Al Bahith Journal for Social Sciences
Homepage: https://journals.uokerbala.edu.iq/index.php/bjh

Meg and *A Man for All Seasons:* A Study of History

Prof. Rasha Abdulmunem Azeez (Ph.D.)
University of Baghdad

Abstract in English

This research paper shows how history is sometimes distorted to convey a different story, not a real one. This distortion is tackled to highlight the character of Meg from a feminist point of view. The argument is based on the theory of adaptation; Paula Vogel adapts Robert Bolt's *A Man for All Seasons* to write her play *Meg*. The aim of this paper is to disuss how Vogel shows in her play that rewriting history might disclose important facts through the theory of adaptation; in the case of *Meg*, it presents a powerful, smart woman who can take decisions and be completely independent. While readers do not meet Meg or Margaret only for few times in *A Man for All Seasons* because she is meant to be marginalized as a secondary character, Meg in Vogel's *Meg* is the central character who controls the whole action of the play, reporting a different historical fact concerning a female figure.

Paper Info

Received: - -2025
Accepted: - -2025
Published: 28-7-2025

Keywords

Keywords: adaptation, history, narrator, historian.

1. Introduction

The story of *A Man of All Seasons* (1960) revolves around the main charcater Sir Thomas More who refuses to act against religion and remains firm in his position against the divorce of King Henry VIII that is against religious convictions. This moral stand leads finally to his execution. Meg his daughter has a slight role in the

play and appears as a secondary character. The story took place during the 16th century in England. Paula Vogel's *Meg* (1977), on the other hand, shows Meg as the main character. *A Man of All Seasons* serves as the setting and the historical background of *Meg*, but the main change is the status of Meg as a feamle character who estabishes herself very well as an inelligent, eductaed woman in a patriarchial sosiety. She defends her position and proves her independence. This is shown particulaly through the relationship with her father and her husband.

Vogel's *Meg* is an effort to examine history and the figure of Sir Thomas More from a female perspective. More's daughter Margaret, or Meg, is the narrator of Vogel's play. *Meg* does not probably present a truer story than the story of Robert Bolt's play *A Man for All Seasons*, but the former underscores the different perspective from which history can be recorded; *Meg* also underscores the conventions that dictate the way history is recorded (Mansbridge 2010). One of Edward Said's powerful statements in *Orientalism* about recording is that "[m]y two fears are distortion and inaccuracy, or rather the kind of inaccuracy produced by too dogmatic a generality and too positivistic a localized focus" (1979). Meg underscores the conventions of recording that provide inaccurate or even deformed history.

2. Theoritical Approach

Linda Hutcheon, author of *A Theory of Adaptation* and poineer of the theory of adaptation, finds that adaptation is so pervasive and is done in a variety of genres: stories, novels, poems, plays, paintings, and operas. Adaptation is an old habit, and the postmodern writer inherits this same habit with more possibilities (2006). It is an invitation from Hutcheon to investigate any possible adaptation in a literary work. Although adaptation tends to be connected with a shift in media such as

the adaptation of a novel to a film, or a play to an opera, adaptation from text to text is viable as well.

To begin with, there are many definitions of adaptation. Writers and theorists do not find it easy to have one, specific definition that explains this term and describes its process. Hutcheon defines adaptation as "an extended, deliberate, announced re-visitation of a particular [and prior] work of art" (2006, p.170); "[i]t is repetition but without replication, bringing together the comfort of ritual and recognition with the delight of surprise and novelty" (2006, p.173). In other words, adaptation "is the ability to repeat without copying, to embed difference in similarity, to be at once both self and Other" (2006, p. 174); "adaptation is an act of appropriating or salvaging, and it is always a double process of interpreting and then creating something new" (2006, p.20). Adaptations are considered new works in the sense that they are, as Hutcheon puts it beautifully, "like melodies transposed into a different key" (2006, p.10).

Meg are examples of character adaptation. In this play, Vogel adapts the character of Margaret (or Meg). Adapting this character evokes some crucial questions: does Vogel create an "other"? what kind of "other" does she create? how does this "other" fit in her adaptation and the message she conveys? Vogel creates by adapting this character a metadrama to highlight the female position and agency in this play and to comment on masculine authority. The adaptation of characters in *Meg* develops the discussion of adaptation process further to include the metadrama subgenre. Through her adaptation of a character, Vogel creates a fragment from the original play in the form of a metadrama to narrate a different story about the central,

female character of the classical play. Metadrama enables Vogel to present for readers or audience a scene behind the curtains of the original play.

