "Shakespeare is a name which serves merely to produce shivers," (Mary H. Watson, "Macbeth Outgrows the Classroom," *EJ*, 39 [Jan. 1950], 33-34), or that they "hate" Shakespeare (Dakin, 332), the college professor may well wonder what he has taught his future teachers which has sent them out to leave such impressions in the minds of their students.

Telling future teachers that Shakespeare is a great man will not make them good teachers; telling them that Shakespeare is *good* for them though a bitter pill won't do it either. Neither will reading the play to them do; or just leaving them with the plot and some quotations. This would hardly challenge a grammar or high school student. Those who are going to teach Shakespeare must understand him fully. They must be able to take the play apart and put it back together again with a clearer idea of what Shakespeare has done with the poetry, plot, and people. They must see the play develop out of apparent harmony into a conflict which frequently ends in death, or bypasses death in some way, leading to a happy ending. They must be able to trace the suspenseful rise of the action and the involvement of the characters in all possible ramifications so that they may be able to transmit some of Shakespeare's excitement to their students. They should be fired with some of the zeal for blank verse and its juxtaposition to prose; with some inkling of imagery and its impact (let us say by noting the effect of the word "blood" in *Macbeth*); with some idea of the dynamic spirit of the age then on the threshold of the English Renaissance, and with some idea of Shakespeare's contribution to it. And this should not be done only during the "introduction" to the course but used to enlighten any part of the plays where the ideas are appropriate.

It will be immediately insisted on by all teachers that this is exactly what they are doing in their classes, and I do not deny it. Yet articles continue to be written based on the supposition that Shakespeare is boring and students dislike him. Since a distaste for Shakespeare cannot be innate in those who have not studied him, it is the more probably transmitted by other students, who were bored by their teachers, and who passed on this boredom to their classmates. How many of us have had advisees who refuse to sign up for a Shakespeare class because their high school experience has developed in them an aversion?

What is past is prologue. That there is a problem I think will be admitted. That there is no solution is equally admissible. It might be that many of those who go out to teach would *know how to teach* if they first knew *what to teach*. For those who are seeking a basic "what to teach" idea I offer the structural analysis of the play. I am primarily con-

cerned with the *what*—the structure—and include the "how" only when it illustrates or clarifies the point.

From my own experience I find that an analysis of dramatic structure is an interesting and effective way of entering the heart of the play and working through it. The structure becomes a convenient peg on which to hang the characterization and all else that suits the goals of the teacher.

It is the one element that permeates the play fr m the opening word to the final line. It is at once static in that the whole play is there complete, and yet dynamic in that the parts are continually interrelating with one another.[1] This can be illustrated by drawing on the board an open cube and labelling the four lines of each side as follows:

BOTTOM LINES: Source, Treatment of Source, Dramatic Conventions, Period and Setting

SIDE LINES: Imagery and Symbolism, Versification and Prose, Language, Choice and Motivation

TOP LINES: Theme (Treatment of Life), Philosophy, Characterization, Catharsis

More factors could be added if desired by making the figure into an octagon. Frequently I place this structure on a set of diagrammed wooden horses labelled Text, Bibliographical Criticism, Shakespeare's Biography and Personality, Historical and Interpretative Criticism, and Conjecture and Controversy. These too might be interrelated by an experienced teacher.

With this kind of structure in mind, it may be easier to see what is going on in the play. It is better visualized when little arrows are drawn pointing to the center to indicate that all of these are constantly interacting visually and aurally, emotionally and intellectually, fictionally and actually on every line of the play.

If the teacher has the resources to develop the structure, he should be able to make any play come vividly to life. As little or as much might be used depending on whether the class is of elementary school age or doctoral candidates or whether the students were dramatizing scenes or listening to lectures.

