‘Praising what is lost / Makes the remembrance dear’
(All’s Well That Ends Well, 5.3.19-20)

REMEMBERING EMERITUS PROFESSOR
MICHAEL (MICK) HATTAWAY

This special issue of *LINGUACULTURE* aims to honour and commemorate the Shakespeare and Renaissance Studies scholar, and wonderful friend, Professor Michael (Mick) Hattaway, whose dedication to the pursuit of learning, discovery, research, and teaching inspired his former students, colleagues and readers. His enthusiastic support of young researchers and new publications such as *LINGUACULTURE*, which he generously accepted to endorse from its first issue in 2010 by becoming a member of the Advisory Board and then publishing his work twice in the journal (in 2010 and 2017) testified to his commitment to making collaborations across national borders a reality and also demonstrated his warm-hearted readiness to facilitate growth, exploration and exchange.

The idea for this special issue of *LINGUACULTURE* emerged while preparing a British Shakespeare Association commemoration of Mick Hattaway, in partnership with the English Department from the Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași in Romania (the recipient of a generous book donation by Mick’s wife, Judi, according to his wishes), on 11 February 2022. Some of Mick’s personal friends and collaborators, including the four editors of this special issue, attended the online event and agreed to contribute. In the following pages readers will find the more personal contributions to this *in memoriam* journal issue, for the most part edited versions of each contributor’s speech during the
February 22 commemorative event, and that is why they differ in register and length. It was the editors’ decision to include them here, in lieu of a more conventional introduction, to capture, at least in part, the variety of ways in which Mick’s legacy as a colleague and friend was evoked that evening.

All articles included in this special issue reflect Mick’s own research interests, ranging from Renaissance drama and Shakespeare’s plays to less conventional reinterpretations of Shakespeare’s life and work.

Peter J. Smith  
Nottingham Trent University

I picked Mick’s brilliant New Cambridge Shakespeare As You Like It to focus on for two reasons. First, my copy arrived just one day before we received Judi’s awful email about the decline in Mick’s health. So I never got to congratulate him about the appearance of a volume over which we’d had quite a few pints; this occasion will have to plug that gap. Thinking about it, the edition must have been in production during the final phase of Mick’s life and that’s obviously a terrible realisation. But, it also shows that he was working pretty much until the end – no lazy retirement for Mick! The second, entirely selfish, reason I picked this book is that I am currently editing the updated New Cambridge Shakespeare’s Richard III so I’m looking to Mick – as ever – as my guide and mentor. He’s going to be a tough act to follow!

Mick’s first edition of AYL was published in 2000 so he’d been living inside this play for over 20 years – and you can tell. He knows every inch of it. I’m just going to comment on two of the areas upon which he focuses in his intro: pastoral: Mick’s characteristic passion for social justice comes through in his definition of this apparently harmless genre: ‘pastoral is a kind of history, not an escape from politics but a reading of politics’ (25) and he goes on to develop his interpretation of the play as a ‘counter-pastoral’, noting its attention to Corin’s labour and rural poverty as well as Touchstone’s urban cynicism and the killing of the deer. Contextually he draws our attention to the bad harvests of the 1590s and the dispossession brought about by enclosure. The play, he writes, ‘registers contemporary movements from a late feudal agricultural economy to a rentier
system run by capitalist landlords, as well as agrarian innovations that turned peasants into labourers and concentrated on production for the market’ (24). It’s this capacity for a tight historical focus and the effortless summing up of 200 years of economic shift that make his argument here, so very nimble.

