

## The Pedagogisation of Sex, the Sexualisation of Pedagogy Foucault, Shakespeare, and Adolescent Sexuality

Dan Colson

This paper argues that, at present, *Romeo and Juliet* is used in American high schools not as an introduction to literature, or a study in universal human behaviour as many claim, but rather it serves as part of a repressive discourse that creates a Foucauldian 'local center of power'. The paper contends that introducing *Romeo and Juliet* in the public, institutional setting of the American high school generates a three-layered discourse of sexuality that utilises a play filled with sexual liberty as part of an overall strategy of power—the obsessive power of adult America's investment in the education and sexuality of the younger generation—in order further to codify and reveal transgressive adolescent sexuality: the discourse proper, which appears in the interstices of desire and language; the confessional elements of the text-student interaction; and the cultural establishment and punitive consequences of perversion.

### ABOUT THE AUTHOR :

Dan Colson is currently a PhD student in American literature at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He can be contacted at [dmcolson@uiuc.edu](mailto:dmcolson@uiuc.edu)

### REFERENCING DETAILS :

Colson, Dan (2008), "The Pedagogisation of Sex, the Sexualisation of Pedagogy: Foucault, Shakespeare, and Adolescent Sexuality", *49th Parallel*, Vol. 22 (Autumn), pp.48–59

Available at : [www.49thparallel.bham.ac.uk](http://www.49thparallel.bham.ac.uk)

### COPYRIGHT NOTICE

Please contact the editors of 49th Parallel regarding any further use of this work. Contact details can be found at [www.49thparallel.bham.ac.uk](http://www.49thparallel.bham.ac.uk), or email us direct at [49thparallel@bham.ac.uk](mailto:49thparallel@bham.ac.uk)

ISSN 1753-5794

49th

# The Pedagogisation of Sex, the Sexualisation of Pedagogy: Foucault, Shakespeare and Adolescent Sexuality

Dan Colson



Most American high schools continue to teach Shakespeare and many use *Romeo and Juliet* to introduce the bard to their students. Some argue that Shakespeare ‘understood human behavior’ better than any other writer,<sup>1</sup> while others accept the reverence that comes along with being *the* English language writer. Certainly his values and perspicacity are not universal, but Shakespeare remains central to the study of Western literature—no matter if the explanation for his centrality is aesthetic or material—because his work is widely perceived as exemplary. His plays have maintained ‘[their] complex implications [for] popular, intellectual, and ideological spheres of social and cultural life’.<sup>2</sup> His importance to literature in general, though, does not explain why educators have decided that a play as bawdy as *Romeo and Juliet*—a play filled with ‘the sexually charged exchange between Gregory and Samson in the opening scene; the Nurse’s reminiscences about the weaning of Juliet; Mercutio’s Queen Mab speech’,<sup>3</sup> and any number of other actions that many parents and teachers would prefer young people not imitate—should be taught to fourteen year-olds. The play, since the early 1980s, has become the most taught in American high schools.<sup>4</sup> Obviously, the use value of the play has changed over time; its material importance and the ends to which the play is put have shifted significantly.

In this paper, I will explore one of the current cultural, pedagogical, material ‘values’ of the play. To this end, I will discuss sex-education, Foucault’s theories of discourse and sexuality, and contemporary pedagogy relevant to the study of *Romeo and Juliet*. I will also examine some critical views of Shakespearean sexuality and scholarly efforts to recognise and articulate Shakespeare’s material value. I argue that, at present, the play’s cultural role—if not its role in individual pedagogies and curricula—is not to introduce students to literature or to study universal human behaviour; rather the play creates a Foucauldian ‘local centre of power’ that is part of a governing discourse around and about sexuality. While this paper does not seek to comment on specific methodologies for teaching the play or offer a pedagogical case study, it does offer a theoretical foundation for considering the complex nexus of uses to which Shakespeare’s work is put and through which Foucauldian practices of self-governance are disseminated to young Americans. Through a meta-pedagogical analysis of common practices cast into the light of Foucault’s work on power and the cultural neuroses surrounding youthful sexuality, this paper explores one of the play’s material uses, a use made unavoidable by discourses that inevitably structure subjective forms. Ultimately I contend that introducing *Romeo and Juliet* in the

public, institutional setting of the American high school generates a three-layered discourse of sexuality that utilises a play filled with sexual liberty as part of an overall strategy of power—the obsessive power of adult America’s investment in the education and sexuality of the younger generation—in order further to codify and reveal transgressive adolescent sexuality: the discourse proper, which generates at the intersection of desire and language; the confessional elements of the text–student interaction; and the cultural establishment and punitive consequences of perversion.