With this overall view in mind, a close analysis of structure can be attempted. A student "sees" a play better when he sees it in Aristotelian terms; a plot has a beginning, a middle, and an end. Once students are told that a beginning is that which has nothing before and something following, they readily see that a middle is that which has something before and something following, and that an end is that which has something before and nothing following. Under analysis they see that there *was* something before, but that it is not appropriate to the artistic beginning of the play. Hamlet is born, but he is of no concern to us until the Ghost of his father comes to narrate the manner of his death. Students are then able to formulate for themselves the concept that a play begins *in medias res* and are then more readily prepared to look for the antecedent action—the fact that Hamlet has just returned from school, that his uncle has married his mother, that his uncle is now king.

Why did Shakespeare not begin with all this antecedent action? Obviously it would not have been significant because it would have been too long before the Point of Change—that point which makes the action of the play begin to rise toward its crisis and climax. Every play, every work of fiction, begins with a Point of Change—a Motive Force—which students can be made to see as an artistic point carefully considered by the author. (Aegeon and Antipholus of Syracuse arrive in Ephesus, Orlando decides to seek his fortune, Macbeth is expected

[1] *Cf.* G. Wilson Knight, *Principles of Shakespearian Production* (London, 1936), Chapter 2.

by the Witches, Bolingbroke has come to challenge Mowbray, Pandarus has agreed to intercede between Troilus and Cressida). Once this point is established, the student has the clue to most of the subsequent action: the effect of the change on the main character, its impact on the plot, and the resultant effect on all the other characters. Other events will be important, but the first one is the one that provides the motivation and starts the action going.

The various kinds of middles lead to the consideration of other matters, but first it is useful to start another structure—that of Life in general.[2] Here too, a diagrammed structure can be evolved. Although every play has antecedent action which is significant and indicates that all was not as it should be in the world, yet so far as the play itself goes, we must consider that there is order and harmony until the Point of Change introduces a new and decisive factor.

This structure considers not the play so much as it considers the life in the play: order existed, something occurs to disrupt it, order must be restored before the play can end. On the left of a diagram illustrating this we would write Order, Harmony, Peace, Ignorance of Evil. These lead by diagonal lines to a central event which introduces an evil into society: disruption of the state, family, society. This point might be labelled Chaos, Calamity, Conflict, Destruction of Institutions, and Knowledge of Evil. From this point we have arrows leading to the ensuing Problems, Emotional Conflicts, Tensions, Mental Torment, Frustrations, Inhibitions, Desire for Release, Satisfaction, or Revenge. Because human beings cannot live under such conditions, release must be sought which we label Flight to Seek Release, Flight to the Ideal, or Flight from Reality, a place where the tensions are either reduced, forgotten, or eliminated. Note in how many plays characters flee into a neighboring forest (*Two Gentlemen of Verona, As You Like It, Midsummer Night's Dream*), into disguise (*Comedy of Errors, Merry Wives of Windsor, Measure for Measure, Merchant of Venice, As You Like It, Taming of the Shrew, All's Well, Twelfth Night, Cymbeline*), into madness (*Hamlet* and *Titus*), into another sex (Rosalind, Viola, Jessica, Imogen), into a hidden existence (Hermione and Hero). In this "ideal world" a mediating factor—a person or an event—is found (love, reform, understanding, knowledge of the truth) which leads to the end which is a Restoration of Normalcy, Harmony, Order. This is not only the structure of drama, it is the very basis of literature and of life.

Frequently I illustrate this structure to a class by means of a rubber band or a ruler. When all is at order the rubber band is at its normal length; it can remain that way always. Supply the slightest amount of tension to the rubber band (the play) and no longer are matters at rest. However slight the tension there is always a point to which it must return when released; it will never stay at the new length without tension. In a play, more and more tension is supplied to our rubber band by the events and characters until a point is reached at which the slightest infinitesimal pull will break it. At this point the mediating factor has to be introduced to release the tension. If the tension is released, the play will be a comedy. If not released the crisis continues; if more tension is supplied, tragedy results. With a ruler a similar technique is used. When the ruler lies flat, all is well; when it stands firmly upright all may be well; but tilt it ever so slightly and all equilibrium vanishes; it must right itself or fall; it cannot remain unbalanced. The observation of the play or life in this manner is used to make the student note those events which add to the tension and thus

[2] Cf. Denton J. Snider's studies in *The Shakespearian Drama: A Commentary*, 3 Vols. (St. Louis, 1887-91).

