

**Chapter 1 : Shakespeare's Outrageous Sexual Puns « PoemShape**

*Sexuality. Like so many circumstances of Shakespeare's personal life, the question of his sexual nature is shrouded in uncertainty. At age 18, in , he married Anne Hathaway, a woman who was eight years older than he.*

Those who recollect such scenes, must all rejoice, we should think, that Mr Bowdler has provided a security against their recurrence; and, as what cannot be pronounced in decent company cannot well afford much pleasure in the closet, we think it is better, every way, that what cannot be spoken, and ought not to have been written, should now cease to be printed. Bowdler, in a preface to his edition, drew a careful distinction between the editor of a literary text and any presumptuous artist who might take it upon him to retouch a painting or sculpture. They can produce a strong emotional effect in certain readers simply by the fact of being bawdy. This remains true even in the comparatively uninhibited s. Yet such evidence as we have from sociologists and psychologists suggests that the verbal expression of ideas connected with sex and non-sexual coprology does still elicit a marked emotional response from most English-speaking readers. People think them healthy, comic, improper, distasteful, offensive or sinister as a result of their tending to defy widely respected if ill-defined standards of chastity or propriety. Perhaps the most obvious fluctuations in ideas of what is proper, at least as far as the English-speaking nations are concerned, can be seen in conversations about pregnancy, childbirth, contraception, and even just the female legs and feet. All those unmentionables of the nineteenth-century English middle classes are now largely free of taboo: Secondly, how far did Elizabethan and Jacobean notions of indecency differ from those most readily acknowledgedâ€”permissively or otherwiseâ€”among English-speaking people today? An initial distinction must be made between sexuality in general and indecency in particular. Quite obviously, not all sexual writing is indecent. A medical textbook or a manual on birth control will be much concerned with the sexual organs and their functioning, but cannot be described as bawdy. In literature too, a great deal of writing about sex and sexual mores is rendered, by its seriousness, utterly remote from bawdy. Consider, for instance, *Madame Bovary*. Bawdy, as distinct from straightforward sensuality, always partakes of the comic, whether through absurdity, grossness or a startling ingenuity. It need not actually be funny, any more than a pun needs to be funny in order to be recognised as a pun, but it often consists in that form of the absurd in which something physical is unexpectedly introduced when something spiritual is at issue. Again, in its least humorous forms, bawdy can be identified by its quality of caricature. It exaggerates, sometimes to the point of being downright bizarre, but sometimes only quite mildly. As with other forms of the grotesque in literature, the reader or listener has to be alert to fine differences in context and fine gradations of tone. Such a phrase is rolled on the tongue, as one critic has put it,<sup>3</sup> while its speaker savours both the picture evoked and the torture in inflicts. Similarly, Othello himself is being bawdy, though with deadly seriousness, when he speaks to Emilia and Desdemona as if they were in a brothel. The sexual accusations become indecent by being perversely distorted. So we have an axiom: It also has to be at once more and less than sensual. Inasmuch as it labours the physical, it is sensual; but its other aspect is the exercise of wit, and this requires that the speaker remain partly at a distance from what he contemplates. Bawdy is often indirect, metaphorical or allusive. Only at its least subtle does it use blunt, unequivocal terms of sexual description, the familiar four-letter words. Shakespeare invariably suppresses these in favour of euphemistic or pseudoeuphemistic substitutes: Again you find substituted words carrying the ideasâ€”case, foin and the like. The area is shady and ill-defined. Its borders are always uncertain, and they can waver mercurially from moment to moment as a conversation or poem proceeds. The region provides breeding grounds for fantasy, as we have already seen with Othello. Most of his allusions to the consummation of marriage are of this neutral kind, as also are his references to childbirth, suckling and, quite often, illegitimacy. Some of this sexually slanted, but non-bawdy, material receives attention in the chapters that follow, but only when it has proved to have a bearing on genuinely indecent passages. More often, serious unexaggerated sexuality can be passed over without special mention. Yet the distinction between the two modes of sexuality will have to be made continually, so it will be worth while at this stage to consider in general terms how far Elizabethan notions of the indecent differed from some of those of the present day. In

