speare's doublets or noted them particularly in *Hamlet*. Rylands' doublets, as it happens, are mainly not hendiadys (only 12 of his 27 make my Table A); Rylands does not use the word "hendiadys" until long after he has finished discussing his doublets (pp. 208, 236); and his two statements about hendiadys are distressingly vague ("The hendiadys uses of *Hamlet* have been considered . . . " [p. 236; "They *have*?" is my astonished query]) or inadequately explanatory ("The metaphor is not used for hendiadys as in Hamlet [sic]," p. 208). He seems to think of hendiadys as the use of two terms not quite parallel either in sense or in style, but he never mentions Latin poetry and, beyond the description quoted by Loesch, which is not a description of hendiadys, he offers no analysis of how the figure works. Although Rylands is acute on some points of Shakespeare's style, on the matter of doublets Granville-Barker, who published his "Preface to *Hamlet*" in 1930, only two years after Rylands' book (which he may indeed have read), seems to me much more telling.

Incidentally, Rylands' edition of *Hamlet*, though helpful in many ways, never mentions hendiadys anywhere—not in its lengthy Introduction, its Notes, its Select Literary Criticism, its Appendixes, or its footnote glosses. My own notes cite Rylands' two glosses mainly to show how editors make up meanings that *miss* the hendiadys in word pairs.

With the exhumation of Rylands' study, we can rejoice that the lost has been found. But there is more at issue here than recovering one scholarly discussion of Shakespeare's style. The crucial question is whether we need to see Shakespeare's use of hendiadys within the larger context of his (and other writers') use of doublets. Loesch's letter gives me a welcome occasion to address briefly this important matter.

About the time my article was published, I became aware that the history of hendiadys and its use in Shakespeare's plays may be only one chapter—but the most significant one for English poetry—in the larger history of the use of English word pairs. Reading Jerome Mitchell's *Thomas Hoccleve: A Study in Early Fifteenth-Century English Poetic* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1968), I found that the device goes back to the ninth-century Alfredian translation of Bede, which frequently uses two Old English words to render one Latin word. Two words, especially if they are long and Latinate, confer gravity on a passage, even if the second adds no significant meaning to the first (see J. M. Hart, "Rhetoric in the Translation of Bede," in *An English Miscellany: Presented to Dr. Furnivall in Honour of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1901], pp. 150–54). For centuries afterward, authors continued to couple their terms, and scholars have cited numerous examples from the prose of Caxton, Cranmer, Bokenham, and the *Book of Common Prayer* (Mitchell, p. 67).

In poetry, too, word pairs abound—in Chaucer, Hoccleve, Lydgate, and other fifteenth-century writers. The linked terms may be synonyms, or they may have "different, or even opposite meanings" (Mitchell, p. 68). But as far as I can judge from Mitchell's examples and from a cursory look through Hoccleve and others, the peculiar elusive character of hendiadys does not enter into these early word pairs. Apparently, however, it became standard practice to join one native English word with a foreign derivative, a polysyllable with a monosyllable, or an abstract with a concrete term—just the combinations mentioned by Rylands (though he gives no credit to Hart, as Granville-Barker gives none to him). Many of the examples in my tables show one or more of these kinds of imbalance (e.g., *expectancy and rose*, *fantasy and trick*, *bell and burial*, *voice and precedent*), along with the peculiarly hendiadic complexity of meaning that my essay tries to describe. One imagines that Shakespeare, familiar with the rhetorical advantages of using asymmetrical word pairs but, unlike most of his predecessors, also aware, from his study of Susenbrotus, of the Vergilian pattern of hendiadys, learned to fuse the two techniques—to write phrases in which the two conjoined terms would not only mix styles (English with foreign, long word with short, abstract with concrete) but would also convey a sense of structural uncertainty and problematical meaning. Rylands' insights, like those of Granville-Barker, like Hart's, like Mitchell's, like mine, are stages in the recognition of an important component of early English literary style, a component that perhaps will find one day a more complete historian than any of us.