to the development of interest (suspense) in the outcome of the action. He will see the author supplying more and more problems (tensions) to the protagonist and his antagonists and look forward more eagerly to the possibility of release or destruction. He might be made to see more clearly the development of the crisis and the climax of the play. All could become clear and all the cubed factors could be brought into focus on this point. For example, the teacher might introduce Shakespeare's sources here to illustrate differences of technique: Gertrude's known guilt in Shakespeare's source as compared with her ambiguity in Shakespeare; the fact that Cassandra in the source of *Measure for Measure* is a married woman while Shakespeare makes her a virgin and a novice in a nunnery; the doubling of the twins in the *Comedy of Errors*. Shakespeare increases the tensions on the characters by making the possible choices the more difficult to make. Life is difficult enough for Romeo and Juliet because they are members of feuding families, but the tensions are increased by the impetuousness of their love, their desire for immediate marriage, the killing of Tybalt, the banishment of Romeo, the immediacy of the second marriage to Paris, the delay of the message to Romeo, and so on. Juliet's flight from reality is into her trance-like sleep, but the mediating Friar fails due to accident and the end is tragedy.

A comic version of this structure is exemplified in *As You Like It* where hatred and greed are introduced to life at the court and its associates by twin examples of brother versus brother conflict leading to usurpation and denial of patrimony. As a result of these actions Duke Senior, Orlando, Adam, Celia, Rosalind, Touchstone, Duke Frederick, and Oliver become denizens in the Forest of Arden where they hope to achieve their ends. With love as the mediating factor and Rosalind as the mediator, four marriages are arranged, the brothers are reunited through love and reformation, and order is restored. Since the ideal has been achieved all return (except Jaques) to the Court where we may presume they live happily forever after.

Separation and Return may itself be utilized as a kind of Shakespearean structure since he uses it so frequently in his plays. In *The Tempest*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Comedy of Errors*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *As You Like It*, *All's Well*, *Twelfth Night*, *The Winter's Tale*, *King Lear*, *Cymbeline*, and *Pericles*, and to some extent actually and symbolically in other plays, Separation and Return is the structure on which the play turns. Once this key is applied to a play or plays, the other events are seen as leading in some way to the eventual solution and every facet of the play becomes an interesting part of the search for reunion.

Last but not least of the methods of structural analysis is the application of the Freytag formula. Gustav Freytag was to modern dramatic structure what Aristotle was to classic drama. *The Technique of Drama: An Exposition of Dramatic Composition and Art* was written in 1863 and passed through six German editions before it was translated into English in 1894 by Elias J. MacEwan (Chicago, Second Edition, 1896). Apparently its influence was very strong, for I have read that the publication of Andrew Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy* (1904) was received with great glee because teachers could now free themselves from the tyranny of analyzing Shakespeare by means of the Freytag formula and turn to psychological analysis instead. Lucia B. Mirrielees in her *Teaching Composition and Literature in Junior and Senior High School*, (N. Y. 1937; I quote from the 1952 edition, p. 436) blacklisted the formula by saying that a play "is not a geometric puzzle to be worked out upon the Freytag de-

sign." I will admit her conclusion that a play is not a puzzle but "a *play* demanding actors, the human voice, and audience"; yet an English class for young people must be more than a mock theater where children learn by doing. Shakespeare is Shakespeare with all the implications that the statement entails. I am not opposed to acting nor any other device including the carving of Shakespearean characters in soap, but the teacher should be able to do more than assign parts. A knowledge of structure is basic. Even the youngest of children understand structure: try to omit one of the piggies in the "This Little Piggy Went to Market" rhyme or one of the pigs in *The Story of the Three Little Pigs* and see what happens.