3. Analysis and Discussion

Reading *A Man for All Seasons*, one does not really meet Meg except for few scenes. It is hard for the readers or researchers to know or evaluate Meg's character because they hardly see her in Bolt's play. Bolt describes her as "[m]idle twenties. A beautiful girl of ardent moral fitness; she both suffers and shelters behind a reserved stillness which it is her father's care to mitigate" (1962, p. xxiii). Although Meg is educated and intellectual, she has her own suffering due to the limitations on women's education at the time. Meg's education cannot be effectively detected by readers in Bolt's play. Her intellect is no more than a shadow of her father's intellect, or "may be a feather in her father's cap" (Mansbridge, 2010, p. 62). We cannot ignore the fact that Bolt gives her character some complexity that is felt in her conversation with Norfolk about reading the doctrines of Machiavelli. Norfolk and More agree that it is hard to find a husband for Meg that fits to her intellect. In another conversation with King Henry in *A Man for All Seasons*, she speaks Latin and he admires her language. Bolt announces in the stage direction that "(*Her Latin is better than [Henry's]…*)" (1979, p.49). However, Meg's brilliance is blurred with her modesty that is highlighted by history. The readers meet in *A Man for All Seasons* almost a silent Meg, and historians speak on her behalf. Steven Connor describes the silent character in his article "Rewriting Wrong: On the Ethics of Literary Reversion" as follows:

… [A]nd the unending responsibility, of those who narrate to speak on behalf of those who had no voice, or no words that can be heard. To rewrite the narratives of the past is to allow and foster the remission of that 'eternal and inhuman wakefulness' of self-present consciousness, to allow those blinks of the eye, 'the cracks and chinks through which another voice, other voices speak in our lives.' (2000, p. 136)

The narration and the narrator play an impactful role in Vogel's adaptation because the readers' attention is more focused on a certain point of view used in the story: whose story is it? Through whose view-point is the story unfolding? Vogel's Meg's story has subjective and internal elements that bring readers into the thoughts and feelings of characters, rather than just telling about external realities (Seger, 1992, p.25). Meg starts her story in *Meg* by addressing the readers and saying,

Margret More Roper was born in 1508, the beloved daughter of the reverent Saint Thomas More, martyr of the true Church—and died the obedient wife of William Roper, Esquire… She submitted her brilliance in all things to her father and husband, thereby increasing her lustre… Why, I've been saintly for over 400 years… Four hundred years of sermonizing and reproach to wives, mistresses, mothers, and school girls. (Vogel, 2008, p.6)

In history, William Roper (Meg's husband) told the story of the Mores; in *A Man for All Seasons*, Bolt tells the story of the Mores; and in *Meg*, Meg tells the story of the Mores. She takes the role not only of the narrator, but also the role of the historian. *Meg* reflects Vogel's concern for the way history is told and who is excluded or kept

silent or passive in that history. Conventionally, we read or study history as we inherit it without a reflection or a moment of thought:

MEG. Perhaps, as unwilling schoolchildren, captive in a sunny classroom, you heard or read of these three men –father, husband, and politician. Book upon book are filled with words about their aspiration, their frustrations, their deaths. But all of that is another story—and not the story I tell to you tonight.

(Vogel, 2008, p.7)

The speech of Meg tells about a female submission and a male authority. Meg is typically remembered for her obedience besides her intelligence. The latter, however, comes as secondary in her fame. In Joanna Mansbridge's perspective, Meg is an example of "history's tendency to flatten (idealize and/or demonize) female figures and cast them as supporting characters to a central male figure" (2014, p.29). Vogel recognizes this role of women as puppets and further tangles the ideal portrait of women in the traditional historical accounts (Mansbridge 2014). Men are always prone to have the authorial voice while women have the passive voice. According to Sue-Ellen Case, "without authority, speaking is inappropriate" (1985, p. 18).Vogel gives authorial voice to Meg, and she portrays an active Meg who is full of vitality; Meg is bold and even playful, lustful, and commanding, especially when it comes to Roper, her husband. She makes Roper (or Will) repeat after her a vow of love and obedience in a scene that makes a reader laugh and feel astonishment at the same time. The vow is about a complete submission to Meg. He admits willingly to be guided by her and follow her discretion concerning all matters—civil, religious, and domestic—and their married life besides upbringing their offspring (Vogel 2008).