2 – provisionality: Keats talks about ‘negative capability [which] Shakespeare possessed so enormously’ as being the capacity to accept ‘uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason’ and something of that characterises Mick’s own preparedness to dwell on the unresolved. ‘The emphasis’, he writes, ‘of the play’s ending is on the provisional’ (44). One instance of this provisionality is the location of the play’s action. If Mick is the foreman, his jury is very much still out: ‘whenever we encounter the word [Arden] we must remember that this is an imaginary location, as ‘French’ as it is ‘English’, as fantastic as it is familiar’ (11). Talking about the play’s ending, Mick writes, ‘We live by […] fictions – of authenticity, of innocence, of desire, of gender and of ending and resolution’ (11) and then to show how provisional all of these qualities are, he sums up: the main characters have ‘bound themselves within an artful and possibly unstable contract that is defined by the multiplicity of ‘ifs’ that stud the play’s conclusion – ‘If truth hold true contents’ (5.4.114), as Hymen sums it up’ (12). The inference is that Hymen’s apparent conclusion is anything but!

In the above summary, I’ve not had time to do justice to the erudition and comprehensiveness of this splendid introduction. But I’d like to end by quoting the most Mick-ish of decrees – can almost hear him saying it: ‘no production is going to succeed unless Arden is a place for fun [his italics], unless [it] leaves space for wit and laughter’ (43). Isn’t that what we all want – for our students, for our colleagues, for our theatre and for our scholarship?

Alison Findlay
Lancaster University

Through his editions of the Henry VI plays, Mick Hattaway taught me how to investigate Shakespeare’s dramatizations of history. Perhaps the most important lesson, expressed in his introduction to The Third Part of King Henry VI
(1993), was that ‘the text contains in fact a multiplicity of histories.’ (27) This apparently simple statement is typical of Mick’s writing. At an immediate level, it is engaging: it invites the reader into the text as a fellow explorer, enacting Mick’s generosity in sharing the production of knowledge with colleagues and students alike. Secondly, it explicitly announces the openness of the text to interpretations in discussion and on stage, something that Mick’s landmark book *Elizabethan Popular Theatre*, helped to illuminate. Thirdly, it deftly summarizes Mick’s main argument on new ways of understanding history in the European Renaissance: ‘history, for Shakespeare, was not a reproduction of ‘truth’; but was itself production of truths, political truths.’ (27) Mick’s deep commitment to unravelling political injustice was matched by an equally deep classical learning. This and the comparisons he drew - between Shakespeare and Montaigne, Boccaccio, Joachim du Bellay on this page alone (27) - excited me with curiosity about classical texts and European contexts. His dedication in fostering connections with universities such as Iasi, and institutions like ESRA have helped to perpetuate a European Renaissance today.

Mick’s writing taught me about Shakespeare’s ‘Radical historiography’, namely his ‘ability to root out the causes of political dilemmas’ and to ‘demonstrate the partiality of contesting explanations,’ ultimately showing ‘there is no way of discriminating between one set of values and another.’ (‘Introduction’, *The Second Part* 7) To me, this encapsulates the essence of exciting drama. By identifying how the *Henry VI* plays demonstrate a newly-emerging sense of class consciousness, Mick also demonstrated how literary critics have something valuable to offer cultural historians. Dramatizations of ‘the economic chasm’ between court and commoners in *The Second Part of Henry VI*, he argued, advertised a ‘searing indictment of aristocratic factionalism’ in a highly self-conscious and insecure class-based society (25).

Mick’s sense of the practicalities of theatre often trumped critically-informed analysis. For example, he points out that, in *The First Part of King Henry VI*, Bedford’s lines ‘The day begins to break, and night is fled / Which pitchy mantle over-veiled the earth’ (2.2.1-2) are not an implicit apology for the lack of resources to create scenic illusion, but the most theatrically efficient way to establish the action: ‘The stage becomes Orleans at dawn.’ (Elizabethan Popular Theatre 34) His sharp eye for detail picks up the similarity between the stage direction for York and the Lords to ‘go up’ to the throne in the opening Parliament
scene of 3 Henry VI and those where York and then Henry VI speak from molehills. Mick suggests some kind of raised platform could have been reused, ‘thus providing an emblem of the vanity of worldly power.’ (37) Mick’s enthusiasm for theatrical effects is clear in the stage histories of these three editions too. His recommendation, via the loan of his VHS recording, first alerted me to Jane Howell’s Brechtian staging of the Henry VI plays for the BBC Shakespeare, the circular set evoking a child’s ‘brightly coloured playground’ with ‘high walls and galleries made out of old doors and timber’ and the performance ‘displaying a Brechtian sense of Spass (fun) in Part I. With typical insight, Mick pointed out that the playground set and the throne ‘knocked together’ from wood suggested ‘the rickety and improvised structure of institutions as Shakespeare portrayed them.’ (‘Introduction’, The Second Part57)