According to Sara Hayden, ‘sexuality education is a standard part of the curriculum in 93 percent of public schools’, but, while many agree that it is an appropriate topic, ‘there is little agreement over *how* it should be taught.’<sup>5</sup> She is speaking of explicit, direct sex-education, concerned with preventing sexually transmitted diseases and increasing knowledge, and she admits that sex-education exists as an inherent deployment point of bio-power. However, I believe that the transparency—the obviousness—of health classes as a point of social control undermines their suppressive authority, whereas the English classroom—a locus where students read about illicit sexuality in language they often do not understand—serves as a far more effective point of inscription for the discourse and the confessional environment that Foucault believes are signal to the deployment of sexuality.

The deployment of sexuality, which Foucault traces over several centuries, is a multi-faceted ‘attempt to regulate [sexuality] more effectively and mask its more indiscreet, conspicuous, and intractable aspects.’<sup>6</sup> It continues in contemporary culture with the ‘pedagogization of children’s sex’,<sup>7</sup> which serves as one of the main ‘mechanisms of knowledge and power centering on sex.’<sup>8</sup> Foucault articulates confession as one of the keys in placing ‘sexuality at the heart of existence’ where it is ‘the central object of examination.’<sup>9</sup> I connect his concepts of pedagogisation and confessions. Cathartic confession—a release through commiserative understanding of others’ transgression—has been transported into the English classroom in the guise of Renaissance drama (and many other literatures taught in American high schools): aside from any pedagogical intent or practice, the coexisting discourses of Shakespearean bawdiness and tabooed adolescent sexuality necessarily generate a space of control, a deployment of technologies already saturated with power–knowledge and always concerned with regulating behaviour.

Adolescents are exposed to multiple discourses in and around sexuality (which are all part of the deployment), but the ways in which *Romeo and Juliet* is frequently taught increase confession, one of the main components of constraint. Foucault argues that a confessional compulsion was established that made it imperative to ‘transform your desire, your every desire, into discourse.’<sup>10</sup> Confession was paramount to a system of discourse that would not allow private desire and that sought to retain control of sexuality by revealing it from infinite angles. It seems that *Romeo and Juliet*’s effect is two-fold: it creates a confessional environment and serves as a cathartic confessional for teenage sexuality. According to a Foucauldian understanding of confession, the confessor—in this case the education institution

itself—'is expected to produce an assessment of the obsessions, images quantity of pleasures, frequency, [and] deviations'.<sup>11</sup> The innumerable critical explorations of *Romeo and Juliet* have confessed the text and the text, in turn, serves as a projected revelation of the pubescent psyche as sexuality transcribed to the page and offered as a reflective confessional for high school students.

It is important, at this point, to discuss the expurgated texts that many high school students read. Most of the overt sexuality and innuendo are cut, leaving a text far less bawdy than the original. But, many teachers argue that 'students [must] appreciate Shakespeare fully', so the entire text must be taught 'in spirit if not in letter'.<sup>12</sup> No matter how much sexual language is expurgated, the play remains a play largely about illicit sexuality. To teach the play the way many teachers believe it should be taught, the sexuality must be addressed. The text itself (which, no matter how heavily edited, still exudes sex to the modern teen), movie versions, and class discussions cannot entirely skirt the 'offensive' elements. All that is accomplished by expurgating the text is that the illicit behaviour is given an extra layer of taboo—the class becomes even more a discourse of 'the Hidden sex, the Mysterious Sex, the Prohibited, Censored sex, the sex Which Dare Not Speak its Name'.<sup>13</sup>