Vogel in this scene reverses marriage conventions at the time; the wives are the ones who have this consent not husbands. Ironically, Meg tells Roper later, "[w]hat mission could you possibly have? Other than scratching my back in the morning" (Vogel, 2008, p. 50).

She, on the other hand, moves always around her father in an attempt to present her knowledge, council, and points of view on political and social matters. Meg defies the naturalization of history of facts and conventions by "demythologizing both her father's legacy as a Great Man and her own as his idealized daughter" (Mansbridge, 2014, p. 29). The process of naturalization of the figure of Sir Thomas More and his text *Utopia* has "mythologized, aesthetically elevated, and described with terms like 'transcendence,' 'universality,' and 'truth'" (Mansbridge, 2014, p. 31). Vogel is shedding light, through her adaptation, on ignored female figures in the canonical works and in history. *Meg* is Vogel's endeavor to recover women stories in history and classical literary works. Mansbridge supports this endeavor by describing it as a necessity: "the need to claim canonical and social authority; the necessity and difficulties involved in claiming authority within discourses defined by men and for men" (2014, p. 27).

In this play, Vogel uses the defamiliarization strategy to address contemporary concerns, especially women's concerns. Vogel complicates the image of Meg that the readers learn about through traditional and historical accounts. History cannot be a single story; it all depends on which version of that story the readers get (Mansbridge 2014). In *Meg,* More asks his daughter to write or continue writing the history of the family. He gives a powerful explanation of how history is documented: "[i]t is all came about as an extension of our discussion of words—

words which in the attempt to capture truth inevitably become fabrications—and particularly offensive as history. So rather than having others fabricate our lives, we shall do it ourselves" (Vogel, 2008, p. 17). Thus, Meg uses her position as a narrator and puts herself in the center of the family or the history of the family; she "deconstructs the idealization of her life and role in history" (Mansbridge, 2010, p. 66). Alternatively, history endorses the public life in which men are the center. Women, on the other hand, are hidden in their private spheres that nobody can learn about distinctly. Hence, culture or society gives its own characterization of women's life, stories, feelings, and even fantasies. Between these two cultural categories (the public and the private), women's private life remains invisible and it remains subject to men's or society's invention even the fictional woman on stage (1985).

When Meg, in Vogel's version, goes out to the public life, she finds herself merely a "reflection in [people's] eyes: Thomas More's daughter, William Roper's wife" (2008, p. 58). She also describes her feelings in the charity experience, which her father asks her to participate in like other parliament members' wives do, as "[v]ery upsetting, Papa. I felt so—so hypocritical, so mean. To think that some ladies go once a week on such errands of mercy, and return to their families feeling uplifted, secure in their salvation, complacent in their youth and well-being" (Vogel, 2008, pp. 58-59). Meg here identifies the superficial role that a woman may have at the time. For Meg, it is a pointless contribution to society. If women need to be charitable or to change something in their society, it will not be a hypocritical action that happens once a week. In her opinion, women are able to have a dramatic contribution or real action in society. Meg's statement about women and their function in society lead to what Rosemary Curb terms as "woman-conscious" (1985, p. 302). Curb states that

this term "encompasses all drama by and about women that is characterized by multiple interior reflections of women's lives and perceptions … Woman-conscious theatre presents a multi-dimensional unraveling of women's collective imagination in a psychic replay of myth and history" (1985, p. 302). Meg represents or speaks here women's conscience. The image of women is neither socially or politically powerless nor emotionally passive as defined by historical myths (Curb 1985). Meg is self-defined in *Meg* as the intellectual and reclaims women's position in history.

