

SHAKESPEARE'S THEATER OF LIFE AND PHILOSOPHY OF BAROQUE THEATER: «FAUSTIAN SPIRIT» OVERTAKES ANCIENT FORM

Purpose of the article is to identify the components of creative method and anthropology of Shakespeare's theater, to compare Shakespeare's theater to Baroque theater, to analyze various conceptions of Shakespeare. Methods: hermeneutic, cultural anthropology, historical and cultural, analytical, psychoanalysis. From philosophical and anthropological positions, creative method and creative works of W. Shakespeare have been analyzed, a strong connection of theater and philosophy of Shakespeare's theater with Baroque theater has been revealed (mysticism, fabulousness, hyperrealism, formal features are replaced by effective ones, usage of parable and utopia (image of King Lear in particular), motives of vanitas (vanity), duality of the world, allegory, «figureness»). Shakespeare suggests a new philosophy of theater based on elimination of borders between reality and art, «baroqueivisation», theatricalization of reality, masks are used as symbols of a real person without distorting it but rather revealing his or her deepest essence, sincerity. It is also reflected in understanding of Shakespeare's authorship problem where mask of a clown and a buffoon are used in order to convey the deepest and most philosophical thoughts to society. Baroque reform of the theater suggested by Shakespeare, reduces theater to universal anthropological model both synchronically and diachronically. Theater runs around the actor, not only art but life of the universe is carried out via actor. This new philosophy of theater cannot be considered only within the «culture of meanings» (G.U. Gumbrecht) but on principle is within the limits of «culture of presence», which helps to understand the ideological idea of Shakespeare's theater, to view biography and personality of Shakespeare in a new way because Shakespearean Studies was within the culture of meanings and tried to consider only the hidden codes and symbols of Shakespeare's theater. Beyond these philosophical hermeneutics remained the transforming, effective power of Shakespeare's theater. Humanization of theater also takes place: based on the old Antique form a new humanistic content is built, where much attention is paid to «life of soul», love, kindness, wits, passion, vengeance, etc., sinfulness of a soul and its ability to clear of evil. Theatre is considered to be not an external spectacle but a deep instrument of immersion in life of a soul and its gradual growth. Since theater is the whole world (in philosophy of culture it can also be identified with the formation of «Faustian soul» (O. Spengler), «Faustian spirit» focused on the infinite formation, the infinity of space), it requires the creation of a corresponding dictionary because the word itself becomes a word-action. A special role of allegory genre for philosophy of Shakespeare's theater is considered, his philosophy is compared to philosophy of F. Bacon.

Ключові слова: hermeneutics, philosophy of culture, cultural anthropology, Shakespeare, poetics, philosophy of theater, culture of presence, baroque philosophy, psychoanalysis.

The perspective of uncovering semantic cores of theatrical activity and Shakespeare's theater, revealing its mystery which is of unconventional importance for anthropological sciences and philosophy of art, seems to be relevant.

The outline of W. Shakespeare's philosophical conception, influence of this conception on his artistic endeavour and Baroque art in general, looks promising. When researching Shakespeare's works there is a gap in understanding of his art and philosophical views, and connections of W. Shakespeare with philosophy of his time and individual philosophers including Francis Bacon still remain unexplored.

Purpose of the article is to identify the components of creative method and anthropology of Shakespeare's theater, to compare Shakespeare's theater to Baroque theater, to analyze various conceptions of Shakespeare including the connection between works of W. Shakespeare and F. Bacon.

Analysis of recent publications. Shakespeare's authorship question arises more than two hundred years after Shakespeare's death, lasts for more than two hundred years and has many different influential conceptions [Shakespeare authorship question, 2021]. Without cutting off authorship of Shakespeare-actor absolutely, first we would like to turn to Bacon's version as one of the main authors of this creative legacy. This version first appeared in the nineteenth century, in W. Henry Smith's works in 1856 (*Was Lord Bacon the Author of Shakespeare's Plays? A Letter to Lord Ellesmere*), it was spread by Delia Bacon and gains such power that by the middle of the twentieth century, in general, supporters of various constituents of authorship of Shakespeare's works could be divided into two main groups: the Stratfords (Shakespeare was identified with Shaksper, an actor, a resident of Stratford) and the Baconists (Bacon was considered either the only or the main author). In the letter to D. Davis F. Bacon speaks of «hidden» poets that's why the Baconians were dearching for hidden codes in Shakespeare's works referring to F. Bacon and vice versa, especially often they compared Shakespeare and ethical work of F. Bacon «On the Meaning and Success of Knowledge, Divine and Human» (1605), only part of which was published during Bacon's life. To develop Baconian theory, British Francis Bacon Society was founded in 1886, and it continues working to the present moment. Famous writer Mark Twain («Did Shakespeare Die?»), 1909) also belonged to the Baconians.

In the second half of the twentieth century, the third, Rutland version of the origin is spread as well, where one of the main authors is Earl of Rutland, or Earl of Rutland and his wife. Even the third version does not deny the influence of Bacon on Rutland. Discussions about the personality of Shakespeare and his authorship resume in the late twentieth – early twenty-first century [Mays, Swanson, 2016]. In Ukraine, for example, there is a Shakespearean portal [Ukrainian Shakespearean portal, 2020, shakespeare.znu.edu.ua]. The sharpest debates arose in 1990s in *The Atlantic Monthly*, *Harper's Magazine*, one of the unexpected theories about Shakespeare's authorship dates back to 2010s, when Shakespeare was identified with Queen Mary Stewart by B. Yorick. («Queenspear»). Theories of G. Bloom [Bloom, 1999] concerning Shakespeare's creativity, its analysis from the viewpoint of new historicism and criticism [Bloom, 2008], are gaining popularity. Also, there are works of Peter Ackroyd [Ackroyd, 2006], H. Grady [2001] and Richard Wilson [Wilson, 2004] who try to apply the principles of postmodern aesthetics including theatricality, to the analysis of Shakespeare's works and philosophy. Modern works on philosophy [Gumbrecht, 2020] and theater aesthetics should be noted, which consider theater as a specific model of European culture and suggest new philosophy of theater (works of E. Fischer-Lichte [Fischer-Lichte, 2018], G. Dalagua [Dalaqua, 2020] in particular).