this, as in any other matter, Shakespeare is not always bound by convention, but we do at least have to be aware of the prevailing conventions of his time if we are to interpret his words sanely. Non-sexual obscenity has changed comparatively little in England across four centuries. More remote from a twentieth-century viewpoint, but clear enough from the attitudes of characters within the plays, is the medieval and Renaissance cherishing of bad breath as a source of ribald humour. The joke has lost its popularity—progressively, I would suppose, with the advance of modern dentistry—though like nose-picking and scratching, halitosis remains a topic widely avoided in everyday conversation. Since these asexual types of impropriety are only marginal to investigation of the sexual, this book could have disregarded them without serious loss. But it happens that when Shakespeare resorts to non-sexual indecency he nearly always does so in a context that is already bawdy in a sexual way. While it would be perfectly logical, then, to rule coprophilous indecency out of this whole discussion, on the grounds of its being asexual, it is easy and usually helpful to consider it alongside the sexual scurrility which tends to accompany it in the plays. Turning to sexual indecency itself, we find a much wider range of Elizabethan subject matter. To begin with, almost any Renaissance comedy, Shakespearean or not, draws on much the same sources of sexual humour as any mid-twentieth-century television farce. There are likely to be jokes about the male and female reproductive organs; about articles of clothing that have sexual implications codpieces, points, hose, plackets, smocks, and bodices low-cut or tight-laced ; about lust, and especially the lust of bachelors, husbands or widows; about frigidity, and especially the frigidity of wives; about adultery and prostitution; and of course about sexual promiscuity generally. Where the Elizabethan selection does differ noticeably from the parallel list one might compile from popular entertainment of the present day it is chiefly in a preference for jokes about cuckoldry, castration or itinerant friars as opposed to, say, birth control, homosexuality or seductive typists. The causes of some of these differences are too obvious to need comment. The Elizabethans did not have typists or reliable methods of birth control—though some of them had ambitions to contraception: How should we maintain our youth and beauty else? Many births of a woman make her old, as many crops make the earth barren. We do, on the other hand, still have adultery, and this makes it interesting that cuckoldry has lost much of the mirthprovoking force which it clearly possessed four centuries ago. Its decline may perhaps be attributable to the loosening of patriarchal ties in a society that has, in general, grown less concerned than it used to be with questions of inheritance. Any act of adultery on the part of a married woman was a potential destroyer of lineage and hence of that ordered security which nowadays depends much more on the independently earned incomes of successive generations. It chanced that in the midst of a Play, after long expectation for Tarlton, being much desired of the people at length he came forth: Tarlton to make sport at the least occasion given him, and seeing the man point with one finger, he in love againe held up two fingers: No quoth Tarlton, they be fingers: For there is no man which in love to mee Lends me one finger, but he shall have three. No, no, sayes the fellow, you gave me the homes: Humour dealing with homosexuality shows up another shift in social attitudes, though here the evidence from Elizabethan drama is harder to weigh. In the first place, emotional friendships between men were an accepted part of Renaissance life, and the gradations between simple admiration and homosexual lust seem to have been even wider in range and subtler in kind than they are now. When young men shared a bed, it was likely to be regarded as a matter of mere convenience rather than as the indulgence of a sexual inversion. The same was true, and remained so for much longer, of pairs of young women. At least one of the sonnets number 20 — shows Shakespeare rebutting the suggestion of physical homosexuality, but, viewed in the light of the sequence as a whole, that attempt to etherealise the love affair looks specious. When the plays glance at sodomy it is with reticence and distaste. Now, the rotten diseases of the south, the guts-gripping ruptures, — incurable bone-ache, and the rivelled fee-simple of the tetter, take and take again such preposterous discoveries! Generally, his allusions to buggery are few in number and ambiguous in tenor. It could be condemning only the art of deliberate misunderstanding, as cultivated by Fluellen and Macmorris, but the considerable force of the word foul in early modern English, and the frequent occurrence of a sexual flavour in fault, together suggest a double entendre. If my suspicion is right and this is a joke based on the idea of the two disputants homosexually mis-taking one another, its very ambiguity looks defensive, a kind of evasion. So far as one can judge, then, Shakespeare seems to have shared