Mick asked ‘In the theatre, are endings necessarily conclusions?’ The example of learning, generosity, and warmth that he has offered us all tells me that the answer is no. Rather, we should follow his prompt ‘Are the questions posed in the course of the play more important than the historical and dramatic answers it offers?’ (57) The answer is yes, and we are invited to learn from what Mick has taught us, and to follow his example as a researcher, teacher and colleague.

Nathalie Vienne-Guerrin
Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3

Mick Hattaway was a wonderful colleague, both humanly and scientifically. The moments we shared at conferences worldwide were emblematic of the gai savoir that characterized him. His presence and his voice were extremely theatrical and his benevolent and generous smile was in itself a treat. He was part of the original steering group of Shakespeareans who initiated the creation of the European Shakespeare Research Association and was one of the scholars who were the most involved in ESRA’s activities. His research spanned a very large range of topics and angles of approach as he was interested in Shakespeare both in his time and in our time. He will remain a mythical figure in the Shakespearean sphere and his abundant work will live long after him. Mick
Hattaway is one of the few scholars about whom we will say that he was not of an age but for all time. Bountiful Mick.

“Alexander Shurbanov
University of Sofia

As a person, Mick was one of the most warm-hearted and good-humoured people I’ve been fortunate to know. Our friendship remained unshaken through more than thirty years. It was based on common academic interests and pursuits but also on mutual sympathy and trust. I can never forget how, a couple of years ago, his terminal illness already at an advanced stage, Mick insisted on taking part in an online conference marking my eightieth anniversary and read his touching contribution from an armchair – the farewell gift of a generous heart and an undaunted spirit.

As one of the leading Shakespearean scholars of our day, Professor Michael Hattaway cherished strong convictions and had an unflinching sense of mission. He firmly believed that Shakespeare could not be truly understood and appreciated outside the social, political and intellectual context of his age, or without a reference to the stage realisation of his dramatic work, and, perhaps most important of all, in isolation from the continuing international life of his legacy. This last consideration prompted him the need for a European association dedicated to the study of Shakespeare in the fascinating variety of his linguistic and cultural permutations across the national borders of the entire continent. And he was happy to see how, through the concerted efforts of a group of friends and colleagues enflamed by his enthusiasm, this project came to fruition in the formation of ESRA.

“Nicoleta Cinpoes
University of Worcester

Preoccupied by the position ESRA, the European Shakespeare Research Association, occupied two years since formalising its existence in Iaşi (after decades of diverse activity under different guises), Mick and I continued our
animated discussion while queuing to board the return flight from Pisa, where we coincided in a seminar at the Association's conference that debated, over four days, on *Shakespeare and Conflict: A European Perspective*. Then, as in subsequent encounters with Mick and his work, to acknowledge that ‘Shakespeare has occupied areas of the cultural map all over Europe and beyond’ entailed – as Hamlet puts it in his advice to the Players – ‘suit[ing] the action to the word’ (3.3).