Presentation of the main material and obtained scientific results of research. Shakespeare was an extremely talented thinker and theatrical figure of his time. At the same time, in the XIX century «Shakespearean mystery» emerges and in the XX-XXI centuries it becomes an important problem of humanitaristics and history, philosophy of culture. Henry James once described the mystery of Shakespeare's genius as following: «I am haunted by the idea that the divine William is the greatest of the mystifiers who have ever existed in this world».

Shakespeare's creative legacy provokes a discussion about the existing influence on him, as most of his works are unique, often the question arises about the authorship of Shakespeare – is it really one person or a number of authors, including Shakespeare hidden under this name. Here I would like even to shift the emphasis from whether Shakespeare really existed, in the classical form, to the question who could be among the authors whom contemporaries recognize as «Shakespeare» and form the basis of textual personality of «Shakespeare». We can assume as in case of Plato and other prominent writers, philosophers, a set of texts already characterize this man, so Plato is the one who wrote all the texts of Plato, Shakespeare is the one who wrote all the texts of Shakespeare. Therefore, we consider this to be the first thesis of our study, based on textual analysis, we can say that there was author Shakespeare who is the author of all Shakespeare's works (usually a tautological statement but this tautology is not imaginary but based on many years of the Shakespeareans' researches). But others could have joined to this

author, Shakespeare's authorship is the essence of Shakespeare's question. Undoubtedly, Shakespeare-actor was involved in the presentations and embodiment, and we hypothesize that author of the texts could be a number of personalities, most of all we adhere to the version that the main author (and ideological inspirer) was Bacon, the poetic part of the texts is associated with Earl Rutland, his friends (not too much) could also have joined the poetic organization of the text. Shakespeare is considered to be the most philosophical and theatrical author of all times, it is this component, in our opinion, that was provided by Francis Bacon and his entourage.

Several versions of Shakespeare's authorship are being spread but they have been more or less refuted, or look very contradictory or unconvincing.

If we summarize all the versions, we can claim that there were two main authors: ideological inspirer and philosopher Francis Bacon and poet with versatile artistic education, Earl Rutland. To mystify and help in the implementation of theatrical plans they hire an actor Shaksper and a great project of truth theatricalization, its «baroqueization» is carried out.

One of the well-known researchers, Marina Litvinova [Litvinova, 2011], conveys this view: «Bacon and Earl Rutland were not just casual friends. In the archives of the Rutlands family I found information that it was Bacon, together with the young Cambridge mentor of Rutland who accompanied an eleven-year-old boy at his father's funeral. He was his tutor and teacher. Shakespeare, in English «Shake-speare», means «to shake with a spear», the Russian analogue of «one who shakes with a spear». This epithet comes from the image of Pallas Athena who is shaking the spear, the patroness of one of the law universities of Grace Inn where Bacon and Rutland were studying, and Bacon once lived there» [Litvinova, 2011].

Figuratively speaking, Pallas Athena was the tenth muse of Francis Bacon: «There is a picture of that time where Athena shakes her spear threatening the ignorance at her feet. There were two theaters right next to Earl Rutland's London estate. These are the Theater and the Curtina, where Burbage's troop played, and to which Stratford Shakespeare belonged. By the way he never signed as «Shakespeare», so this Stratford citizen unlike author of Shakespeare's legacy, is commonly called in Russian «Shakespeare», English «Shakspere». So this way his last will was signed. .. (Bacon and Rutland) wrote the plays of the first decade together. In the second decade after 1603, Rutland was writing alone» [Litvinova, 2011].

Many researchers immediately drew their attention to the discrepancy between Shakespeare's textual personality and the biography of a narrow-minded burgher and moneylender Shaksper who was sometimes engaged in theatrical activities.

For example, Thomas Looney pleads for a more unique version of authorship of Shakespeare's legacy, attributing it to Edwar De Vere, Earl of Oxford (1550-1604) but he outlines the author's psychological and textual portrait correctly, in our opinion. In his speech at Cambridge, Harvey uses the term «Earl of Oxford» to describe personality of the Earl as a person who shakes a spear, but we have already seen that this expression was common among the Cambridges and could be used once by most courtiers with Cambridge education. Thomas Looney builds his version on the application of Latin expression *Vultus tela vibrat* to the Earl of Oxford – «the one who shakes the spear» and a number of other biographical details. But there is not a single manuscript signed by De Vere, and he died early – in 1604, that contradicts the following fact about Shakespeare: after that year mature works of Shakespeare emerge [Gililov, 1997, p. 223-227]. Looney builds a detailed psychological and textual portrait of Shakespeare (we completely agree with these socio-psychological characteristics): he is a noble man close to the court, royalty, well-educated, talented (Shakespeare's dictionary has more than 30 thousand words, most European writers, even brilliant, are limited to 5-8 thousand words), creatively mature, eccentric, sensual, has a perfect knowledge of theater, a developed literary taste, sympathy for Lancaster supporters in the war of the Red and White Roses, knowledge about Italy including its topography, not represented in other sources besides immediate visits and experiences, knowledge of sports including aristocratic falconry, knowledge and love of music and musical instruments, insecurity in relations with women, generosity, benevolence, tolerance, liberal attitude to Catholicism.

M. Litvinova [Litvinova, 2011] makes clear that Rutland was the creator of the poetic heritage but he could not start it on his own, so he was a student and a successor, founder and ideological leader of creative duo or trio when considering theatrical activities and activities veiling true creators of the burgher and actor Shakspeare: «But Earl Rutland could not, as far as he was too young, independently write historical chronicles containing deep historical concept, in fact, Bacon's one. The first chronicle, *Henry VI, Part One*, was played in the summer of 1591, when Rutland was fourteen years old. However, he had been studying at Cambridge for three years already and was very familiar with Bacon. While reading the works of the Baconians, I found facts that unequivocally proved Bacon's involvement in Shakespeare's work. This is what happened in my mind: «William Shakespeare» was created by a great thinker Francis Bacon, and a great poet, Earl of Rutland. Bacon in this work is a Teacher, Earl of Rutland is a Disciple. This student was not only comprehensively artistically gifted but also a strong all-rounder. He was a mathematician, historian, narrator, he had a telescope and geometric tools at home» [Litvinova, 2011].

Let us consider in more detail the figure of the Teacher, Francis Bacon, the founder of a new philosophy and natural sciences that changed the paradigm of Antiquity and Aristotle.