Contemporary pedagogy approaches *Romeo and Juliet*—often in its edited form—as a play to which students can and should relate. Jonathan Goldberg contends that the rise of *Romeo and Juliet* in the high school curriculum indicates a shift from the 'civics lesson' of *Julius Caesar* to the 'sexual revolution'—the demystification of love as a personal, private experience.<sup>14</sup> Larry Johannessen goes a step further, advocating a break with traditional methods of teaching the play that emphasise its 'historical and/or philosophical background'.<sup>15</sup> He suggests instead a methodology that attempts to connect his students' views of love with the love between Romeo and Juliet. As a teacher, his role is to 'facilitate the discussion' and 'help [students] inquire [and] think about' love in the play.<sup>16</sup> Johannessen, in other words, wants his students to enter into the play and relate with the characters. His unspoken expectation is that students will relate to the two protagonists, who participate in illicit love and die for their actions. Thomas Moisan proposes a similar focus on desire; one that shows that 'the social order [has] failed to control the passion of the lovers'.<sup>17</sup> Again, students receive an implied threat: the social order sought to control the two young lovers, just as it continues to do. In the play, transgression of the social order meant banishment (separation from one's beloved) or death. Educators recognise 'students' engagement with the idealistic, romantic element of the text'<sup>18</sup> and encourage them 'to inhabit the imaginative world of play, emotionally, intellectually, and spiritually'.<sup>19</sup> To maintain student interest, teachers frequently provide confessional connections and create a curriculum that relies on this engagement by unwittingly emphasizing those parts of the text that are most concerned with sexuality—the intersection of love and rebellion.

Ann Thompson claims that 'sexuality is a fashionable and controversial topic, not just in literary studies but throughout the whole range of the humanities' and, in particular, in Shakespearean criticism.<sup>20</sup> During the last two decades, much attention has been paid to gender, sex, sexuality, and their intersections in Shakespeare's work.

While I do not offer an exhaustive examination of the scholarship, I will discuss two aspects of sexuality especially relevant to the study of *Romeo and Juliet* and that are suggestive for further research: the intersection of desire, language, and confession, and the role perverse elements play in the discourse of the text and of the classroom. First, Catherine Belsey contends that *Romeo and Juliet* is fundamentally 'a play about desire',<sup>21</sup> where discourse is translated into pleasure.<sup>22</sup> From this view, the play itself is a Foucauldian discourse that is made accessible to students—they enter the play and participate in a desire-laden conversation about sexuality and transgression. Belsey continues, claiming that the play 'dramatizes . . . sexual desire . . . at the level of the signifier'.<sup>23</sup> In the English classroom, where language mastery is the ultimate goal, language is tied to desire; a desire that is realized, but swiftly followed by death. The signification of sexuality is allowed in order to suppress the signified. The lovers are 'a stand-in for something which cannot be embraced'.<sup>24</sup> Gayle Whittier complements this view with her claim that the two lovers experience a 'verbal loss of innocence preceding and paralleling their physical loss of innocence', with the linguistic act offering only an 'illusory transcendence'.<sup>25</sup> Language is not transcendent, but action is, and the word 'transgressive' can be used to replace the word 'transcendent'. Students are offered linguistic acts that serve as a confession that, through reading and recitation, they partake in as an institutional ritual. Romeo, 'being held a foe, he may not have access / To breathe such vows as lovers use to swear'.<sup>26</sup> Students have no such restraint. They are encouraged to breathe the vows of both fated lovers and to confess the desires that culture assumes to dwell within them. They preemptively confess their sexual transgressions and illuminate sexuality in an institutional setting, thus revealing 'what one is thinking and what one thinks he is not thinking' and reinforcing 'heterogeneous sexualities', both of which produce an 'exhaustive expression of an individual secret'.<sup>27</sup> Through confession, they participate in a 'ritual of discourse'<sup>28</sup> that inevitably locates them within a power binary: institution/citizen. Culture, by assuring their entrance into this binary's discourse, creates one of many local centres of power that institutionalise sexuality and suppress deviance.

Lloyd Davis's contention that the play demonstrates 'inescapable ties between sex and violence'<sup>29</sup> is a Shakespearean example of the 'perversion [which is] endemic to modern society'.<sup>30</sup> Dollimore defines perversion as 'erring, straying, or deviating from a path, destiny or objective which is understood as natural'<sup>31</sup> and I see three important approaches to perversion in *Romeo and Juliet*. The first two are types of perversion: disobedience and sadism/masochism (which, in the context of this play, I see as inextricably linked). My third approach is to consider the relation between a cultural power strategy and perversion. Disobedience is the first and most obvious perversion in the play. Romeo and Juliet each fall in love with an enemy, contravening their parents' wishes and casting themselves into a world of deception that culminates in their deaths. Their marriage is not condoned, or validated, by anyone other than Friar Lawrence, and after Romeo kills Tybalt, he disobeys the Duke's edict by returning to Verona. He transgresses against two of Foucault's most powerful loci of power: family and government. The family is the earliest constraint, while government (understood broadly) is the most comprehensive. Romeo is