For this celebration of Mick’s words and actions, I have chosen his article ‘Lands, realms, women and texts: Possession, entitlement and occupation’ published in *Cahiers Élisabéthains* (2018), *one in which he invites us to join him in the examination of the problematics raised by both portable and non-portable property* (7). When discussing the word ‘occupy’, Mick’s erudition takes us deftly through its complex meaning(s) from ‘Anglo-Norman, Old and Middle French, when it meant ‘to take possession of, to seize’, to what ‘it came to mean’ – ‘almost but not entirely’: ‘own’, thus ‘tactfully remind[ing] us that owning encompasses seizing’ (10). This he illustrates with ample examples from the Shakespeare canon and the works of his contemporaries, their sources and realities. His doing so is also a metaphorical lesson in Renaissance scholarship, whose methodology is a live negotiation of these very meanings of the word, as he elaborates later in the article: ‘the word designates occupation of the subject rather than by the subject’ (11).

Books occupied Mick, and performance politics; this article and the talk out of which the article was born – the opening keynote at another ESRA conference, in 2015 – offer, I believe, a lesson in ‘suit[ing]’ words and the actions a la Mick. The article, which opens the special issue of *Cahiers Élisabéthains* focused on Europe’s Shakespeare(s), is a tour de force that weaves seamlessly, with learnedness and tongue-in-cheek-ness. It ranged across Latin etymologies and post-colonial ‘land grabbing’, whether discussing the ‘rhetoric of conquest’ in warfare or in love affairs, in Shakespeare’s history plays as much as in contemporary stage productions, namely of Love’s Labours’ Lost and Love’s Labours’ Won (the RSC’s 2016 double-bill).

When, in the 2015, he discussed King John and Roman Law, his ‘occupation of the subject’ was also one ‘by the subject’. Mick spoke of this Shakespeare play from a lectern in Worcester Cathedral (the venue which hosted his opening keynote at ESRA 2015) about and in a present physically haunted by the past: the English king’s tomb behind him was as clearly visible to his audience
as the anniversary of Magna Carta was on everyone’s mind. His talk of ‘occupying’ – as owning, seizing, raping, both political and sexual, discursive and physical – in the presence of the remains of the king linked to the 1215 document which legislated precisely the relation between the monarch and the law presenced for us all more immediate acts of ‘occupation’: ‘Occupy London Movement’, Crimea by Russia, UKIP’s of Britain, and by the time his talk became the article ready for print, BREXIT, Trump’s leadership, the rise of the right in Europe. They were, he suggested, matters of state and matters of the state of us. He rounded up his argument with one last lesson: ‘texts are not things to be possessed’ yet stage ‘productions can occupy historical moments as well as political spaces’ (21) – a form of ownership that ‘seizes the day’.

‘When Shakespeare wants to defamiliarize a word, he repeats it. When he repeats words, you can tell he is thinking about them – or thinking with them.’ (14) This has been Mick’s work with Shakespeare and with performance: it repeats Shakespeare thinking about the words and about Shakespeare, but most importantly thinking with them. His was always ‘a repetition with a difference’, the repetition that made a difference. As Mick’s talk and article argued, and his life and work continue to teach us, this is the difference between reducing Shakespeare to an atavism and doing Shakespeare activism.

Back in 2009, Mick introduced Ukrainian colleagues to ESRA and followed his words of support with actions – books sent and visits; in 2015 he was pledging his commitment to their work on Shakespeare and on their identity, just as the second edition of the seminal book Shakespeare in the New Europe he co-edited came out. As ‘occupation’ has come once again to mean the horrors of war since the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine and our academic profession is under the threat to be dispossessed by neo-liberal governments, I look to Mick for advice and as example: ‘Profession is derived from ‘possession’: One’s self is fashioned by one’s calling – as one might be possessed by the devil.’ (11)

Odette Blumenfeld
Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași

Although two years have elapsed since Mick passed away, the avalanche of memories and thoughts about him continue to invade my mind and will do so
until my last breaths for it is impossible to forget, be it for one moment, your spiritual father, a father marked by the highest qualities of the human mind epitomized in his valuable contributions to the evolution of the field of Shakespearean studies, the many landmark books he wrote or edited being enough proof of that. It was a visibility that never made him feel superior. On the contrary, he was always goodhearted, modest, on friendly terms with both the older and the younger ones whom he treated as his equals. Hence, the many friends he made that genuinely lament his death. Mick was willing to discover new things about different places, to share ideas with others, in short, he was open to novelty, to the unknown that had to be understood and mastered.