Francis Bacon introduced a completely new strategy for the study of nature. He concludes about the threefold possibility of nature cognition. According to the naturalist and philosopher of nature, nature exists in three states and under triple control. The first is «in free state», the second is «under the influence of the matter distortion», and the third one is «bounded by the power of human art», when «human labour and effort make it possible to see a completely different image of objects, a different world (*universitas*) or a different theater of things».

The first state comprises «species of things, the second one monsters, the third one works of human art (*artificialia*)» [Bacon, 1978, p. 218-219] and is associated with the history of art.

«New Organon» has to not only renew all philosophy and science after Aristotle, but set new foundations for consideration of nature and man, which neither Aristotle nor his predecessors saw or were able to define. With respect to the tradition of natural philosophers of Ancient Greece, Francis Bacon nevertheless notes that Greek philosophers «were too prone to vanity and triviality of founding schools and gaining fame among ordinary people». One cannot hope for the search for truth when «one is inclined to such vanity» [Bacon, 1978, p. 36].

The Aristotelian tradition was so established that any of the innovators were seen as a rebel, and search for truth became possible only in Aristotelian manner, and as for nature it was already considered to be studied through in the body of Aristotelian texts, and this causes the greatest damage to any natural science: «Those who dared to talk about nature as a subject already studied... caused most damage to philosophy and science» [Bacon, 1978, p. 7].

Renaissance brought the greatest discovery – human dignity and freedom of judgment. Francis Bacon finally dares to direct this freedom of views and judgments to nature and man is a part of nature. Thus the naturalist not only breaks up with a tradition but also is responsible for consequences of his scientific research: «when one or another may dare to use freedom of judgment, he or she can perform this work only on his own.. Because in such cases efforts of people are imprisoned, as if in prison, into writings of famous authors. If someone does not agree with them, he will be immediately accused of being a rebel, greedy to change» [Bacon, 1978, p. 53].

Mistakes of predecessors in this area stem from the fact that philosophers were either too fond of sophistry or misunderstood nature itself and its laws, or were guided by superstitions including religious and mythological ones: «Thus, the root of mistakes of false philosophy is threefold: sophistry, empiricism and superstition» [Bacon, 1978, p. 28]. These three sources are analyzed in detail in «New Organon», the researcher has not only to avoid the «idols» of knowledge but also be able to build his own research strategy with the help of induction.

It is not accidental that Francis Bacon refers to concepts of «species» – ideas which exist in nature itself, in things themselves, as well as «idols», «eidolons» – false reflections of ideas, by false copies philosopher must find the truth itself, eternal and unchanged: «Truth should be

sought not in favour of any time which is fleeting, but in the light of experience of nature, which is eternal» [Bacon, 1978, p. 24].

As two wings the bird has, so there must be two directions in human cognition, one of which is already approved by Aristotelian tradition, and the other one is proclaimed by F. Bacon himself. So old scientific apparatus of research is not enough for new tasks, so – «New Organon»: «So, let there be two sources of doctrine and... two communities of observers or philosophers ... Let the first one do the science, the other invent it... we usually call one of our ways prediction of mind, and the other one interpretation of nature» [Bacon, 1978, p. 10].

In addition, the result of knowledge should not only be speculative, theoretical but also practical, «art» is understood by Bacon as ingenuity that benefits all the mankind, it is an «engineering» art that transforms nature and is based at the same time on its laws (rules). Knowledge also gives human being power which he was deprived of, but he is able to achieve it through his mind: «knowledge and power of man coincide because ignorance of the cause makes it difficult to act» [Bacon, 1978, p. 12].

As a result, such knowledge about nature will lead to changes and improvements in human society, not only *New Organon* hints to it, but in several years it will become the leading thought in *New Atlantis*. Philosophy and science do not exist by themselves but for the improvement of man and life of all mankind, so representatives of the utopian world declare the purpose of their society to sailors – «cognition of the causes and hidden power of all things, expanding human power over nature until everything becomes possible for the first one» [Bacon, 1978, p. 509], knowledge is not only might and power but a crucial anthropological factor, a factor of social and Christian progress.

Marina Litvinova is one of the first researchers who draws attention to numerous parallels of ideas and texts of Bacon and Shakespeare: «In Shakespeare's plays and poetry there are not only thoughts but also expressions and statements borrowed from the 1595 notebook of Francis Bacon which wasn't published during his life. Bacon's first major work was published in 1605 (only ten essays had been published before). By that time, three-quarters of Shakespeare's works had already been written. However no even tangible evidence of acquaintance of Shakspere-Stratford and Francis Bacon exist. So, he couldn't have got acquainted with Bacon's thoughts» [Litvinova, 2011].

Most of all Bacon values wits, he passes this intelligence on to his student Rutland and endows Shakespeare with this intelligence. Bacon speaks of wits, citing an old parable about the greatest gift of an orator. Demosthenes believes that the orator first of all needs a gesture, he repeats this statement for three times: everything needed for the orator is a gesture. Bacon explains this parable in such a way that a gesture is a gift due to art of actor, a gift that can be placed above other abilities and talents, the reason for this is a lack of wisdom among most people, so a person, a speaker, an actor who has won over human stupidity, has the greatest power of influence.

Gesture takes into account both wisdom and narrow-mindedness. Apart from Rhetoric, wits are valued the most: «What is needed the most? – Wits. And what is needed secondly and thirdly? – Again, wits. And by the way, wits is a child of lowness and ignorance and cannot be compared to other talents, and yet it fascinates and conquers everybody who is weak-minded or light-hearted, and there are always many of them, at moments of weakness wits conquer the wise» [Bacon, 1978, p. 376].

One of interesting researchers of Shakespearean question, Gililov, without rejecting Bacon's involvement in the authorship of the playwright's legacy, devotes all his works to proving the authorship of another creator hidden behind Shakespeare's mask – Earl of Rutland, and he does a herculian task, including to the authors also Rutland's wife Elizabeth, a poet and a daughter of known at that time poet Sidney who spoke in the minds of contemporaries under the symbolic name of Phoenix (Gililov in particular believes [Gililov, 1997] that Chester's collection «The Martyr of Love» was dedicated to the Rutlands and nobody else). As for this version, we would like to point out that the designation «shaking speare», «shake speare» refers

not so much to Pallas but to the party of patriarchal life which opposed another party in England at that time – the «protofeminist» trend, the weaving and spindle party. So in fact Shakespeare is not a neutral name but the name of ideological defenders of the patriarchal past and patriarchy, that's why in our opinion since its ideological goal was to restore ancient patriarchy and feudalism (Baroque medievalism), they could hardly allow women to join their work consciously – in particular, to wife Elizabeth Rutland and to her aunt who according to some researchers, edited not only Sidney's texts but also the Great Folio's, Mary Sidney Countess of Pembroke.