Meg in history resembles Meg in Bolt's *A Man for All Season*. Vogel's play conforms with Bolt's play in admitting wit, knowledge, and education to Meg. The difference is in the exposition. Meg's intellect in Bolt's play is secondary, hidden, and passive. Vogel maximizes Meg's intellect as superior, vibrant, and central. Both Megs share the same love to and trust in the figure of the father, More. In More's absence, both Megs share the same feelings: "I've not yet told you what the house is like, without you" (Bolt, 1962, p. 141); and Vogel's Meg states, "but you can't take me with you to your councils! Papa, I have no one to talk to" (2008, p.16). The infidelity is in the deconstruction of this love and the reverent figure of More by Vogel's Meg by the end of the play. The play of Vogel explores father-daughter relationship "at that painful transition 'when father and daughter turn round and see each other as man and woman'" (Vogel, 2008, p. 3). Vogel unfolds this reality gradually in her play. Like Bolt, Vogel depicts More as a family man who has religious conventions. He advocates women education in an age when women were illiterate, and were praised only for obedience; he tells Meg that "[y]our education will always be my proudest accomplishment" (Vogel, 2008, p. 18). Meg describes him at the beginning of the play as "he's very great, and very dear, and… slightly

ridiculous" (Vogel, 2008, p. 12). By saying "slightly ridiculous," she is trying to give the audience an impression of her deconstruction of his figure by the end of the play. Hence, Meg's devotion for her father does not last till the end of Vogel's play as it has in Bolt's play. In her conversation with her father near the middle of *Meg*, Meg is stunned by her father's praise of her dead mother. He claims that her mother (Jane Colt), or women in general, had has an outstanding intellect. He discloses to his daughter:

> [Y]ou have a gift far beyond plain sewing and embroidery—that typical ignorance that passes for "breeding" among English gentlewomen… Men live their lives out never realizing that there are dark continents waiting to be discovered, whole new worlds of experience—a foot away from them, in the minds of their wives… So I determined to uncover the secret of your sex. But your mother—she was sparkling, by God, and as awed by Greek as I by her…[, but she] died first before I discovered her. (Vogel, 2008, pp. 25-26)

Retha Warnicke discusses in her book about women in the English Renaissance that More discerned that women's or wives' education would support the family because "the female humanist would not only be an attractive and desirable wife but also a loving and caring mother" (1993, p. 205). Bolt evaluates More in the preface to *A Man for All Seasons* as well: "what first attracted me was a person who could not be accused of any incapacity for life, who indeed seized life in great variety and almost greedy quantities, who nevertheless found something in himself without which life

was valueless and when that was denied him was able to grasp his death" (1962, p. xiii). For More, lying on an oath is a great sin, and leads to a soul's destruction.

Hitherto, history, Bolt, and Vogel agree that More is an ideal man. The deconstruction in Vogel's adaptation starts when Meg has a conversation with Alice, Meg's stepmother. Meg learns from Alice that her father fell in love with Jane Colt's younger sister, but he married Jane because she was the eldest. Meg realizes also that her mother hated reading and she preferred to sweep floors to learn Latin. Jane escaped insistently any of More's attempts to teach her Latin. Finally, Jane had five children and, at this point, it was impossible for her to learn. Meg comments in a startling way, "[s]o the story of my mother's refinement is a myth!" (Vogel, 2008, p. 67). At this stage, the disappointment of Meg in her father is provoked. Then, she knows from Alice that More has married her only a month after the death of his "beloved wife" (Vogel, 2008, p. 68). Furthermore, he married Alice secretly, and she acted as the family's housekeeper for over a year before announcing their marriage. Meg reports, "[a]nd all to save appearance! ... I should not have any—any illusions" (Vogel, 2008, p. 68). Meg discovers that her father is a liar and a flatterer as Cromwell describes him once for Meg: "[i]f I may suggest your mistake in perception—you see your father in terms of one role and one face—ah, do we not all see our fathers so? But he has many faces" (Vogel, 2008, p. 64). The picture of the perfect father is shattered now for Meg. It is not only that More's figure is deconstructed, but also Meg's great devotion for him is deconstructed as well. Meg recalls a childhood memory of the river downstream in October, and how she "gazed up at that limitless, eternal October blue… That is how much I love my father" (Vogel, 2008, p. 69). Meg, ultimately, signs a document that Cromwell prepares to