willing to risk both family and political affiliations for what is in essence a sexual desire. He disobeys both the Montagues and the Capulets by visiting Juliet for a night of sex before his banishment, and he disobeys the Duke to allow his body to enjoy Juliet one last time: 'Eyes, look your last! / Arms, take our last embrace! and lips, O you / The doors of breath, seal with a righteous kiss a dateless bargain'.<sup>32</sup> Romeo dies with a kiss and the sexually perverse desire—a desire that intimately binds sex and violence and that leads to many deaths—ends him. The second overt perversion within the text is sadism/masochism. Both Romeo and Juliet seem to take satisfaction in the pain caused by their love. Rather than ignore or attempt to reduce they pain, they relish it and heighten it for themselves and for each other. Shortly before Romeo leaves Juliet's chamber he says that 'all these woes shall serve / For sweet discourses in our times to come'.<sup>33</sup> In their post-coital reverie, Romeo articulates a belief in the pleasure-heightening power of pain (and ironically describes that pleasure as another discourse). They have transgressed societal norms and parental wishes, inflicting easily predictable pain, to increase the ecstatic pleasure of illicit sexuality. Romeo and Juliet's own experience of pain and perception of the other's pain represent a perverse gratification, a masochistic and sadistic yearning that, again, culminates in the ironic double murder / double suicide—both kill themselves, but both are also killed by the other.

Romeo and Juliet, however, do not create perversion; it is created through 'a dispersion of sexualities, a strengthening of their disparate forms, a multiple implantation of "perversions"<sup>34</sup> that 'constitute and maintain the very social order'.<sup>35</sup> Herein lies the paradox: how does a play that merely demonstrates culturally created perversion deter contemporary adolescent perversion? Freud believed that love transcended perversion, liberating sexuality,<sup>36</sup> but, as Dollimore points out: 'death, mutilation, and incarceration have been, and remain, the fate of the pervert'.<sup>37</sup> *Romeo and Juliet* is not a story of liberating love, but of punished perversion. It offers a dual admonition for students: perversion defines normality, so you must discuss sexuality in all its forms and confess your own deviant desires to avoid the same fate; but, if you do not, excommunication (through various stigmatic labels) or death awaits you.

The rise of materialist criticism, particularly the cultural variety espoused by Raymond Williams, Alan Sinfield, and Jonathan Dollimore, initiated a 'paradigm shift that . . . witnessed the emergence of a new "political awareness" in Renaissance studies'<sup>38</sup> and that has left no doubt that all the literature we teach has use value. Quite obviously, Shakespeare is no exception, no matter how much some cling to antiquated notions of transcendence or 'Truth', 'he has been appropriated for certain practices and attitudes, and can be reappropriated for others'.<sup>39</sup> Many recent critics have sought to debunk a notion of universality that posits Shakespeare as a 'repository of universal truths', and reveal a previously idealised Shakespeare that is, in reality, only the 'truths' of the 'dominant culture'.<sup>40</sup> Those in power—or perhaps more accurately, power itself, a governance coextensive with culture and discourse that cannot be attributed to a single person, group, or movement—have utilised Shakespeare, along with innumerable other writers, for their own ends. This has

always been the case, but only in recent years have scholars shined critical light on literature's cultural use value.

Shakespeare has long been used for multifarious purposes, and the twentieth-century high school classroom is not the first place his work has been used as a form of sex-education. George C. Gross claims that Mary Cowden Clarke used Shakespeare as a lesson in virtue for Victorian women. She believed that 'education [was] the best defense against sin' and 'she took advantage . . . of her position as a student of Shakespeare'<sup>41</sup> to teach women the perils of sexuality through 'exhortation, precept, and example'.<sup>42</sup> Here is Shakespeare, a presumed playwright of the people—whose characters purportedly represent all types, not only paragons of virtue—co-opted as a way to teach virtue. In contemporary curricula, we see a secularised version of Clarke's pedagogy: instead of teaching virtue, educators generate, reproduce, and become part of a discourse that reinforces the dichotomy between natural and unnatural acts—between appropriate and inappropriate sexuality.