in the conventional disapproval of sodomy which found further theatrical expression through Jonson, Middleton, Tourneur and others. The practice of sodomy in such high places, however, would not have been likely to make the dramatists more outspoken about it. And the law remained unchanged: Coke mentions only one Jacobean prosecution for a homosexual offence: It was not that the deadly nature of syphilis went unrecognised. But the writers of medical treatises were not yet able to distinguish between syphilis and the other sexually transmitted diseases—“infections that were much less dangerous, but which simultaneously affected many of the syphilitic patients. Interesting though they are, these various changes in the prevailing modes of sexual humour over the centuries are only a part of what has to be taken into account for the assessment of Shakespearean indecency. An equally important kind of change is the purely semantic. In sexual matters, more than in most others, individual words have tended to change their meaning or force, often under the pressure of changing fashions in slang. Aunt, for example, can no longer mean prostitute, unless in some special stage situation which explicitly sets up the euphemism. Aching bones, coughing, a cracked voice and whitening or thinning hair do not nowadays suggest venereal illness, as they do for Timon of Athens and for Pandarus in Troilus and Cressida. The cart is no longer a standard punishment for prostitutes. Appetite, in modern usage, has lost the sense sexual appetite or lust, just as light no longer invites semantic punning on a secondary meaning forward, wanton. Contrariwise, bastard has lost much of its scabrous weight by declining into common usage as a vague expletive. Thereafter the word fails to hold its place in the spoken language even as a soldierly expletive. Cuckold and bawd have also vanished from everyday speech, while bawdy and bawdry survive only in comparatively sophisticated usually literary contexts, and pox only in medical compounds such as chicken-pox. As regards our recognising sexual indecency when we come to it, however, neither old-fashioned subject matter nor obsolete vocabulary represents the major difficulty. The archaic and the puzzling at least alert us, as we read, to the need for research. The trickiest problem lies rather in responding accurately to the sexual innuendo of a bygone age. What about these crooners, eh? What about these crooners? Look at the stuff they sing. Look at the songs they sing! John Osborne, equipping his Entertainer with that music-hall joke, can count on us to see it, and to appreciate its hackneyed quality, because it is rooted in the subsoil of a popular culture which is still familiar. But with this, compare Ben Jonson inviting a friend to supper. Capers can suggest kidlike even goatish? Mutton crops up frequently in the Elizabethan period as a cant term for prostitute, or at any rate to denote a sexually available woman. A short-legged hen is more innocent, but play-house poultry are prostitutes in Bartholomew Fair II. Coney, although commonest in its straightforward sense rabbit and its slang extension to gull or naive victim, sometimes becomes a term of endearment for a woman, decently or indecently OED, cony, sb. The Martial poem is not in any way erotic, but Jonson is, as usual, adapting, not merely translating, so he is not in any way bound by the limits of his Latin original.

**Chapter 2 : William Shakespeare - Sexuality | [blog.quintoapp.com](http://blog.quintoapp.com)**

*The sexuality of William Shakespeare has been the subject of recurring debate. It is known from public records that he married Anne Hathaway and that they had three children; scholars have analysed their relationship through these documents, and particularly through the bequests to her in Shakespeare's will.*

Whoever hath her wish, thou hast thy Will, And Will to boot, and Will in over-plus; More than enough am I that vexed thee still, To thy sweet will making addition thus. Wilt thou, whose will is large and spacious, Not once vouchsafe to hide my will in thine? Shall will in others seem right gracious, And in my will no fair acceptance shine? The sea, all water, yet receives rain still, And in abundance addeth to his store; So thou, being rich in Will, add to thy Will One will of mine, to make thy large will more. Let no unkind, no fair beseechers kill; Think all but one, and me in that one Will. Commentators have identified six or seven relevant meanings not all of them bawdy. Any reader of the two sonnets this and the following one soon realises that the hidden meanings are of greater importance than the surface meaning. One therefore has to be aware of these other meanings to make sense out of apparent nonsense. It must be said that the poem is not entirely flattering to the woman addressed. One wonders whether or not she was ever shown any of these productions. Probably not, because they are written so entirely from a male perspective that it would be considered appropriate only to circulate them within a coterie of male friends. Women were considered to be deficient in understanding of many topics. But here the subject matter is, apart from its indelicacy, of such a nature that any woman seeing it, if she were of an independent mind, would be inclined to dismiss it as being typical male mythology, totally unrelated to the way in which women act and think. For it is based on the viewpoint, common to all male dominated societies, that the female through her sexuality constitutes a threat to established order. Any woman was potentially regarded as a man eater and capable of alluring males to her so that they might be held in bondage for evermore, as in the Homeric myth of Circe. Although not clearly stated, except perhaps in folk literature, the bondage was often that of having to satisfy her enormous sexual appetite. The answer finally given is that they most wish for dominion over their husbands, but many counter suggestions are made before this conclusion is reached. Let the child then sucke his fill, Let the woman have her will, All will hush was heard before, Ah and Oh will cry no more. The sonnet, working on a similar theme, is about as direct as it could be, and it implies that the woman has a capacious vagina, that she takes all comers, and that she cannot get enough of them. Nevertheless the sonnet is essentially one of despair. The most interesting precursor of this sonnet is The Ballad of Will which is uncertainly attributed to Thomas Wyatt. I give the text of it below in the additional notes. The meanings of will which recur throughout the poem are as follows. Wish, desire; thing desired. Carnal desire, lust, sexual longing. A slang term for the male sex organ. As in - this night he fleshes his will in the spoil of her honour. A slang term for the female sex organ. The difficulty with following the typescript rigidly is that the Q text is generally very arbitrary in such matters, in some sonnets italicising a word while in others, where the use seems to be exactly comparable, a plain typeface is used. However even that explanation is doubtful for its occurrences in lines 2, 11 and 12 only obliquely fits that meaning. Readers in any case have to bear in mind the large numbers of meanings which the word carries, and allow in each case the relevant suggestions to filter into their minds. There is general agreement about a , but no one knows if b and c are relevant. None of the other lines of the poem confirm unequivocally that there is more than one William, although it seems quite clear that there is more than one lover. But the evidence is far from clear and may be interpreted either way, for Will or not for Will. Will here probably puns on the meanings William, sexual craving, penis. More than enough am I that vexed thee still, This and the following line are of uncertain import. Shakespeare uses the word fairly frequently, but not elsewhere with sexual innuendo. To thy sweet will making addition thus. The difficulty with these two lines 3 and 4 is that they are out of harmony with the rest of the poem. But if that is so, then the subsequent begging for admittance is not necessary. He is already receiving what he claims to be so desirous of. Perhaps one could solve the problem by putting a question mark at the end of this line, causing the am I of the previous line to be an interrogative rather than a direct statement of fact. Are you not willing to? Not once vouchsafe to hide my