Gililov describes F. Bacon's participation in Shakespeare's project as following: «Bacon is such a person who could probably be the author or co-author of some Shakespearean works. This is confirmed by some discoveries of the last century. For example, in 1867 a so-called Northumberland manuscript was found, in which the names of Shakespeare's plays «Richard II» and «Richard III» were written in Bacon's hand, a few stanzas from «Lucretia», a funny latinized word from «The Martyr of Love» – honori-ficabilitudina, – and most intriguingly – in his hand the name of William Shakespeare is immediately written. There is no unambiguous explanation of the «Northumberland manuscript» but he is one of few contemporaries whose name Bacon has never mentioned in his works or in numerous letters» [Gililov, 1997, p. 200].

The version of the authorship of Roger Manners under the guise of Shakespeare, namely Earl of Rutland (Rutland Rodger) first appeared in the article of G. Zeigler in 1893, the researcher believes that education in Cambridge, Oxford, Padua, participation in Essex riot, Ben Johnson's hints speak in favour of the fact that under the guise of a clown and new Terence, hides Earl of Rutland, an orphan, and therefore «a child of a state» mentioned in the sonnets. Russian-American professor P. Porokhovshchikov supported and developed this version in the middle of the twentieth century. An important evidence for P. Porokhovshchikov is the original variation of the song from «The Twelfth Night», written in Rutland's handwriting, found and researched in Belvoir, the ancestral estate of the Rutlands.

At the end of XX - beginning of XXI century, the main defender of this hypothesis is Gililov who publishes a thorough study of this issue. Gililov's main proof is Chester's collection dedicated to the Rutlands, to mythological Dove and Phoenix (*The Martyr of Love*). The main discovery that confirms this hypothesis, according to Gililov, is the presence of unicorns as a watermark on Chester's collection paper and the Rutlands' coat of arms. «The unicorn we found on the paper of Chester's collection is present in the Rutlands' coat of arms - there are even two of them there» [Gililov, 1997, p. 96].

Summarizing his evidence that Shakespeare is a poet Rutland (or Rutland and his wife Elizabeth Rutland) Gililov writes the following:

1) – Shakespeare's first poems are dedicated to Earl of Southampton – the best friend of Earl of Rutland, both were avid theatergoers, as evidenced by their correspondence (in particular, on October 13, 1599 when Essex returned and was arrested, R. White wrote to his patron Robert Sidney «Lord Southampton and Lord Rutland do not appear at court, being at the theater every day» [Gililov, 1997, p. 268]). Their Italian teacher John Florio is shown in «The Martyr of Love» in teacher Holofernes, their friend Antonio Perez is portrayed as Don Adrian de Armado. In June 1592, Earl of Rutland spent a few days in the house of Southampton (a letter to Roger's mother, referring to Southampton's visit to Rutland), in 1594 [Gililov, 1997, p. 253] «Venus and Adonis» is dedicated to Southampton and signed by Shakespeare, in 1595 «Disgraced Lucretia» was published, again dedicated to Southampton.

Gililov considers Earl of Southampton and Earl of Pembroke as two closest friends of Shakespeare, to the former first Shakespeare's poems were dedicated, to the latter the Great Folio was [Gililov, 1997, p. 209]. This indicates that Shakespeare belonged to a very aristocratic circle, he was on the same footing, almost equal to kings, his closest friends were Earl of Southampton, Earl of Pembroke, Earl of Montgomery, a provincial bourgeois actor could not even dream of such acquaintances and such behavior in the corresponding historical epoch. Researchers find Shakespeare's sympathy for Essex in Chorus performances in *Henry V* where Essex returning

from Ireland as a hero or king, is glorified and eagerly awaited in 1599, and Shakespeare openly wishes Essex an «Irish revolt on the edge of the sword».

2) – The first theatrical rehearsals were at Cambridge Theater, such plays could be arranged only by the Cambrians (Shakespeare did not study at Cambridge), the first recognition of Shakespeare's work was also among the Cambrians, friends Rutland, Weaver, Barnfield, Covel, Merez. In the student play *The Returning from Parnassus*, Gallio, Rutland's mask, is the author of sonnets and the praise of poet Weaver, and Gallio is the author of sonnets attributed to Shakespeare.

3) – Acquaintance with Italian realias, education in Italy: in the University of Padua Rutland studied with Danish students Rosenkrantz and Guildenstern, the schedule of disciplines in the University of Padua in «The Taming of the Shrew» and other plays. An outstanding discovery of Demblon was the discovery in archives of the University of Padua in Italy of students lists for 1596, where together with Earl Rutland there were students from Denmark, Rosenkrantz and Guildenstern. Demblon also explored the circumstances of Rutland's venerable mission to Denmark in 1603 and their reflection in the second edition (second quarto) of *Hamlet* which emerged in 1604-1606. Demblon's books published before the First World War in France, mark a new stage in the development of Shakespearean studies» [Gililov, 1997, p. 212].

4) – Danish realias appear in *Hamlet* after the trip of Earl Rutland to Denmark including the tradition of celebrating and decorating a throne room with a carpet (in Kronborg Hall where the honorary ambassador from King Jacob Earl Rutland was met by Danish King Christian, there is a silk carpet with images in historical chronology, the carpet is shared in the middle dividing the hall into two parts).

5) – Rutland was a friend, a relative and a supporter of Essex whose glorification is in *Henry V*, after the suppression of speech against Queen Elizabeth which Earl of Rutland suffers from, and Shakespeare's works come to a tragic turning point. F. Bacon stood widely apart, he condemned Essex, moreover Bacon was the official writer-accuser, author of «Declaration of betrayal committed by Robert, Earl of Essex» [Gililov, 1997, p. 202].

Rutland marries the daughter of famous Philip Sidney, Elizabeth, who was nicknamed Phoenix. Her cousin, Earl Pembroke, and his mother, Mary Sidney-Pembroke, were friends with Rutland-Shakespeare, and it was Earl Pembroke who gave Shakespeare's sonnets to the publisher. Precisely to Earl of Pembroke the posthumously published Great Folio was dedicated, initiated and edited by Mary Sidney Countess of Pembroke.