Acting, reading, and oral interpretation are but means to greater ends and one of the means to get to those ends is the understanding of how a Shakespeare play works. The Freytag formula is improperly used *when its formulation becomes an end in itself*, as would be any of the structures I have outlined above. But when it is used as a means to the goals indicated earlier, it becomes a valuable tool. Students should know the structure of a Shakespearean sonnet too, but to derive great satisfaction solely from the students' ability to say that a Shakespearean sonnet consists of fourteen lines of iambic pentameter rhyming abab cdcd efef gg, frequently divided into octave and sestet, is to miss the point of teaching. The structure is an aid to understanding the sonnet; but the content of the sonnet, not its structure, is supposed to stimulate the mind and give the enjoyment.

Briefly stated, the Freytag formula calls for six parts with two others optional. Every play has an Introduction, an Exciting Force, Rising Action, Climax, Falling Action, and Catastrophe or Denouement. Good but not indispensable are a Tragic Force after the climax, and a Moment of Final Suspense which comes before the denouement and is discoverable in most plays. To these I have found it necessary to add what I call a Crisis immediately before the Climax of the play. Before explaining these I should say that the teacher need never use these terms in class if he feels they will confuse the students; but to show how the action of the play develops and to what ends, the appropriate steps are a useful device.

The Introduction sets the scene, introduces the characters, gives some of the antecedent action, and often suggests the prevailing mood. The Ghost scene in *Hamlet*, the Witch scene in *Macbeth*, Orlando's opening statement in *As You Like It* are cited here merely to recall the effect.

The Exciting Force is that event which stimulates the rest of the action of the play. It is the Point of Change I mentioned earlier. In *Julius Caesar* it is the plan to kill Caesar, in *Romeo and Juliet* it is the meeting of the lovers, in *Macbeth* it is the prophecy of the Witches.

The Rising Action consists of all the events and complications which lead to the Crisis of the play. The Crisis may be compared with the highest point of tension of the rubber-band analogy previously cited. By the time of Crisis, the action has come to a point where the play may turn to either comedy or tragedy based on the decision of the protagonist at this particular point. Because the making of a decision involves reflection on the part of the character, whether of long or short duration, I frequently call this point Duration of Decision. In *The Comedy of Errors* Balthasar is trying to persuade Antipholus of Ephesus not to break into his own house by means of a crowbar. For twenty-two lines he pleads with Antipholus. At their conclusion Antipholus declares, "You have prevailed: I will depart in quiet" (III.2.107). Had he broken in, he would have met his twin

brother and ended the play (and incidentally have left Aegeon his father to perish by nightfall). In *The Merchant of Venice* Bassanio stands before the caskets and deliberates for thirty-five lines before he chooses the proper casket (III.2.107). The Duration of Decision in both these examples is the Crisis. The final choice is the Climax of the play, for from those decisions the rest of the action develops. Sometimes the Climax may be called the Point of No Return, this being the crucial action or choice in the life of the character. Frequently the point is seen more easily when looking back from the end of the play. For example, as we look back over Richard II's actions we see that at III.3.196 Bolingbroke makes his final statement: "My gracious lord, I come but for mine own." At this point Richard apparently might have still returned Bolingbroke's lands and titles and Bolingbroke should have departed satisfied; but Richard replies, "Your own is yours, and I am yours, and all." From this point there is no return possible.

The Climax having been reached, the Falling Action begins. Naturally the author cannot have the play deteriorate and just coast to an end, so new problems and conflicts are introduced, some of them involving major crises that seem to give some plays two climaxes. In *Romeo and Juliet* Mercutio is killed by Tybalt who runs away for a space of thirty-two lines. When he is seen returning, Romeo cries, "Away to heaven, respective lenity, And fire-eyed fury be my conduct now" (III.1.129). The die has been cast, he has chosen personal rather than legal revenge and immediately kills Tybalt, sealing his doom—the climax of the play. But possibly there is a second climax when Juliet is placed in a position where she too has to choose between marriage to Paris or family ostracism. The Friar's potion resolves the difficulty, momentarily, but the play goes on to its catastrophic ending. Hamlet's decision not to kill Claudius as he is praying may be considered the Climax of that play for he gets no further opportunity and he dies for missing it. Yet some critics consider the killing of Polonius the Climax because by that murder Hamlet loses his innocence and Nemesis has to follow.