will in thine? A word much in use in the bible and prayer books generally. The liturgical vocabulary of words such as vouchsafe, gracious, will, brings this sonnet to the edge of an abyss of blasphemy. It is almost as if the poet, in his agony, wishes to be arraigned for his idolatrous infatuation. But it is difficult to believe that he was unaware of these echoes. Possibly he decided to allow them not because he wished to drag in the sacred name of the Godhead to a sordid affair of sexual mistrust, but to point the moral that all love is equally mysterious and can never find the appropriate or adequate words to transmit or explain itself. Possibly with a hint of class snobbery. And in my will no fair acceptance shine? The sea, all water, yet receives rain still, The poet now turns to a more grandiose metaphor from nature. Surely if the sea can continue to receive moisture from all sources then his beloved can follow such an example and take all those who desire her. The same metaphor is used in Twelfth Night. In fact it is not so, since the Twelfth Night episode finishes with an image of male detumescence, and quite possibly the whole speech was accompanied with obscene gestures on the stage. O spirit of love! The date of Twelfth Night is c. So thou, being rich in Will, add to thy Will Just as the sea, being rich in water, adds still more, so you, being rich in Will in its various senses , may add yet more to your desires and Wills. One will of mine, to make thy large will more. See the next sonnet, line Let no unkind, no fair beseechers kill; A difficult line, with no agreement as to its meaning. The fair beseechers are the lovers of the fair damsel. Alternatively unkind may be taken as a noun signifying cruelty. Think all but one, and me in that one Will. Good faith, how foolish are our minds! Up with my tent there! Who hath descried the number of the foe? The meanings of this line are deliberately laden with ambiguities and innuendo. Additional notes I will and yet I may not, The more it is my pain. What thing I will, I shall not. Wherefore my will is vain. Will willing is in vain, This may I right well see. Although my will would fain, My will it may not be. Because I will and may not, My will is not my own. For lack of will I cannot, The cause whereof I moan. Between I will and shall not My love cannot obtain. Thus wishers wants their will And that they will do crave. But they that will not will Their will the soonest have. Since that I will and shall not, My will I will refrain. Thus, for to will and will not, Will willing is but vain. This poem is found in a manuscript BM Harleian 78 containing other Wyatt poems. Muir gives it as a doubtful Wyatt poem. If it is a genuine Wyatt poem, or contemporary with him, it predates this sonnet by at least fifty years.

**Chapter 3 : Shakespeare Quotes, Quotations & Sayings**

*William Shakespeare is widely regarded as one of the greatest writers of all time, and his plays have entertained, inspired, and instructed for centuries. One thing your high school English.*

