

IN THE COURT OF SHAKESPEARE

BETWEEN:

FAMILY OF X, A MINOR

Applicant

– and –

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE HIGH SCHOOL

Respondent

Matter No.....5/2007
Hearing Date.....20/03/2007

FACTUM OF THE APPLICANT

Caolan Moore
Faculty of Law
Counsel for the Applicant

Laura Brightwell
Faculty of English
Counsel for the Applicant

INDEX

PART I – FACTS	1
PART II – ISSUES	2
PART III – ARGUMENTS	3
A. The Quebec law prohibiting the wearing of symbols or dress by which students in public schools conspicuously manifest a religious affiliation is against the law of Shakespeare	3
1. The <i>niqab</i> presents a unique concern for Shakespeare.....	3
2. Secular society benefits from the inclusion of religious language and practice.....	4
3. Citizens cannot be asked to obey a law manifestly contrary to their faith.....	5
B. Parents are responsible for the spiritual well-being of their children, even and especially where that spiritual well-being is in conflict with concerns of this world	6
1. Parental responsibility for spiritual well-being is tied to procreation.....	6
2. Allegiance to family is greater than allegiance to the state.....	6
3. Children are key to personal and familial memory.....	7
4. Parents do not always know best but this does not weaken the child-parent bond.....	8
C. The revealed truth of God is not subject to secular jurisdiction	8
1. God’s authority is not subject to secular jurisdiction.....	8
2. The <i>niqab</i> constitutes the revealed truth of God.....	10
3. Quebec law has no jurisdiction over an individual’s soul.....	10
4. God’s authority over Sahar is just.....	12
5. Our responsibility to the law is dependent on our relationship to its maker.....	12
i) Enforcement of the Quebec law shows insufficient relationship to Sahar.....	12
ii) The Quebec law does not sufficiently consider the After-life.....	13
6. Devotion is a virtue.....	15
PART IV – ORDER SOUGHT	16
PART IV – LIST OF AUTHORITIES	17

PART I – FACTS

- [1] Sahar X (Sahar) is sixteen years old and comes from a devout Muslim family, which arrived in Montreal from Algeria when she was ten. Her father, Rachid X, was a professor of comparative literature in Algiers but now works as a janitor in the Montreal region. Sahar wears a full *niqab* in public at all times as an expression of her faith and submission to God.
- [2] The Quebec government recently passed a law stating in part that "in all public schools in Quebec, wearing symbols or dress by which students conspicuously manifest a religious affiliation is prohibited." After complaints from some of the other children and teachers, and in accordance with the government's policy, Sahar was twice refused admission to William Shakespeare High School (WSH) in Notre-Dame-de-Grace where she is officially enrolled.
- [3] In a media interview on the question, Dr Arnold, the Headmaster of WSH, quoted with approval the 2003 Final Report of the French Presidential Commission. The prohibition of public displays of religious identity is there seen as a bulwark of secular society: "Demanding state neutrality does not seem very comparable with the display of an aggressive proselytism, particularly within the schools. Being willing to adapt the public expression of one's religious particularities and to set limits to the affirmation of one's identity allows everyone to meet in the public space."
- [4] The X family has on several occasions appealed to the school, the Board, and the Quebec Minister of Education, but their appeals have all been denied. In a recent meeting between the school and the family, however, Rachid X and Dr Arnold agreed to refer the matter to the Court of Shakespeare.

PART II – ISSUES

- [5] A) Does the Quebec law prohibiting the wearing of symbols or dress by which students in public schools conspicuously manifest a religious affiliation against the law of Shakespeare?
- [6] B) Are parents responsible for the spiritual well-being of their children, even and especially where that spiritual well-being is in conflict with concerns of this world?
- [7] C) Is the revealed truth of God subject to secular jurisdiction?

PART III – ARGUMENTS

[8] The applicant presents three arguments. The first section addresses the specific Quebec law at issue and submits that it is against the law of Shakespeare. The final two sections explore the larger implications of this law in an attempt to better define the boundaries of the Court of Shakespeare in relation to the parent-child relationship and matters of divine revelation and submit that both are beyond the Court's jurisdiction.

A. The Quebec law prohibiting the wearing of symbols or dress by which students in public schools conspicuously manifest a religious affiliation is against the law of Shakespeare

[9] The specific concerns that inspired the Quebec law regarding the impact of religious symbols or dress in public secular space are not explicitly considered in Shakespeare's canon. But this is not detrimental in considering this issue, as Shakespeare provides sufficient guidance in this area for the Court to reach a decision.

In re Attorney General for Canada; ex parte Heinrich, [2003] 1 C. of Sh. 1 [*Heinrich*] at para. 38.
Attorney General of Canada v. Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors., [2004] 2 C. of Sh. 1 [*Same Sex Marriage Case*] at para. 8.

[10] In our modern pluralistic society, the Court of Shakespeare should assume that Islam and the practice thereof enjoys the same presumptions Shakespeare extends to Christian belief for the purpose of making claims using the law of Shakespeare. Namely, that Islam is assumed to be good, or, at the very least, does not cause harm to adherents by its nature and practice.