6) – Shakespeare's sonnets play on the family name of the Rutlands – Manners, which is also done by poet Ben Johnson, in particular in the poem dedicated to memory of Shakespeare in the Great Folio, Ben Johnson calls the Rutlands «Poets of the Belvoir Valley». The death of the Rutlands in the summer of 1612 coincides with the completion of Shakespeare's works. *Henry VIII* was added by Fletcher who studied with Earl of Rutland. It is also hypothesized that the publication of the Great Folio is dedicated to the 10th anniversary of the Rutlands' death in 1622, and the Second Folio is dedicated to the twentieth anniversary. The Rutlands monument was made by the Jansen brothers who were also authors of the wall monument to Shakespeare in Stratford Church. It was not easy for the Stratfords to explain why John Fletcher, one of Rutland's Cambridge friends, wrote *Henry VIII* in 1613, since Shakespeare lived for another three years, why couldn't he write his own work without assistance, this finishing writing speaks of the death of one of the main poetic authors of Shakespeare's heritage [Gililov, 1997, p. 389].

7) – A few months after the death of the Rutlands, Shakespeare receives money from their servant and leaves London forever. All that is known about the Rutlands is that Shakespeare was in their house and he was paid money there.

8) – Almost all the books found as basic sources in the works of Shakespeare, are available in the library of Belvoir, Earl of Rutland. There is also a manuscript of the song version of *Twelfth Night*, written, as established by P. Porokhovshchikov, by Rutland, it is «THE ONLY authentic manuscript of Shakespeare's text» [Gililov, 1997, p. 423-424]. There is also information, for example, that in September 1585 the French book by Belfort «Tragic Stories» was purchased

for Rutland's Library in Paris, which became the plot source for *Hamlet*. It is also a number of historical chronicles, including the chronicles of Hall, Holinshed and others, which became a source of historical plots and realias of Shakespeare's works, for example [Gililov, 1997, p. 247].

9) – These are also images of Shakespeare's *Storm* where the main image of Prospero corresponds to Earl Rutland. Prospero embodies the experience and wisdom of a man who will soon say goodbye to life. *Storm* was staged at the royal court in Whitehall on November 1, 1611 and was accepted with sympathy by the monarch. In *Storm* there are allusions to the valley of Belvoir and Earl of Rutland: surprised at the power of Prosper, Sebastian begins to believe in unicorns. As it is known, they decorated the Rutlands' coat of arms, the reign of Phoenix on the throne is pointed out, characters are surprised at islanders' lifestyle, it is a strange manner of their life (II, 1; III, 3) (a play on words manners – Earl Manners). On this island, according to Antonio, the soil is red (a play on words rut – red, tawny – rut, Rutland – red «rusty» land of Belvoir) [Gililov, 1997, p. 388-389].

V. Herman [Herman, 2007] tries to refute this concept, basing on the lists found by the Shakespearean Borukhov: «Boris Borukhov found ... information that one of Shakespeare's contemporaries was a Scottish poet William Drummond, known for his «Conversations with Ben Johnson» (a valuable historical document of the day), collected a library in Scotland and at the same time recorded the books purchased and read over the years. Several such lists of books have been preserved, one of which – for 1606 – lists our collection «The Martyr of love». There is no book itself in the remains of his library or in its catalogues, but it is mentioned in the list: W. Drummond read this book in 1606. Borukhov did not limit himself to old publications, he invited facsimile copies of Drummond's authentic sources from British archives. Everything was confirmed. Thus, this book (even when it was read by Drummond not in a typographic edition but only in a manuscript donated to him by one of the co-authors of the collection) was written in any case no later than 1606 but not after the death of the Rutlands in 1612. It means (in the scientific sense definitely), its content cannot be dedicated to the death of the Rutlands but clearly is dedicated to the death of someone else. This means that Gililov's concept (or rather, a mountain of various hypotheses) has collapsed for science forever» [Herman, 2007].

F. Bacon has a special attitude to love as well as to wits, ingenuity, it is a specific weakness that only in a small number of cases leads to mercy and humanity – it is impossible to love and to be wise at the same time: «Love is always rewarded either with reciprocity, or with hidden and secret contempt. Moreover, men should beware of this passion because it is the reason why other goods are lost with love itself included» [Bacon, 1978, p. 373]. Love is a child of recklessness: «As for other losses, the poet's statement defines them really well: the one who chooses Elena loses the gifts of Juno and Pallas. For he who values passion of love too much loses both wealth and wisdom» [Bacon, 1978, p. 373].

Theater is based on passion of love more than life: «Stage is more prone to love than human life. The reason is that on stage love is usually a subject of comedies, and only sometimes tragedies but in life it brings many misfortunes, sometimes taking a form of a siren, sometimes a fury... And so we believe that love (though infrequently) can find a way not only into a heart that is open to it but into a heart that is secure from it. Epicurus says badly: «Satis magnum alter alteri theatrum sumus» – supposedly a man created to contemplate the heavens and all noble objects, should do nothing but kneel before a small idol and be a slave of not low desires (like animals), but a vision which was given to him for a more sublime purpose» [Bacon, 1978, p. 372-373].

Herman quite successfully explained this expression by Bacon to clear up the theatricality of life and even love itself [Herman, 2007]. Why does Bacon acknowledge ancient wisdom but it is not enough for him, why this expression of Epicurus, in Bacon's interpretation, does not inspire man but rather humiliate him? Because man has a noble gift of Heaven, the sight which identifies him with celestial oasis – the sight, provides an opportunity to contemplate including divine beings (here is not so much a cut-off with Neoplatonism of Renaissance, as its reinterpretation by Bacon from humanistic positions). Passion of love can both open the eyes and obscure it.