Shakespeare, Spenser, Daniel and Drayton all settle on a single Sonnet scheme. When Sidney was writing, the Sonnet was still an unestablished form. He was creating it in the act of writing it. What might appear to be eccentric or radical has more to do with his search for a form that satisfies his own aesthetics. If you want a brief but good introduction to Sidney how to understand some of the themes central to his poetry and how they differ from modern day concerns I strongly recommend Sir Philip Sidney. *Atrophil and Stella* by Peter Sinclair. I just discovered his blog and think very highly of it. The latter website includes a variety of links to his works. All unmarked feet are iambic. That she dear She might take some pleasure of my pain: It is the fullest of the early texts and includes songs as they are given here some texts have none, others only some , lyric embellishments on the narrative running through the sonnets. The book appears to be out-of-print, or I would provide a link. What Wright does is to treat certain phrases as a double foot. So, in the first line, a standard reading would read the line as Iambic Hexameter with a trochaic first foot: In his later sonnets, double feet can consist of two trochees, for example, an effect that would all but disappear from shorter Elizabethan poems – treated as incompetent. Sidney must have been well aware of the trends – that poets, like Spenser, Daniel and Drayton were increasingly favoring a strong Iambic Pentameter line. He was writing a line that was more typical of French Poetry, the Alexandrine, and trying to naturalize it if not reconcile it with accentual syllabic verse more natural to the English language. In the French poetry of the time, the Alexandrine was not as patterned as it was to become at the hands of the 17th century French Dramatists. So, the form of the Alexandrine with which Sidney was familiar, was a less patterned, syllabic line. That he was familiar with the Alexandrine is apparent from his *Defence of Poetry*: Now for the rhyme [modern accentual verse], though we do not observe quantity, yet we observe the accent very precisely, which other languages either cannot do, or will not do so absolutely. That caesura, or breathing place in the midst of the verse, neither Italian nor Spanish have, the French and we never almost fail of. And there is also the parallelism of meter – each having a double foot trochee-iamb. Sidney seems to be combining syllabic French Influence with accentual syllabic English Influence verse in a strict dodecasyllabic line. The variant double feet seemed to give Sidney some flexibility in the patterning of his syntax. Through such arrangements of meter and phrasing, Sidney finds a convincing tonal correlative for the psychological states of the Petrarchan lover and opens up iambic pentameter to a whole new order of English Speech. Sidney may have been dissatisfied with Alexandrines, or more attracted to the developing decasyllabic lines of Iambic Pentameter. The rest of his sonnets are decasyllabic. That said, he carries over the technique of the double foot into his decasyllabic sonnets. In our day, his decasyllabic sonnets would easily fall within the confines of Iambic Pentameter. That is, most would readily identify them as Iambic Pentameter. Interpreting Sonnet 1 In his own day, though, his meter was much more experimental than that – miles apart from the sonnets Spenser was writing. And speaking of which, I quick word on interpreting the sonnet: That the dear She might take some pleasure of my pain: This line works on many levels because of the word pain. Pain was also a reference to orgasm as it is now. So – Sidney is slyly suggesting that, if only his Sonnets achieve their aim, she might take some pleasure her own orgasm from his orgasm. If you think this far-fetched, then I would recommend a book like *Filthy Shakespeare*. The Elizabethans saw life very differently than we do. Death and sex was ever present. Life, in all its glory and decay, was intimate. The Elizabethans were all too ready to find sly humor in the crudities of life – much to the dismay and denial of our more puritan contemporaries. Does he simply mean that she will know that he loves her? The phrase to bibically know someone comes from this era. To know someone possessed the double sense of having sex, just as it does now. So – Sidney is saying that if she reads his sonnets, she might come to know him, have sex with him. He is continuing the playful double-entendre of the previous line. Knowledge might pity win, and pity grace obtain The first quatrain closes, appropriately, with the attainment of grace. Why is my verse so barren of new pride, So far from variation or quick change? Why

with the time do I not glance aside To new-found methods and to compounds strange? Why write I still all one, ever the same, And keep invention in a noted weed, That every word doth almost tell my name, Showing their birth and where they did proceed? O, know, sweet love, I always write of you, And you and love are still my argument; So all my best is dressing old words new, Spending again what is already spent: For as the sun is daily new and old, So is my love still telling what is told. They loved nothing more than the display of wit in rhetoric and debate. Formally, though the meter of Sonnet 1 is written in Alexandrines, the closing couplet typifies the majority of his sonnets. All that changes, between these 83 sonnets, is the rhyme scheme leading up to the closing couplet. Sonnet 1 – Three Interlocking Sicilian Quatrains: The rhyme scheme of Sonnet 1, as mentioned before, comes closest to the Shakespearean Sonnet, saving its epigrammatic couplet for the close of the sonnet. The whole of the sonnet feels driven toward the concluding couplet. Sonnet 2 is a sort of hybrid between Petrarchan and English Sonnets. The nested couplets in the first and second quatrain make the first octave feel more self-contained, more like a Petrarchan Sonnet. And here is yet another Sidneyan experiment – a sonnet composed in Identical Rhyme. Tired with the dusty toils of busy day, Languished with horrors of the silent night, Suffering the evils both of day and night, While no night is more dark then is my day, Nor no day hath less quiet then my night: With such bad-mixture of my night and day, That living thus in blackst winter night, I feele the flames of hottest summer day. I tell the day, to please them thou art bright And dost him grace when clouds do blot the heaven: One gets the feeling that Shakespeare was measuring himself against Sidney. The second form, unfortunately in the minority, is typified by Sonnet He was trying to do something different – at least if judged against his contemporaries. Only Donne would come close. So, while his sonnets might not have been considered Iambic Pentameter in his own day, Sidney was using Iambic Pentameter as a basic pattern from which to vary. This sonnet form the Sonnet above was, to my knowledge, was first used by Sidney probably created by him and never used again. It does something very unique. The couplet assumes the role of a sort of epigrammatic volta, the embodiment of the Petrarchan turn, neatly hinging the subject matter. This Sidneyan form clearly demarcates the sonnet into two parts – the Octave, a hinging heroic Couplet, and a summarizing quatrain. The form is, perhaps, the most legal-like, attorney-esque form in all of poetry – perfectly suited to the Elizabethan temperament of discourse, reason, balance, thesis and antithesis. The heroic couplet aurally reinforces the turn in disquisition – subliminally. The heroic couplet of the volta therefore feels less like a summation than a hinge between two distinct parts. Interpreting Sonnet 80 Sonnet 80 stretches the notion of the conceit almost to the limit – verging on fetish by modern standards. Swell with pride, he says. The word slide was every bit as suggestive in Elizabethan days as now. Just which lip is he talking about? All fairly innocent stuff. Then he knowingly suggests his real meaning. Anyway, Sidney, as if suspecting that he may be skirting obviousness – becomes somewhat more platonic with the Hinge Couplet: Sweet lip, he writes, you teach my mouth with one sweet kiss. Interpret that how you will. Both sonnets end with a kiss. Since saucy jacks so happy are in this, Give them thy fingers, me thy lips to kiss. To all and any – if this post was helpful, was enjoyable, or if you have further questions or suggestions, please comment!