The current deployment of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* in high school curricula is three-fold: The play is an inherently constraining local centre of power—originating in the nexus of both the text's and the students' language and desire—created through the classroom discourse; it is a cathartic confessional that, through vicarious connection with the text, forces adolescent sexuality to be codified and repeated *ad infinitum*, thus further discouraging (labeling, stigmatizing, reifying) certain manifestations of sexuality; and it is an object lesson—it demonstrates the socially inevitable role of perversion, but also the repercussions of the same perversion. The discourse proper in the classroom creates a mandated discussion of illicit love and the implied sexuality surrounding that love. Expurgated versions of the text only increase the imaginative acts that imbue the discourse with its revelatory power and lead to the vicarious connection necessary for the creation of the confessional element. Foucault considers confession unavoidable: 'One confesses – or is forced to confess'.<sup>43</sup> If individuals will not confess of their own volition, 'the confession is wrung from them by violence or threat'.<sup>44</sup> *Romeo and Juliet* functions doubly as the characters' confession (the text is presumably their posthumous, cautionary confession) and a confessional text that students are encouraged to enter. Once they have related to the 'love' aspects of the text, they are implicated in the lovers' transgression and they are, in fact, confessing their own 'sins' against the institutional construction of natural and appropriate sexuality. The play also demonstrates the paradoxical construction and condemnation of perversion. Society requires the 'specification [and] regional solidification' of 'aberrant sexualities' to demarcate cultural norms.<sup>45</sup> Only through abnormality can normality be defined. Aberration, however, will not be tolerated. Students are shown deviance so they can better understand behavioural expectations, but they are also shown the severe consequences of transgressing their culture's values.

As Foucault asserts, 'power is not something that is acquired, seized or shared'—there is nothing 'outside' of power, so everyone exists within a power system—but it is 'exercised from innumerable points'.<sup>46</sup> Discourses in and around

sexuality have proliferated (medical, familial, psychoanalytic, etc.) and the educational institution is now overtly involved in creating further sexual discourse. Sexuality 'will not . . . liberate us from the constraints of our ideologies, our institutions, or our desires',<sup>47</sup> because it is fully implicated with the ideologies that structure the deployment of sexuality, the institutions that focus the deployment, and the desires that are regulated within it. Thanks to shifting curricula and the need for new centres of power, for new methods of governance, *Romeo and Juliet* is now implicated as well.





## ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Ronald E. Salomone and James E. Davis, Preface, *Teaching Shakespeare into the Twenty First Century* (Athens, OH: University of Ohio Press, 1997), xi
- <sup>2</sup> Lloyd Davis, Introduction, *Shakespeare Matters: History, Teaching, Performance* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2003), p.26
- <sup>3</sup> James A. Andreas, Sr., "Shakespeare's Bawdry: Orality, Literacy, and Censorship in *Romeo and Juliet*", *Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*, ed. Maurice Hunt (New York: Modern Language Association, 2000), p.115
- <sup>4</sup> Jonathan Goldberg, "Romeo and Juliet's Open Rs", *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*, ed. Joseph A. Porter, Critical Essays on British Literature Series, (New York: Hall, 1997), p.82
- <sup>5</sup> Sarah Hayden, "Teenage Bodies, Teenage Selves: Tracing the Implications of Bio-Power in Contemporary Sexuality Education Texts", *Women's Studies in Communication* 24/1 (2001), p.31
- <sup>6</sup> Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), p.105
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid, p.104
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid, p.103
- <sup>9</sup> Michel Foucault, "Power and Sex", trans. David J. Parent, *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977–1984*, ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman (New York: Routledge, 1988), p.111
- <sup>10</sup> Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, p.21
- <sup>11</sup> Alison Leigh Brown, *On Foucault: A Critical Introduction*, Wadsworth Philosophers Series (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2000), p.87
- <sup>12</sup> Andreas, "Shakespeare's Bawdry: Orality, Literacy, and Censorship in *Romeo and Juliet*", p.124
- <sup>13</sup> Brown, *On Foucault: A Critical Introduction*, p.86
- <sup>14</sup> Goldberg, "Romeo and Juliet's Open Rs", pp.82–83
- <sup>15</sup> Larry R. Johannessen, "Enhancing Response to *Romeo and Juliet*", *Teaching Shakespeare into the Twenty-First Century*, eds. Ronald E. Salomone and James E. Davis (Athens, OH: University of Ohio Press, 1997), p.134
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid, p.139
- <sup>17</sup> Thomas Moisan "'Now Art Thou What Thou Art'; or, Being Sociable in Verona: Teaching Gender and Desire in *Romeo and Juliet*", *Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*, ed. Maurice Hunt (New York: Modern Language Association, 2000), p.57
- <sup>18</sup> Maurice Hunt, Introduction, *Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet* (New York: Modern Language Association, 2000), p.24
- <sup>19</sup> Rex Gibson, "Editing Shakespeare for School Students", *Problems of Editing*, ed. Christa Jansohn (Tubingen: Niemeyer, 1999), p.199
- <sup>20</sup> Ann Thompson, "Shakespeare and Sexuality", *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production*, vol. 46, ed. Stanley Wells (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p.1
- <sup>21</sup> Catherine Belsey, "The Name of the Rose in *Romeo and Juliet*". *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*, ed. Joseph A. Porter, Critical Essays on British Literature Series (New York: Hall, 1997), p.65
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid, p.84
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid, p.79
- <sup>24</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>25</sup> Gayle, Whittier, "The Sonnet's Body and the Body Sonnetized in *Romeo and Juliet*". *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*, ed. Joseph A. Porter, Critical Essays on British Literature Series (New York: Hall, 1997), p.57
- <sup>26</sup> William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet. The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1997), 2.1. pp.9–10
- <sup>27</sup> Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, pp.60–61
- <sup>28</sup> Ibid, p.61