Actually this is a quote from Seneca, we see Christianized Stoicism, not Epicureanism itself, Seneca's interpretation of Epicurus' thoughts in a letter to friend in Latin. Herman [Herman, 2007] whose view we share, is not satisfied with the cited academic translation in academic publication and because of such translation Bacon's deep thought loses its meaning; that is, it literally sounds, «Each of us for another one is a great theater» (Bacon F. Essays in 2 volumes / edited by A.L. Subbotin, USSR Academy of Sciences. Moscow, 1972 [Bacon, 1978, p. 371]). Is everyone indeed a real theater for anyone else, when according to Seneca and Epicurus it is about the spaciousness, the infinity of this theater of the world, which ends nowhere, Herman points out to too abstract and unsuccessful translation. The adverb «satis» having a key role in translation, is not translated at all in academic edition. Satis magnum alter alteri theatrum sumus, magnum theatrum sumus – «we are a great theater», «alter alteri» – for each other. The most difficult it is to translate «satis», in relation to this translation Herman [Herman, 2007] emphasizes that «satis» is an adverb which usually means «enough», because «non satis» is «not enough», but also satis can be a part of the verb such as «satis est» – «that's enough». One probable version of the translation, Herman believes, is: «Let's be content that we are an endless theater for each other. «What is Bacon dissatisfied with in Antiquity and Epicureanism, first of all with the self-worth of pleasure, the sensuality of life, the fact that «it has no (more important than life itself) purpose and shouldn't have! It is self-sufficient. What do we need from other people among whom we live? In a best-case scenario, we watch them manifest themselves to us, next to us. They create an additional sensual benefit, a spectacle. Or – a theater» [Herman, 2007]. And we should not expect best from each other, this mutual observation, mutual spectacle is enough, Antiquity and Epicureanism are satisfied with this external spectacle, but Middle Ages, Renaissance and Bacon as a carrier of new thinking phenomena speaks of the lack of old vision, external contemplation, an old theater that plunges deep into things. Therefore, the point of view of Epicurus according to Bacon is «bad», Antiquity is limited by the external, sensual.

Paraphrasing O. Spengler [Spengler, 1998], F. Bacon for the first time sees a new infinite inner «Faustian» space behind the limited corporeality, spherical body, «miracle», «theatron», «spectacle for public». Philosophy of New Age and the corresponding spectacle is being born, psychological, not limited to the old framework, Epicureanism and the old theater can only support «barren» souls who see only the external spectacle, the external theater. These souls do not fulfill their mission, the inner, divine theater remains hidden from them, which, according to Bacon, «bad» [Bacon, 1978, p. 371]. These lost souls, the Epicureans, are satisfied with the outward splendor, theatron, they live with passion, not with inner sight and reason, and rob themselves.

V. Herman [Herman, 2007] in particular tries to convey the position of Bacon, let's note that this position is in general the position of Baroque, various passions, love, kindness are necessary but not sufficient, there is something higher than us, we have a higher purpose, passions are the way but not a purpose of our existence, love is important not in itself, but in the fact that it leads to God and reason, a higher vision: «from the viewpoint of Bacon, human life is not self-sufficient but aimed at a higher meaning of the universe. And – therefore – it is a deal of man on this Earth not to frown at each other, representing theater but to fulfill his or her higher purpose. It is a fundamental ideological dispute! And here – from the viewpoint of this dispute – human love (which is understood quite traditionally as a normal passion of love) belongs to the plane of Epicurean, self-sufficient perception of life and does not fit into system of human service to higher goals of this world» [Herman, 2007].

Such is contradictory understanding of love and theater, its external and internal aspects, Neoplatonic and at the same time modern, Baroque understanding of it, the understanding of Plotinus' «inner» man, which does not fit only into corporeality and external manifestations.

One of manifestations of this two-sided, double-standart theater (inner Divine content in a bright comedic-buffoonery, «Epicurean» spectacle) is Shakespeare's Jacques-melancholic. Everyone who has European education is definitely familiar with this Jacques, it is Jacques on

behalf of Baroque playwright says the words that can be considered both the essence of Shakespeare's theater and the essence of philosophy of Baroque era: «The whole world is a theater // In it women, men – all are actors // They have their own entrances, exits // And everyone plays not a single role there» (II, 7). Here are not only roots of European globalism and cosmopolitanism but also an understanding of dual nature of European theater – a spectacular allegorical debate and at the same time a metaphysical test of the soul. Not surprisingly, shortly before the proclamation of these words of Jacques, the Globe Theater was created on stage – to embody global problems of modernity in artistic dimension, it will be engaged in both modern and contemporary art. The globe in the form of round world was supported by Hercules on his broad shoulders, who greeted the theatrical audience at the entrance of the Globe Theater, another self-ironic Shakespearean metaphor. In the Latin inscription under the «global» image of Hercules the supporter of the earthly order, the same idea about theatricality of the world is found: «The whole world is a stage (the whole world is performed by actor)» («Totus mundus agit histrionem») (histrion is a wandering actor, a tramp, i.e. the same Jacques the Fatalist), whoever was behind his mask, the mask as an actor manifests itself. So the Shakespearean question did not arise and could not arise by Shakespeare's contemporaries, and even a hundred years later because Baroque worldview does not distinguish between mask and figure, when choosing the mask you become it, so this way Earl Rutland and Bacon became an actor Shakespeare. Why it happened is another question, the 1990s talk about conspiracy theories but it is a very modern view, and too far from Baroque and its worldview. There was no conspiracy, there was only a theater, the theater of the world.

Hippolyte Ten prophetically and quite truly remarked that Jacques the Melancholic is one of Shakespeare's best and dearest heroes, a transparent mask behind which «the poet's face is visible». A clown and a buffoon are allowed to do what highly respected gentlemen cannot do including the ability to tell the truth, expose weaknesses, in Slavic cultures such a role is still played by a fool, in Romano-Germanic cultures there is only a buffoon. It's not just Jacques, it's also for example Gallio, a character in Shakespeare's early works: Gallio, a strange character in a «Parnassian» play, is Jacques who made his dream come true, he hides his face and real name under the guise of a clown, and the name of the clown» [Gililov, 1997, p. 283]. One of his best admirers and contemporaries, Ben Johnson, tried to explain Shakespeare's strange portrait as a clown in mask out of this artistic «capture», the English expression *has hit his face* can be read ambivalently – the artist grabbed, found his face and the artist hid (behind the mask) his face, but it is said that the artist managed to «overcome (go beyond) life itself», here art is seen not only as a way to decorate life, its «figures», but how to hide the author in the image, twisting it conditionally, art is unable to grasp the mind, so the engraving refers to Shakespeare's works without revealing or reinforcing his mystery. Shakespeare is not only a clown who has grown into his mask which shows the design of Folio and portraits of Shakespeare and a monument to him, but also the second Terence, a slave who took the teacher's name, so that the teacher could speak the truth freely despite existing social stereotypes and superstitions: it is the epigram of 1610 in the book «Exposing Stupidity», where D. Davis reproduces the existing epigram «Our English Terence, Mr. William Shakespeare» [Gililov, 1997, p. 154-156], those days it was believed that Terence was only a mask, not a real author.