**Chapter 4 : Bawdy Bard: How To Find the Sex in Shakespeare | The Mary Sue**

*Sexual Shakespeare is the first book to argue that Shakespeare's sexuality has always presented a problem to readers, who thus have a tendency to desexualize him.*

Anderson, led by Captain Jesse Cooper. The other, captained by Ernest McSorley, was the S. The ship was last seen on radar around 7: Edmund Fitzgerald, and what happened to it that fateful day: The large cargo vessels that roamed the five Great Lakes were known as lakers, and the S. Edmund Fitzgerald was, at the time, the biggest ever built. It was christened on June 8, , and made its first voyage on September 24 the same year. The chairman of Northwestern Mutual had a long history with the Great Lakes shipping industry. November is a brutal month on the Great Lakes. Frequent storms and hurricane-force winds can batter even the toughest-built freighters. It left at 2: A second ship, the Arthur M. Gale warnings had been issued by the National Weather Service the previous day, and by the morning of the 10th, the advisories had been upgraded to an official storm warning. As swells reached 35 feet and winds raged at nearly mph, the ship contacted Coast Guard officials in Sault Ste. Marie and said they were taking on water. After that, there was nothing on the radar. The ship was approximately 15 miles north of Whitefish Point when it seemingly vanished. Captain Cooper, on the Anderson, was in contact with the Coast Guard and made it to Whitefish Point sometime after 8 p. Later, the Anderson made its way back into the storm to search for the ship, but found only a pair of lifeboats and debris. Along with the captain, the other crew members of the Fitzgerald included porters, oilers, engineers, maintenance workers, cooks, watchmen, deck hands, and wheelmen. Most crew members were from Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, and Minnesota. The treacherous weather conditions are an obvious factor, but experts differ on what they think specifically caused the accident. Following the wreck, the U. Coast Guard and National Transportation Safety Board agreed that the tragedy was likely due to faulty cargo hatches, which led to flooding. Predictably, there are still those who harbor other theories, including unsecured hatches, maintenance troubles, massive waves, structural issues, and yes, even aliens. Author and Great Lakes historian Frederick Stonehouse posited that the ship likely hit a shoal and took on too much water before plunging into Lake Superior. Navy and Coast Guard deployed planes and cutters with magnetic anomaly detectors, sidescan sonar, and sonar survey to find the wreckage. In May, a Navy underwater recovery vehicle was sent to the site, and on May 20, , the ship was spotted below the surface of the lake. In the decades since, only a handful of people have been able to see the wreck, which lies in two pieces. A pair of divers made their way down in , the same year a crewâ€™ with help from the Canadian Navy, the National Geographic Society, Sony, and the Sault Ste. The Canadian government has since prohibited access to the site. For more on the story and the ship, visit S. This article originally appeared in

**Chapter 5 : What a Cunning Linguist! Top 5 Moments of Innuendo in Shakespeare | The Daily Geekette**

*The subject of sexuality and sexual language in Shakespeare's plays has long been a topic of critical interest. Ranging from the humorous and playful to the dark and taboo, the exploration of.*