- <sup>29</sup> Lloyd Davis, "Death-Marked Love': Desire and Presence in *Romeo and Juliet*". *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. R.S. White, New Casebooks Series (New York: Palgrave, 2001), p.39
- <sup>30</sup> Jonathan Dollimore, "The Politics of Perversion: Augustine, Shakespeare, Freud, Foucault". *Sexual Sameness: Textual Differences in Lesbian and Gay Writing*, ed. Joseph Bristow. (London: Routledge, 1992), p.10
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>32</sup> Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, 5.3. pp.112–115
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid, 3.5. pp.52–53
- <sup>34</sup> Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, p.37
- <sup>35</sup> Dollimore, "The Politics of Perversion: Augustine, Shakespeare, Freud, Foucault", p.9
- <sup>36</sup> Ibid, p.21
- <sup>37</sup> Ibid, p.24
- <sup>38</sup> John J. Joughin, "Shakespeare and Politics: an Introduction", *Shakespeare and Politics*, ed. Catherine M. S. Alexander (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p.2
- <sup>39</sup> Alan Sinfield, "Give an Account of Shakespeare in Education, Showing Why You Think They Are Effective and What You Have Appreciated about Them; Support Your Comments with Precise References", *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, eds. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994), p.161
- <sup>40</sup> Susan Gushee O'Malley, "Cultural Appropriations of Shakespeare in the Classroom", *Shakespeare Matters: History, Teaching, Performance*, ed. Lloyd Davis. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2003), p.138
- <sup>41</sup> George C. Gross, "Mary Cowden Clarke, 'The Girlhood of Shakespeare's Heroines,' and the Sex Education of Victorian Women", *Victorian Studies: A Journal of the Humanities, Arts and Sciences* 16 (1972), p.58
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid, p.39
- <sup>43</sup> Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, p.59
- <sup>44</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>45</sup> Ibid, p.44
- <sup>46</sup> Ibid, p.94
- <sup>47</sup> Ibid, p.90