Conclusions, scientific novelty. 1. From philosophical and anthropological positions, creative method and creative works of W. Shakespeare have been analyzed, a strong connection of theater and philosophy of Shakespeare's theater with Baroque theater has been revealed (mysticism, fabulousness, hyperrealism, formal features are replaced by effective ones, usage of parable and utopia (image of King Lear in particular), motives of vanitas (vanity), duality of the world, allegory, «figureness»).

2. Shakespeare suggests a new philosophy of theater based on elimination of borders between reality and art, «baroqueivisation», theatricalization of reality, masks are used as symbols of a real person without distorting it but rather revealing his or her deepest essence, sincerity. It is also reflected in understanding of Shakespeare's authorship problem where mask of a clown

and a buffoon are used in order to convey the deepest and most philosophical thoughts to society .

3. Baroque reform of the theater suggested by Shakespeare, reduces theater to universal anthropological model both synchronically and diachronically. Theater runs around the actor, not only art but life of the universe is carried out via actor. This new philosophy of theater cannot be considered only within the «culture of meanings» (G.U. Gumbrecht) but on principle is within the limits of «culture of presence» (G.U. Gumbrecht), which helps to understand the ideological idea of Shakespeare's theater, to view biography and personality of Shakespeare in a new way because Shakespearean Studies was within the culture of meanings and tried to consider only the hidden codes and symbols of Shakespeare's theater. Beyond these philosophical hermeneutics remained the transforming, effective power of Shakespeare's theater, so Shakespeare's biography is not a line of conspiracies in various social, political or ideological (or gender) interests, but above all a profound reform of theater and poetics in the broadest sense of the word, when art becomes a reformer of reality.

4. Humanization of theater also takes place: based on the old Antique form a new humanistic content is built, where much attention is paid to «life of soul», love, kindness, wits, passion, vengeance, etc., sinfulness of a soul and its ability to clear of evil. Theatre is considered to be not an external spectacle but a deep instrument of immersion in life of a soul and its gradual growth. Since theater is the whole world (in philosophy of culture it can also be identified with the formation of «Faustian soul» (O. Spengler), «Faustian spirit» focused on the infinite formation, the infinity of space), it requires the creation of a corresponding dictionary because the word itself becomes a word-action, acquiring magical properties to transform primarily wandering actor-histrion, and then the entire socio-cultural, and later natural reality.

5. A special role of allegory genre for philosophy of Shakespeare's theater is considered, his philosophy is compared to philosophy of F. Bacon, the hypothesis of Bacon's involvement in the formation of a number of Shakespeare's philosophical ideas is proved, and therefore the problem of authorship in philosophy and philosophy of culture is reconsidered.

REFERENCES

- Ackroyd, P. (2006). *Shakespeare: The Biography*. London: Vintage. 530. (in English).
- Bacon, F. (1978). *Essays in 2 volumes / Compiled, common. ed. A. Subbotin; USSR Academy of Sciences*. Vol.2. Moscow: Thought. (In Russian).
- Bloom, H. (1999). *Shakespeare: The invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead Books. (pp.19-45). (in English).
- Bloom, H. (2008). Heims, Neil (Ed.). *King Lear. Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages. Bloom's Literary Criticism*. New York: (pp.7-10). (in English).
- Dalaqua, G. H. (2020) Aesthetic injustice. *Journal of aesthetics and culture*. 2020, Vol. 12. Pp.1-2, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/20004214.2020.1712183>
- Fischer-Lichte, E. (2018) Philosophical Theatre: Some Reflection on the Concept. *Anglia*. 2018. Vol. 136. Issue 1. (pp.43-60). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/ang-2018-0008>
- Gililov, I.M. (1997). *A game about William Shakespeare, or The Mystery of the Great Phoenix*. Moscow: Artist. Director. Theater, 1997. (In Russian).
- Grady, H. (2001). Modernity, Modernism and Postmodernism in the Twentieth Century's Shakespeare. In. Bristol, Michael; McLuskie, Kathleen (Eds.). *Shakespeare and Modern Theatre: The Performance of Modernity*. New York: Routledge. (pp.20-35). (in English).
- Gumbrecht, G.U. (2020). *Presence production. What value can not pass / trans. from English I. Ivashchenko*. Kharkiv: IST Publishing, 2020. (In Ukrainian).
- Herman, B. (2008). *Portrait of Shakespeare, or the Personal Case of Francis Bacon*. Moscow: Arthouse Media.2008 (In Russian).
- Herman, W. (2007). About the personality of Shakespeare-author. *Image and thought Vol. 29*. 2007. (pp.4-11). URL: <http://lit-obraz.narod.ru/Vipusk29/grmn29.htm> (In Russian).

Litvinova, M. (2011). He sowed the «Storm». URL: <https://rg.ru/2011/01/30/shakespear-poln.html>

Mays, A.&Swanson, J. (2016). Shakespeare Died a Nobody, and Got famous by Accident. *New York Post*, 20 April 2016, Retrived 31 December 2020. (in English).

Shakespeare's Question (2021). URL: https://uk.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%A8%D0%B5%D0%BA%D1%81%D0%BF%D1%96%D1%80%D1%96%D0%B2%D1%81%D1%8C%D0%BA%D0%B5_%D0%BF%D0%B8%D1%82%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%BD%D1%8F (In Ukrainian).

Spengler, O. (1998). *Sunset of Europe. Essays on the morphology of world history*. Moscow: Mysl. Vol.2. (In Russian).

Ukrainian Shakespeare Portal (2020). URL: [shakespeare.znu.edu.ua // http://shakespeare.in.ua/en](http://shakespeare.in.ua/en) (In Ukrainian).

Wilson, R. (2004). *Secret Shakespeare: Studies in Theatre, Religion and Resistance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 326. (in English).

Tytar Olena V.