Marriage[ edit ] At the age of 18, Shakespeare married the year-old Anne Hathaway. The consistory court of the Diocese of Worcester issued a marriage licence on 27 November Six months after the marriage, she gave birth to a daughter, Susanna. Greenblatt suggests that this may imply that he felt trapped by Hathaway. This may seem like a slight, but many historians contend that the second best bed was typically the marital bed, while the best bed was reserved for guests. One anecdote along these lines is provided by a lawyer named John Manningham , who wrote in his diary that Shakespeare had a brief affair with a woman during a performance of Richard III. Shakespeare, overhearing their conclusion, went before, was entertained and at his game ere Burbage came. Then, message being brought that Richard the Third was at the door, Shakespeare caused return to be made that William the Conqueror was before Richard the Third. While this is one of the few surviving contemporary anecdotes about Shakespeareâ€”it was made in March , a month after Manningham had seen the play [15] [16] â€”some scholars are sceptical of its validity. Later in the poem there is a section in which "H. This is introduced with a short explanatory passage: The fact that W. The poems were initially published, perhaps without his approval, in Nevertheless, there are numerous passages in the sonnets addressed to the Fair Lord that have been read as expressing desire for a younger man. The poems refer to sleepless nights, anguish and jealousy caused by the youth. The line can be read literally as a denial of sexual interest. However, given the homoerotic tone of the rest of the sonnet, it could also be meant to appear disingenuous, [24] mimicking the common sentiment of would-be seducers: In Sonnet 20, the narrator tells the youth to sleep with women, but to love only him: In some sonnets addressed to the youth, such as Sonnet 52 , the erotic punning is particularly intense: In the preface to his Pelican edition, at which time, in Britain, proven male homosexuality still carried a prison sentence, dismissal from the professions and huge public stigma , Douglas Bush writes, Since modern readers are unused to such ardor in masculine friendship and are likely to leap at the notion of homosexuality a notion sufficiently refuted by the sonnets themselves , we may remember that such an ideal , often exalted above the love of women, could exist in real life, from Montaigne to Sir Thomas Browne , and was conspicuous in Renaissance literature. But Shakespeare for him was always unimpeachably heterosexual. By , the Variorum edition of the sonnets contained an appendix with the conflicting views of nearly forty commentators. In the year after "the law in Britain decriminalized homosexual acts between consenting males over twenty-one", the historian G. The love which he felt for Southampton may well have been the most intense emotion of his life.

**Chapter 6 : 10 of Shakespeare's Best Dirty Jokes | Mental Floss**

*"Shakespeare realized sexual jokes, especially double entendres, put the twinkle in the performance," says John Basil, artistic director of the American Globe Theatre. "He's never crude."*

Now, I was the kind of girl who, even in middle school, grasped Shakespeare pretty easily, at least more so than my peers. The language was far more important than the actors. And audiences were filled with people from all social classes that Shakespeare had to make sure there was a little bit of something for everyone to enjoy. That means that for every one of those beautiful, memorable speeches we were quizzed on in high school, Shakes also added a butt or penis joke to make sure the people in the cheap seats were still paying attention. Because line numbers may vary between different editions, the act and scene number for each has also been provided. I think most of them are by Mercutio. Mercutio and the Capulet Nurse are by far the most frequent perpetrators of bawdy speech. Lady Capulet bids Nurse to call for Juliet, as she wishes to discuss prospects of marriage for her daughter. Not the most orthodox way to issue a proclamation, but it introduces us to her character. When Juliet does finally appear, Nurse reminisces about watching her grow up, and shares what she feels to be a hilarious anecdote: The day before, she broke her brow, And then my husband "God be with his soul! Thou wilt fall backward when thou hast more wit, Wilt thou not, Jule? Lady, shall I lie in your lap? I mean, my head upon your lap? Do you think I meant country matters? I think nothing, my lord. What is, my lord? Begin at the 4: As Hamlet sits with Ophelia to begin watching the play plays-within-plays was a common Shakespeare trope, he asks to lay his head in her lap, and she promptly says no. Like what this gif of Stephen Colbert trying to get his cards out from his desk looks like! Source Ophelia, trying to maintain a good reputation i. Probably the best example of this is in MND: This play is Pyramus and Thisby, which bears quite a few similarities to the plot of Romeo and Juliet. Instead of a balcony scene, however, the lovers have a clandestine meeting with a wall separating them. O wall, full often thou hast heard my moans, For parting my fair Pyramus and me! So picture two lovers, trying to whisper to each other while a man stands stiffly between them. The stones testicles are not the only part of Wall graced by lips, of course. O, kiss me through the hole of this vil[e] wall! What a kiss-ass you are. Twelfth Night Act II, scene v Source Though cross-dressing shenanigans and mistaken identity are the foundations of Twelfth Night, this next innuendo comes to us through a subplot involving a love letter prank on Malvolio. He is the steward of lady Olivia who falls for Viola in masculine disguise, and, to be frank, a bit of an ass. They concoct a plan of revenge, and forge a note that makes Malvolio believe his lady has the hots for him and that dressing garishly is a worthy show of his own love. As a sidenote, the alternative title to this play, What You Will may have a new meaning for you as we come to our last innuendo. This one is simultaneously way naughtier and waaaay classier. Read this sonnet out loud to a friend, maybe even one of your parents. A straight-through reading like that leaves you with a nonsensical poem. Shakespeare shaped our language in so many ways, some of them beautiful, and some of them bawdy. My job here was just to shine a little light on the dark, naughty ones. Hit up the comments section!