approve More's condemnation and execution. She signs this paper to save her family the consequences of the decision of her father of refusing the oath and in order not to make martyrs of herself, her husband, and her children. Cromwell promises her a normal life as citizens after the execution of More. She states coldly referring to her father, "I have no patience for martyers" (Vogel, 2008, p. 66); she also contends, "I cannot martyr myself for the memory of October" (Vogel, 2008, p. 7). Mansbridge suggests that Meg has been in a reverie that dissolves into a present address (2010); for Mansbridge, Meg's reaction is not a deconstruction only, but also a "demythologization of Meg's father… [as] a microcosm of the demythologization of the great heroes of grand narratives of history" (2010, p. 72). If *A Man for All Seasons* is centralized around More the family man and his outstanding love for his family, *Meg* closes with Meg's viewing her father as "a stubborn thinker, a doting father, and a neglectful husband… [Meg is] angered by a father who cared more for conventions than for his family" (Mansbridge, 2014, pp. 31-32). Meg rebels against her father. She not only approves her father's execution, but also decides not to attend his execution as mentioned by history. Meg alters history by admitting that she did not meet her father in his way to his execution as history recorded. It is Roper who fabricates history and writes that Meg has attended her father's beheading. He also writes the history of a great man, Sir Thomas More.

After the death of her father, Meg raises her sons and daughters. Unlike the historical Meg, who taught her three daughters Greek and Latin which enabled one of them—Mary Roper Basset—to get the foundation that would result in her becoming a Greek and Latin scholar (Murphy, 1984, p. 1), Vogel's Meg sends only her sons to school. She teaches her daughters catechism, but "I [Meg] did not teach

them Greek—not for them the mystery of the stars, nor the lyricism of math. They grew up to be big healthy women, giggling,… gossiping,…. [knitting] before the fire…, and [dreaming] of the inn-keeper's son; and so passed gaily through their days in darkness" (Vogel, 2008, p. 73). Waking up from her reverie, Meg recognizes the uselessness of women's education in an age where women are not appreciated for their knowledge. They were confined in their world of knitting and always under men control. A woman will be always Eve that has the apples of damnation. This is how More describes Meg in *A Man for All Seasons* when she comes to prison, with Alice and Roper, to convince him to swear to the oath: "[w]ell, has Eve run out of apples?" (Bolt, 1962, p. 141). Meg here is portrayed as the emotional woman who is trying to convince Adam (her father here) to disobey God and be damned instead of being saved. A woman is portrayed to have a negative impact on a man, while he is portrayed as a saint and a hero: "Sir Thomas does not go to his doom because of a fatal weakness in his character. His steadfast strength causes others to condemn him" (Taubman, 1961, p. xi). More seems so steadfast that even Eve cannot sway him (Veidemanis 1966). Vogel's Meg ends the play by saying that "men are martyred in death… But women—women are martyred in life" (Vogel, 2008, p. 73).

Although Meg is armed with knowledge and finds herself superior, especially at the beginning of the play, she finally unifies herself with all women at the time. Meg's last words in Vogel's adaptation are, "I lived on, a story never recorded, until at last, I too, departed. My grave was marked with a stone cut by history; but oh, women of my age—could I have chosen, I would lie with you in your unmarked communal grave—of silence" (2008, p. 73). Meg realizes that her education is both a gift and a curse that isolates her from other women (Vogel 2008).

Meg is aware that her education is a privilege that not any woman has enjoyed at the time, but she finds herself unbelonging to the women of the community. Alice explains to Meg how the typical, normal woman behaves at the time: "[y]ou have no shame….Had you been mine, you'd be learning to cook, and clean, and care for a decent, honest, intelligent husband" (Vogel, 2008, p. 11). Meg on another occasion argues with her father about her education:

> Why did you decide to teach me Latin and Greek? I'm not complaining, because I'm ever so grateful to you—if you've separated me from kin and kind, you have also opened up an entire world of solace past my sisters' fantasies. It's rather thrilling, Papa. I sometimes stay transfixed over a page in a book, and the words lose meaning. Because I think—I am very likely the only woman in the world right now poring over these words—there is no other woman. I am unique. It's uncharted territory that together, you and I, are exploring. But Papa, does that make me a freak of nature? (Vogel, 2008, p. 25)

Meg's education alienates her from other women, and then she discovers that she has lived in a halo of deception and that knowledge will not be a power for women at the time. She discovers the falsehood or the myth of her mother's education and her father's greatness. As Mansbridge puts it, "[i]n *Meg*, knowledge is even more alienating than ignorance, since it creates an acute awareness of the limitations circumscribing women's production and practical use of their learning" (2010, p. 74).That is why Meg lets her daughters live as other women live and die in communal grave with their gender, though in darkness. What Meg wants for her daughters is "a

life without alienation, without unanswerable questions, and without the shadow of a Great Man [with hidden secrets] obscuring their light" (Mansbridge, 2010, p. 75). Although Vogel's Meg gets the recognition, she ends with confinement.