George T. Wright
University of Minnesota

Reading, Writing, and Teaching

To the Editor:

Helen Vendler's 1980 Presidential Address (*PMLA*, 96 [1981], 344–50) said many things that the profession would do well to ponder. Not only does the "divorce of composition from the reading of powerful imaginative writing" (p. 345) undermine our ability to convince the public, or even our students, that studying literature is practical as well as pleasurable, it denies the integrative nature of thought. It seems foolish to study a literary work

without speculating how it came to be, how the writer developed it from an inchoate notion to a finely worked expression. Conversely, while it is possible to teach writing apart from literature, it is surely foolhardy. For in both reading and writing we engage in discourse. Writing is bound to be enriched by the intellectual stimulation that often results from thoughtful consideration of literary works. As this is true of students' writing, so is it true of our own writing.

In the light of the humanism Vendler professes, it is galling that she would so readily create a lesser class among us. Because "we allow surgeons to operate and not to write," Vendler urges us to "allow teachers in colleges to teach and not write . . ." (p. 346). What is simply wrong-headed is her observation that "writing is a different profession from teaching, . . . from scholarly research and discovery, . . . from the profession of critical thinking" (p. 346). What, then, is writing? And what is teaching? Do they occur in vacuo? All current research into the nature of the writing process assumes that only in writing can we clarify our thought. And, indeed, haven't we been telling freshmen that for generations?

Leaving aside the traditional justification of scholarly research and writing as an ancillary to good teaching, I speak now as a teacher of freshman composition. The teacher of composition must necessarily teach discourse—reading, writing, and thinking as reciprocal activities. It is inconceivable that, without constant struggle to maintain control over our own writing, we could lead students to wrest meaning from a resistant medium.

Yes, pity the composition teacher who must struggle with ninety or more themes a week. But isn't it condescending to imply that such a burden should excuse this person from writing? To be sure, we may doubt whether any of us must publish an article in *PMLA* to be ranked at the top of the profession. If Vendler and the MLA are serious about restoring the connection between reading and writing, then some thought may be given to easing the crushing burden of freshman themes so that the writing teacher can engage in the most effective form of course preparation, namely, the act of writing itself.

ROGER J. BRESNAHAN
Michigan State University

Ms. Vendler replies:

Roger Bresnahan has misunderstood my sentence urging that we "allow teachers in colleges to teach and not write." I do not see in that sentence any creation of "a lesser class among us." Most college teachers do not publish; the class of those who teach and do not write is already by far the largest class among us. What I object to is the way the members of this valuable and earnest majority are made to feel inadequate because they have not published.

There is no necessary correlation between intelligence and competence, on the one hand, and the need or wish to write, on the other. "Only in writing can we clarify our thought," says Bresnahan. But many clear-thinking people, as we are all aware, do not write and feel no wish to write; they clarify their thoughts very well by reflection and utterance. We all know teachers of this excellent sort.

I did not imply that we should "excuse" teachers of Freshman English from writing because of their demanding work. Those who want to write will write—if it is a pleasure to them and something that their nature requires. That is true of all writers, even if their paid work is time-consuming and demanding.

But I wholly agree with Bresnahan that "the crushing burden of freshman themes" ought to be eased. The best way to ease it is to give up our exclusive emphasis, in Freshman English, on writing. Our freshmen should read a great deal, discuss their reading, and feel what it is to read and talk naturally about books, ideas, and feelings. Once they begin to hear the *written* language in their minds they can begin to write. Until they hear it, their writing will be pitiable.

HELEN VENDLER
Boston University

Conflicting Names

To the Editor:

In Carlos Feal's "Conflicting Names, Conflicting Laws: Zorrilla's *Don Juan Tenorio*" (*PMLA*, 96 [1981], 375–87) there is a striking statement contrasting Tirso's Don Juan, "man without a name," with Zorrilla's character, who "insistently affirms his name" (p. 378). Examination of Tirso's and Zorrilla's plays suggests that the contrast is overstated and that we may need to qualify Feal's conclusion that "the man without a name, through generations, paradoxically gives rise to one of the most imposing names in history" (p. 378). It would be more accurate to state that Tirso's title, *El burlador de Sevilla* (*The Trickster of Seville*), suggests his play's content better than the name would