**Chapter 7 : William Shakespeare Sexuality in Shakespeare - Essay - [blog.quintoapp.com](http://blog.quintoapp.com)**

*Shakespeare knew that sexual harassment is made possible by sexual hypocrisy: that harassed women are rarely believed, that women are only allowed to be wives, widows, or virgins, and this is what.*

Bring fact-checked results to the top of your browser search. At age 18, in 1582, he married Anne Hathaway, a woman who was eight years older than he. Their first child, Susanna, was born on May 26, 1583, about six months after the marriage ceremony. A license had been issued for the marriage on November 27, 1582, with only one reading instead of the usual three of the banns, or announcement of the intent to marry in order to give any party the opportunity to raise any potential legal objections. Anne gave birth some 21 months after the arrival of Susanna to twins, named Hamnet and Judith, who were christened on February 2, 1585. Thereafter William and Anne had no more children. They remained married until his death in 1616. Were they compatible, or did William prefer to live apart from Anne for most of this time? When he moved to London at some point between 1592 and 1593, he did not take his family with him. Divorce was nearly impossible in this era. Were there medical or other reasons for the absence of any more children? Was he present in Stratford when Hamnet, his only son, died in 1596 at age 11? He bought a fine house for his family in Stratford and acquired real estate in the vicinity. He seems to have retired to Stratford from London about 1608. He had lived apart from his wife and children, except presumably for occasional visits in the course of a very busy professional life, for at least two decades. Knowledge on this subject is uncertain at best. According to an entry dated March 13, 1616, in the commonplace book of a law student named John Manningham, Shakespeare had a brief affair after he happened to overhear a female citizen at a performance of *Richard III* making an assignation with Richard Burbage, the leading actor of the acting company to which Shakespeare also belonged. It does at least suggest, at any rate, that Manningham imagined it to be true that Shakespeare was heterosexual and not averse to an occasional infidelity to his marriage vows. Apart from these intriguing circumstances, little evidence survives other than the poems and plays that Shakespeare wrote. Can anything be learned from them? The sonnets, written perhaps over an extended period from the early 1590s into the 1600s, chronicle a deeply loving relationship between the speaker of the sonnets and a well-born young man. At times the poet-speaker is greatly sustained and comforted by a love that seems reciprocal. This narrative would seem to posit heterosexual desire in the poet-speaker, even if of a troubled and guilty sort; but do the earlier sonnets suggest also a desire for the young man? Yet readers today cannot easily tell whether that love is aimed at physical completion. Critic Joseph Pequigney has argued at length that the sonnets nonetheless do commemorate a consummated physical relationship between the poet-speaker and the friend, but most commentators have backed away from such a bold assertion. A significant difficulty is that one cannot be sure that the sonnets are autobiographical. Shakespeare is such a masterful dramatist that one can easily imagine him creating such an intriguing story line as the basis for his sonnet sequence. Then, too, are the sonnets printed in the order that Shakespeare would have intended? He seems not to have been involved in their publication in 1609, long after most of them had been written. Even so, one can perhaps ask why such a story would have appealed to Shakespeare. Is there a level at which fantasy and dreamwork may be involved? The plays and other poems lend themselves uncertainly to such speculation. Loving relationships between two men are sometimes portrayed as extraordinarily deep. Antonio in *Twelfth Night* protests to Sebastian that he needs to accompany Sebastian on his adventures even at great personal risk: That is to say, I will die if you leave me behind. Certainly his plays contain many warmly positive depictions of heterosexuality, in the loves of *Romeo and Juliet*, *Orlando and Rosalind*, and *Henry V* and *Katharine of France*, among many others. At the same time, Shakespeare is astute in his representations of sexual ambiguity. Viola—in disguise as a young man, Cesario, in *Twelfth Night*—wins the love of Duke Orsino in such a delicate way that what appears to be the love between two men morphs into the heterosexual mating of Orsino and Viola. Shakespeare is characteristically delicate on that score, but he does seem to delight in the frisson of sexual suggestion.

**Chapter 8 : Slang and sexual language in Shakespeare | [Royal Shakespeare Company](http://RoyalShakespeareCompany.com)**

## DOWNLOAD PDF SEXUAL SHAKESPEARE

*Forget Judi Blume, Shakespeare was the real reason behind our sexual awakening as kids (except we didn't realise it back then). Check out his 12 most erotic quotes: Check out his 12 most erotic quotes.*

### Chapter 9 : Sex with Shakespeare (Audiobook) by Jillian Keenan | [blog.quintoapp.com](http://blog.quintoapp.com)

*Shakespeare's use of sexual language, imagery and erotic themes is extensive, varied, and although this is necessarily hard to establish, probably innovative at times. This glossary provides a first-hand guide to Shakespeare's sexual language, some of which is notoriously difficult to unravel and.*