Meg's feelings of alienation are intensified in Vogel's adaptation, while they do appear indirectly in Bolt's *A Man for All Seasons* without any emphasis. When King Henry tells Meg that he hears that she is a scholar, she answers, "[a]mong women I pass for one, Your Grace" (Bolt, 1962, p. 48).Vogel creates an other of Bolt's Meg in a Lyotardian manner. Vogel presents the "unpresentable" of the character of Meg; Vogel puts this "unpresentable" forward in her adaptation: "[w]hat might the 'unpresentable' be? It could be an Other that threatens unified systems of thought: something that needs to be expelled or cast outside of a system… [; otherwise, the other would be] disturbing" (Lane, 2013, pp. 202-203). Meg's deconstruction of her character as a woman of modesty and piety and her deconstruction of her father's ideal figure are the disturbing effects of Meg's other presented by Vogel. Meg reveals that history is a lie and a fabrication. Vogel suggests by her adaptation that "[a]ll that has been received, if only yesterday…, must be suspected" (Lane, 2013, p. 203).

The other of Meg created by Vogel can be perceived also as a "metafictional character" as termed by June Schlueter (1979, p. 14). Vogel creates in *Meg* a metacharacter based on the marginalized character of Meg in *A Man for All Seasons*. In the process of character adaptation, according to Vincent Murphy in his book *Page to Stage: The Craft of Adaptation*, the adapters will try to find a character (or may be characters) who moves them, to take apart that character's story, and to rebuild a play about that character. The adapters will be able to bring their favorite

stories to life and create their own character from literature. The adapters will shape the character's life in whatever way that works for their piece; they may come up with new ways to tell the story. Murphy further discusses that this creation is simultaneously exciting and frightening because the adapter should act as a god and decide who is important and why. The adapters need to choose also which of the relationships among characters are most relevant to explore, that best reveal the conflict of the adaptation (2012). Vogel, for example, explores Meg's relationship with her father to reveal the reality of the myths created by history; Vogel explores the mutual relationship of love and faith between the daughter and the father that turns out to be a gender-bias relationship: male authority and female subordination. Vogel also delves into Meg's relation to her husband to reveal by whom the stories of history might be written: "Village Idiot" (Vogel, 2008, p. 4).

Vogel assumes one reality of the identity of Meg in her adaptation. Meg speaks to the readers during the whole play; she wants them to be aware of her story that nobody knows before and, in turn, to be aware of the realities presented in history and transferred from one generation to the other. What Vogel is typically doing here, besides creating a metafictional character, is making use, again, of Brecht's alienation effect. The aim of this effect is to hinder the audience, or the readers here, from simply identifying themselves with the characters. This effect will allow the readers to accept or reject the players' actions and speech on a conscious level instead of a subconscious level (Brecht 1947).The core of the alienation effect in *Meg* is Meg's speech to the readers as she comments on or conveys certain events in the play. For Vogel, the purpose of using Brecht's technique here is to reveal a history of omission as far as women are concerned (Murphy 1984). Her role is to fill in gaps what has

been omitted in the life of Meg, and to make the readers participate in the process of demythologization. Meg's monologue to the readers, at the outset of the play, helps to set the action of the play and bring the past forward, provides the reader with immediate information about the action of the play, and sets relationship between past and present.

4. Conclusion

In her challenge to the myths and history in *Meg*, Vogel is confronting the binary view of female sexuality as either threateningly wild (a prostitute) or properly domesticated. A dual packaging that is naturalized by the dominant culture. It is the dichotomy of the idealized, romanticized heroine or the degraded prostitute. Vogel turns this dichotomy inside out (Mansbridge 2010). She shows a Meg who is pregnant before marriage. It is "a transition from the virgin goddess Athena… to the sex goddess of the twentieth century. Either way, women did not escape the role of merchandise in the world of male exchange" (Case, 1985, p. 53). They are not whores as culture may evaluate them. They are women who are unappreciated by their male-dominant society. Culture positions them against each other or against themselves as in *Meg*. The play ends with a woman who regrets her literacy and gives up the right of her daughters in education. Meg, surpass history and canon. She seems to have the ability to decide not to romanticize the end of her father or her relation to her father, by not attending with tears his execution or by not educating her daughters. Vogel does not furnish absolute ends or ultimate solutions albeit she grants awareness and a sense of challenge.