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andreas**, James A, Sr. "Shakespeare's Bawdry: Orality, Literacy, and Censorship in *Romeo and Juliet*". *Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. Maurice Hunt. New York: MLA, 2000. pp.115–124
- Belsey**, Catherine. "The Name of the Rose in *Romeo and Juliet*". *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. Joseph A. Porter. Critical Essays on British Literature Series. New York: Hall, 1997. pp.64–81
- Brown**, Alison Leigh. *On Foucault: A Critical Introduction*. Wadsworth Philosophers Series. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 2000
- Burt**, Richard, and Jeffrey Wallen. "Knowing Better: Sex, Cultural Criticism, and the Pedagogical Imperative in the 1990s". *Diacritics: A Review of Contemporary Criticism* 29.1 (1999): pp.72–91
- Davis**, Lloyd. "'Death-Marked Love': Desire and Presence in *Romeo and Juliet*". *Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. R.S. White. New Casebooks Series. New York: Palgrave, 2001. pp.28–46
- . Introduction. *Shakespeare Matters: History, Teaching, Performance*. Newark, DE: U Delaware P, 2003
- Dollimore**, Jonathan. "The Politics of Perversion: Augustine, Shakespeare, Freud, Foucault". *Sexual Sameness: Textual Differences in Lesbian and Gay Writing*. Ed. Joseph Bristow. London: Routledge, 1992. pp.9–25
- Foucault**, Michel. *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1978
- . "Power and Sex". Trans. David J. Parent. *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977–1984*. Ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman. New York: Routledge, 1988. pp.110–124
- Gibson**, Rex. "Editing Shakespeare for School Students". *Problems of Editing*. Ed. Christa Jansohn. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1999. pp.180–199
- Goldberg**, Jonathan. "*Romeo and Juliet's* Open Rs". *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. Joseph A. Porter. Critical Essays on British Literature Series. New York: Hall, 1997. pp.82–96
- Gross**, George C. "Mary Cowden Clarke, 'The Girlhood of Shakespeare's Heroines,' and the Sex Education of Victorian Women". *Victorian Studies: A Journal of the Humanities, Arts and Sciences* 16 (1972): pp.37–58
- Hayden**, Sarah. "Teenage Bodies, Teenage Selves: Tracing the Implications of Bio-Power in Contemporary Sexuality Education Texts". *Women's Studies in Communication* 24.1 (2001): pp.30–61
- Hunt**, Maurice. Introduction. *Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*. New York: MLA, 2000
- Johannessen**, Larry R. "Enhancing Response to *Romeo and Juliet*". *Teaching Shakespeare into the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. Ronald E. Salomone and James E. Davis. Athens, OH: U Ohio P, 1997. pp.154–165
- Joughin**, John J. "Shakespeare and Politics: an Introduction". *Shakespeare and Politics*. Ed. Catherine M. S. Alexander. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. pp.1–21
- Moisan**, Thomas. "'Now Art Thou What Thou Art'; or, Being Sociable in Verona: Teaching Gender and Desire in *Romeo and Juliet*". *Approaches to Teaching Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. Maurice Hunt. New York: MLA, 2000. pp.47–58

**O'Malley**, Susan Gushee. "Cultural Appropriations of Shakespeare in the Classroom". *Shakespeare Matters: History, Teaching, Performance*. Ed. Lloyd Davis. Newark, DE: U Delaware P, 2003. pp.138–150

**Salomone**, Ronald E., and James E. Davis. Preface. *Teaching Shakespeare into the Twenty-First Century*. Athens, OH: U Ohio P, 1997

**Shakespeare**, William. *Romeo and Juliet*. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton, 1997

**Sinfield**, Alan. "Give an Account of Shakespeare in Education, Showing Why You Think They Are Effective and What You Have Appreciated about Them; Support Your Comments with Precise References". *Political Shakespeare: Essays in Cultural Materialism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Ed. Jonathan Dollimore and Alan Sinfield. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1994. pp.158–181

**Thompson**, Ann. "Shakespeare and Sexuality". *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production*. Vol. 46. Ed. Stanley Wells. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994. pp.1–8

**Whittier**, Gayle. "The Sonnet's Body and the Body Sonnetized in *Romeo and Juliet*". *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. Joseph A. Porter. Critical Essays on British Literature Series. New York: Hall, 1997. pp.47–63



## SUBMISSIONS GUIDELINES

The editors would like to invite academics and post-graduates to submit articles on a broad range of topics pertaining to American and Canadian Studies. Some of the disciplines previously covered in 49th Parallel include history, literature, film, popular culture, politics, photography, the visual arts, and their relation within an international comparative framework. The use of film, pictures, sound, and creative web designs will be considered for placement in the e-journal.

**Submissions should comply with the following:**

Author's name should appear only on a separate cover page, along with title, and a brief abstract (not exceeding 150 words). The author's name should not appear within the article aside from references to relevant other works. House editorial style is based on Chicago (14th ed.) with UK spelling. Please email [49thparallel@bham.ac.uk](mailto:49thparallel@bham.ac.uk) with submissions, or visit [www.49thparallel.bham.ac.uk](http://www.49thparallel.bham.ac.uk) for further information and previous issues.

UNIVERSITY OF  
BIRMINGHAM

ISSN 1753-5794