ScD in Philosophy, professor

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University

6, Svobody sqr., 61022, Kharkiv, Ukraine

E-mail: tytarolena77@gmail.com, lena_tytar@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-1951-7830

Article arrived: 10.04.2021

Accepted: 11.05.2021

ТЕАТР ЖИТТЯ В. ШЕКСПІРА ТА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТЕАТРУ ДОБИ БАРОКО: «ФАУСТІВСЬКИЙ ДУХ» ОПАНОВУЄ АНТИЧНУ ФОРМУ

Титар Олена Володимирівна

доктор філософських наук, професор кафедри теорії культури і філософії науки

Харківський національний університет імені В.Н. Каразіна

м. Свободи, 6, 61022, Харків, Україна

E-mail: tytarolena77@gmail.com, lena_tytar@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0002-1951-7830

АНОТАЦІЯ

Мета статті – виявити складові творчого методу та антропологію театру Шекспіра, порівняти театр Шекспіра з театром бароко, проаналізувати різні концепції шекспіріани. Методи дослідження – герменевтичний, культурна антропологія, історично-культурний, аналітичний, психоаналіз. З філософсько-антропологічної позиції проаналізований творчий метод та творчість В. Шекспіра, виявлений тісний зв'язок театру та філософії театру Шекспіра з театром бароко (містичність, казковість, гіперреалістичність, формальні ознаки замінюються дієвими, використання притчі та утопії (зокрема, образ Короля Ліра), мотивів ванітас (суетності), подвійності світу, алегоричності, «фігурності»). Шекспір пропонує нову філософію театру, що заснована на стиранні межі між дійсністю та мистецтвом, бароковізації, театралізації дійсності, маски використовуються як символи справжньої особистості, що не викривляють персону, а навпаки, розкривають її найглибшу сутність, щирість. Це також відображається у розумінні проблеми авторства Шекспіра, який використовує маску паяца та блазня для того, щоб донести до суспільства найглибші та найфілософичніші думки. Барокова реформа театру, запропонована Шекспіром, зводить театр до універсальної антропологічної моделі, як в синхронічному, так і діахронічному аспекті. Театр обертається навколо актора, через актора здійснюється не тільки мистецтво, а й життя усього Всесвіту. Ця нова філософія театру не може розглядатись тільки в межах «культури значень» (Г.У. Гумбрехт), а принципово знаходиться в межах «культури присутності», що допомагає зрозуміти ідейний замисел шекспірівського театру і по-новому подивитись на біографію та

особистість самого Шекспіра, оскільки шекспірознавство знаходилося у межах культури значень і намагалось розглянути лише приховані коди та символи шекспірівського театру, то за цими межами філософської герменевтики залишалась перетворююча, дієва сила Шекспірівського театру. Відбувається також гуманізація театру: на основі старої античної форми будується новий гуманістичний зміст, де велика увага приділяється «життю душі», любові, доброті, кмітливості, пристрасті, мстивості, тощо, гріховності душі та її здатності очиститись від зла, театр розглядається вже не як зовнішнє видовище, а як глибокий інструмент занурення у життя душі та її поступового зростання. Оскільки театр – весь світ (в філософії культури це також може бути ототожнено зі становленням «фаустівської душі», орієнтовної на нескінченне становлення, безконечність простору), то він вимагає створення відповідного словника, оскільки саме слово стає словом-дією. Розглядається особлива роль жанру алегорії для філософії театру В. Шекспіра, порівняно його філософію з філософією Ф. Бекона.

Ключові слова: герменевтика, філософія культури, культурна антропологія, Шекспір, поезика, філософія театру, культура присутності, філософія бароко, психоаналіз.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

Бэкон Ф. Сочинения в 2 томах / Сост., общ. ред., пред. А. Субботина; Ин-т филос. АН СССР. Москва: Мысль, 1978. Т.2, 575 с.

Герман В. О личности Шекспира-автора. *Образ и мысль*. 2007. Вып. 29. С.4-11. URL: <http://lit-obraz.narod.ru/Vipusk29/grmn29.htm>

Герман В. Портрет Шекспира, или Личное дело Фрэнсиса Бэкона. Москва: Артхаус медиа, 2008. 304 с.

Гилилов И. М. Игра об Уильяме Шекспире, или Тайна великого феникса. Москва: Артист. Режиссер. Театр, 1997. 474 с.

Гумбрехт Г.У. Продуктування присутності. Що значення не може передати / пер. з англ. І. Іващенко. Харків: IST Publishing, 2020. 186 с.

Литвинова М. Посеявший «Бурю». URL: <https://rg.ru/2011/01/30/shakespeare-poln.html>

Український Шекспірівський портал (2020) *shakespeare.znu.edu.ua* [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://shakespeare.in.ua/uk>

Шекспірівське питання. URL: https://uk.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%A8%D0%B5%D0%BA%D1%81%D0%BF%D1%96%D1%80%D1%96%D0%B2%D1%81%D1%8C%D0%BA%D0%B5_%D0%BF%D0%B8%D1%82%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%BD%D1%8F

Шпенглер О. Закат Европы. Очерки морфологии мировой истории / Пер. с нем. Москва: Мысль, 1998. Т.2, 606 с.

Ackroyd P. Shakespeare: The Biography. London: Vintage, 2006. 530 p.

Bloom H. Shakespeare: The invention of the Human. New York: Riverhead Books, 1999. pp.19-45.

Bloom H. King Lear. Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages / N. Heims, (ed.). *Bloom's Literary Criticism*. New York: 2008. Pp.7-10.

Dalaqua G. H. Aesthetic injustice. *Journal of aesthetics and culture*. 2020, Vol. 12. Pp.1-2. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/20004214.2020.1712183>

Fischer-Lichte E. Philosophical Theatre: Some Reflection on the Concept. *Anglia*. 2018. Vol. 136. Issue 1. Pp.43-60. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/ang-2018-0008>, www.degruyter.com

Grady H. Modernity, Modernism and Postmodernism in the Twentieth Century's Shakespeare. *Bristol, Michael; McLuskie, Kathleen (eds.). Shakespeare and Modern Theatre: The Performance of Modernity*. New York: Routledge, 2001. Pp.20-35

Mays A., Swanson J. Shakespeare Died a Nobody, and Got famous by Accident. *New York Post*, 20 April 2016, Retrived 31 December 2020.

Wilson R. Secret Shakespeare: Studies in Theatre, Religion and Resistance. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004. 326 p.

Стаття надійшла до редакції: 10.04.2021

Схвалено до друку: 11.05.2021