5. References

Bolt, Robert, (1962). *A Man for All Seasons*. A Division of Random House, New York.

Brecht, Bertolt (1947). *Brecht On Theatre*. Trans. Ed. John Willett. Methuen, New York.

Case, S.-E. (1985). Classic Drag: The Greek Creation of Female Parts. *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 317-327.

Connor, Steven (2000). Rewriting Wrong: On the Ethics of Literary Revision. *Postmodern Literary Theory: An Anthology,* edited by Niall Lucy, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford, pp. 123-139.

Curb, Rosemary K. (1985). Re/cognition, Re/presentation, and Re/creation in Women-Conscious Drama. *Theatre Journal*, Vol.37, No. 3, pp. 302-316.

Hutcheon, Linda (2006). *A Theory of Adaptation*. Routledge.

Lane, Richard J., editor (2013). *Global Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Routledge.

Mansbridge, Joanna (2014). *Paula Vogel*. The U of Michigan P.

--- (2010). "Camp, the Canon, and a Performative Burlesque: Paula Vogel's Plays as Literary and Cultural Revision." Dissertation, The City U of New York P.

Murphy, Clare M. (1984). On the Women in More's Life: Two Recent Works. *Moreana*, Vol.21, No.82, pp.109-117.

Murphy, Vincent (2012). *Page to Stage: The Craft of Adaptation*. U of Michigan P, Michigan, *ProQuest* ebrary, https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.gsu.edu/lib/gsu/detail.action?docID=3415118. Accessed 1 June 2016.

Said, Edward W. (1979). *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, New York.

Schlueter, June (1979). *Metafictional Characters in Modern Drama*. Columbia U P, New York.

Seger, Linda (1992). *The Art of Adaptation: Turning Fact and Fiction into Film*. Henry Holt and Company, New York.

Taubman, Howard (1961). Universal Themes: *A Man for All Seasons* Implicates All of Us. *New York Times*, 3 Dec. X1.

Veidemanis, Gladys (1966). A Play for All Seasons. *The English Journal*, Vol.8, No.55, pp.1006-10014.

Vogel, Paula (2008). *Meg*. Samuel French, New York.

Warnicke, Retha M. (1993). *Women of the English Renaissance and Reformation*. Greenwood Press, Connecticut.

Abstract in Arabic

(ميغ) و (رجل لكل المواسم) دراسه للتاريخ

يبين هذا البحث كيف يتم تشويه التاريخ في بعض الاحيان. وتم تناول هذا التشويه لغرض تسليط الضوء على شخصية ميغ من ناحية الشخصية النسوية بالاعتماد على نظرية الاقتباس حيث اقتبست الكاتبة المسرحية باولا فوكل مسرحية (رجل لكل المواسم) للكاتب المسرحي روبرت بولت من اجل كتابة مسرحيتها المعنونة (ميغ). يهدف هذا البحث الى مناقشة كيف قامت الكاتبة بكشف حقائق مهمة عن طريق أعادة كتابة التاريخ تتمثل هذه الحقائق في مسرحية (ميغ) كشف ماهية الشخصية الحقيقية لميغ والتي تتسم بالقوة والذكاء وقادرة على اتخاذ القرار بشكل مستقل تماما . في حين ان القراء لا يلتقون بشخصية ميغ او مارغريت سوى لمرات قليلة في مسرحية (رجل لكل المواسم) لانها شخصية مهمشة وتم جعلها تظهر كشخصية ثانوية في المسرحية، فأن شخصية ميغ هي الشخصية الرئيسية في مسرحية (ميغ) لفوكل والتي تسيطر على احداث المسرحية لتنقل حقيقة تاريخية مختلفة عن شخصية نسوية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الاقتباس، التاريخ، القاص، المؤرخ.