The Tragic Force, when it is present, occurs after the climax. If the killing of Polonius is not a second Climax, it is the Tragic Force which impels further action. Freytag gives the election of Coriolanus to the Consulship as the Climax of that play and his almost immediate banishment because of his pride as the Tragic Force which incites the subsequent action.

The Moment of Final Suspense comes before the ending at a point where the falling action has created enough suspense in the mind of the observer that he thinks there is yet some hope for the protagonist's safety in a tragedy. In a comedy it may occur where some additional disillusionment precedes the final happy outcome. The hope that Romeo may get to the Capulet monument in time to save Juliet or the doubt that Macbeth can be killed in battle since he is invulnerable to man born of woman are such points in tragedy. In *Measure for Measure* when the Duke seems to refuse to listen to Isabella's accusation of Angelo in the last act and when Katharina is sent for by Petruchio, there may still be some belief that Angelo may avoid his fate or that the Shrew is not tamed.

The Catastrophe or Denouement is the ending of the play where all turns out as it should and all is explained to the audience implicitly by the events or explicitly by a character in the play. Even before this point, and sometimes it occurs before the Moment of Final Suspense, Freytag cites a Moment of Final Force which seals the idea of a play inevitably as a tragedy. The Ghost of Caesar when it appears to Brutus re-

minds us that Brutus has the guilt of his ruler on his hands; the killing of Paris at the Capulet tomb re-emphasizes Romeo's tragic guilt. Claudius plans the murder of Hamlet with Laertes, stressing more than his earlier confession his guilt and necessary death before the play ends.

Those who want further information I must refer to Freytag's own book, but I hope it will be obvious that the German scholar has given us a plan for structural analysis of a play that is very far from obsolete and applicable—as all these structural plans are—to all of fictional literature and even to life itself, which, after all, fiction imitates. That the teacher will have to apply himself to the play with diligence—and perhaps arrive at ambiguous crises and climaxes —is apparent, but once the structure is arrived at, the entire play becomes dynamic, every event falls into place, every word and image will be seen leading to the desired effect, every action and soliloquy be seen as adding to the interest and suspense of the plot, and the play understood a little more clearly at the least and a lot more clearly at the most than it ever was before.

Frequently to fix the idea firmly in mind I make an analogy between the Freytag formula and a disease. At the Introduction the person is well. At the Exciting Force he is exposed to a contagious disease. For a while he thinks he may not have caught it, or is immune. The Rising Action begins when his temperature begins to rise and subsequent symptoms of aches, pains, eruptions, and complications increase the virulence of the disease. At the Crisis the temperature has become so extreme that the doctors know that the slightest increase will be beyond what any human has survived before. This Duration of Decision is the number of hours or days that the temperature stays at that point. The Climax is reached when the temperature rises so that death will become inevitable, or falls and the patient will survive. A Tragic Force may enter with, let us say, a slight temporary paralysis to complicate matters, and the Falling Action is the movement to life or death. The Moment of Final Suspense may be a sudden recurrence of a symptom, but that is overcome and the conclusion follows. Or it might be done by making an analogy to a race. Here we have a line up, the discharge of the starter's pistol, the fighting for position, and the eventual emergence of two leaders who run neck and neck for a while until one forges ahead. But there is still danger that the race might be lost and at one moment the loser might even close the gap, but the winner comes out ahead in the end.

Like all essays on teaching, this may well be a conclusion in which nothing is concluded. Educationists may say, "You are not teaching a subject; you are teaching students!" My natural reply is, "I am teaching students a subject!" If we are to use Shakespeare as a means of enriching minds, refining tastes, exercising intellects, stimulating imaginations, deepening sympathies, developing emotional maturity, and stimulating love for literature—worthy goals to say the least —we must think not merely of teaching Shakespeare but think of doing it in the best way possible. Structure is one of many approaches emphasized here because it should be considered basic.

The application of any method depends on the imagination and background of the teacher. The inquiring and alert teacher will try everything—and whether he is teaching ninth graders, or undergraduate or graduate students who are to become teachers and scholars, he may find something here —especially if he has never before attempted structural analysis—that is useful; and he should find enough resource material in his library or in his experience to make it work.