I also had the opportunity to attend some of his classes. I was deeply impressed by his skill in turning the sophisticated scholarly research on a Shakespearean text into simplified, palatable versions to be understood by the students, thus managing to catch their attention and stimulate them to ask questions and express personal points of view.

When the Department’s Centre for (Inter)cultural and (Inter)lingual Research came into being, we realized that it was vital for its future to have its own academic journal, a kind of platform for presenting, discussing and disseminating research findings related to a broad spectrum of topics pertaining to such fields as linguistics, literary theory and criticism, cultural anthropology, translation and adaptation studies, performance studies, film studies. That is how LINGUACULTURE came into being. Mick enthusiastically accepted to be a member of its advisory board. He took this responsibility seriously coming up with ideas for thematic issues and names of possible contributors being aware that our major goal was to increase the visibility of the journal both nationally and internationally.

We continue to talk about Mick, his presence with us being of a different kind, through the books from his personal library generously donated to us by his wife in 2022. Our students and staff members constantly borrow them and make the utmost use of them. Mick’s book corner in the main room of our Department will keep him alive in our memory and of the generations to come, thus contradicting the way in which John Weever, quoted by Mick in one of his articles, epigrammatically speaks of how brief men’s memories are: ‘Man’s memory, with new forgets the old/ One tale is good until another’s told’. 
Boika Sokolova  
University of Notre Dame [USA] in England

My Brilliant Friend Mick  
There comes a time in one’s professional career when invitations to contribute to Festschrifts abound. Next—and it comes as a shock—when you are asked to read at a friend’s funeral. Then come other, quieter moments of remembering which fill the hole left by that person. For me, Mick was a rare gift of a friend whom I was lucky to have.

I met Mick in 1987, on a visit to Sheffield where he was Chair of English, a position requiring erudition matching that of its other distinguished occupant, William Empson. In spite of my apprehension (characteristic of an un-travelled East European) Mick’s genuine friendliness immediately invited me into his world. As a parting gift after our first lunch together, I received a copy of his Elizabethan Popular Theatre which bears the inscription, ‘To Boika, in celebration of a good conversation’. Looking at it now, I cannot remember what that conversation was about, but it marked the beginning of decades of professional and personal closeness. I miss the sense of fun that always surrounded Mick, his wicked sense of humour, his generously shared erudition, his capacity to help in a most delicate way.

Mick was one of the moving spirits opening up the way to scholars who had lived behind the Iron Curtain, and genuinely believed in the attainment of a better world. He enabled the organising of one of the first international Shakespeare conferences in Eastern Europe after 1989. The unforgettable days of Shakespeare in the New Europe, in Bankya, 1993, were days of intense emotional closeness, Shakespeare discussions, toasts to Christopher Marlowe and enthusiastic assertion of the potential of good will. One of my most cherished memories comes from the preparation of the volume which came out of this conference. Mick and I were sitting on the steps of the British Museum, planning the Introduction, when a flock of pigeons quietly pecking at our feet suddenly took flight. It was a splendid picture of soaring up whiteness and looked like a good omen.
Many years passed, many lunches were shared, many books followed. Days before the news of Mick’s death, a packet arrived on my doorstep. It contained what turned out to be his last gift, the third edition of *As You Like It*. A shaky hand had written, ‘For Boika Tons of love’. Well, his handwriting was never great, and I didn’t read in his struggling hand a sign of parting. Or maybe, I didn’t want to.

More than a decade ago, I received for my birthday a rosebush from him and Judi. As he gave it to me, he mumbled that there was something about it which reminded him of Schubert. Thinking back on this, I realise how Mick continues to live in my world—not only through the memories of a friendship and his books, but with the delicate lightness of an intelligence that is not unlike music.

**Michael Hattaway’s works cited and discussed in the texts above:**