1. The *niqab* presents a unique concern for Shakespeare

[11] What makes the *niqab* unique is its mandatory, lay and involuntary nature that adherents must commit to at a young age. Shakespeare's reflections on religion are largely limited to Christianity, which does not *require* any material expression of religiosity via symbols or dress from non-clerical adherents during their everyday life. It is also worth noting that the presence of religious dress and symbols in the public realm is uncontroversial in

Shakespeare. The Duke, for example, in *Measure* is not prevented from wearing religious clothing that conceals his identity in public. Nor does his religious clothing create social discord.

See *The Book of Matthew* 6:18.
Measure for Measure 1.3.

[12] Shakespeare's method of dealing with the tensions and pressures that existed within the wide range of post-Reformation belief is a model for addressing modern religious pluralism. The plays address this reality, not by banishing controversial religious ideas and disagreements from the stage, but by engaging them. Shakespeare's world is necessarily composed of diverse religions and combinations of insignia and doctrines. In *Hamlet*, for example, Shakespeare deliberately forces together a multitude of radically different ideas.

Anthony Dawson, "Shakespeare and Secular Performance" at 4.
 Jeffrey Knapp, *Shakespeare's Tribe: Church, Nation, and Theatre in Renaissance England*, (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2002) at 10.
 Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory*, (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2001) at 240.
Hamlet 1.4.20-25.

[13] Finally, Sahar's observance cannot be compared to what some may consider Isabella's, or even Angelo's, overly doctrinal or inflexible observance of dogma or law. The *niqab* cannot be equated with fervor or inflexible obedience; it is not an extra commitment, but an essential one. As "lawful as eating."

Measure for Measure, 2.1.17-31, 3.1.134-153.
The Winter's Tale, 5.3.111

2. Secular society benefits from the inclusion of religious language and practice

[14] As it cannot enforce its judgments, the Court of Shakespeare seeks authority from the persuasive power of its decisions. Despite its intended appeal to a broad audience, Shakespeare's work is not devoid of religious language or symbolism. To the contrary, Shakespeare taps into a variety of conflicting religious symbols and beliefs to give his plays more meaning and authority. The ghost of Hamlet's father, for example, is a very Catholic

ghost in a very Protestant setting. This sets an example for how our modern society should cope with a plurality of religious convictions. Public secular space can benefit from respectfully and thoughtfully embracing the use of religious language and practice.

Martha Nussbaum, *Poetic Justice* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995) at 10.
Anthony Dawson, "Shakespeare and Secular Performance" at 5, 6.

[15] Further, even if the applicant concedes that the wearing of religious symbols or dress causes conflict in public schools, there is an onus on the state to adapt to an increasingly diverse society. It cannot be assumed that secularism for secularism's sake constitutes a greater good or that its strict enforcement makes public places more neutral or welcoming. Secularism cannot unilaterally set the terms for what is appropriate in society without becoming a form of proselytism itself and risking its own neutrality. It is also not evident that religious dress or symbols, in and of themselves, are forms of proselytism.

Multani v. Commission scolaire Marguerite-Bourgeoys, [2006] 1 S.C.R. 256 at paras. 76., 79.

[16] Religious practice can be altered to accommodate a secular public space, but not at the cost of its own significance. This is especially true when: 1) there is no evidence presented to draw the conclusion that religious dress or symbols (and the *niqab* in particular) threaten the common use of public space; and 2) there is no evidence that the banning of religious dress or symbols is the appropriate way to address this concern.

Anthony Dawson, "Shakespeare and Secular Performance" at 5, 6.

3. Citizens cannot be asked to obey a law manifestly contrary to their faith

[17] If the Court finds that there is a conflict between the Quebec law and the manifestation of Sahar's faith, it is clearly against the law of Shakespeare to ask Sahar to violate her faith, no matter how well intended the public policy. Under the law of Shakespeare, Sahar, with her family and community, may choose confrontation with the law or withdraw from society. The law, in attempting to make a public space to accommodate all people, may make it a

place only for the few who are comfortable in it. Rebuke may be the only appropriate response when the law requires strict adherence and does not sufficiently acknowledge religious belief:

It is requir'd
 You do awake your faith. Then, all stand still.
 Or; those that think it is unlawful business
 I am about, let them depart. (*The Winter's Tale* 5.3.94-7)

Huston Diehl, "'Does Not the Stone Rebuke Me?': The Pauline Rebuke and Paulina's Lawful Magic in *The Winter's Tale*" at 5.

B. Parents are responsible for the spiritual well-being of their children, even and especially where that spiritual well-being is in conflict with concerns of this world

[18] The spiritual well-being of children is beyond the jurisdiction of the state. The state must at minimum stay neutral in its interaction with children, or, when appropriate, work to accommodate the wishes of their parents.

1. Parental responsibility for spiritual well-being is tied to procreation

[19] “[C]hildren are the blessing that faith bestows.” Marriage is important for the production, protection, and upbringing of children and requires that faith and child-rearing be examined together. If faith is, as Manderson J. describes it in the *Same Sex Marriage Case*, faith in *l’autrui*, the enormous faith children place in their parents ought to be respected. Or if, as Yachnin J. argues, “interpersonal faith cannot be prised apart from religious faith,” parents should also be respected as bearers of that faith and the foundation of religious community.

Attorney General of Canada v. Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors., [2004] 2 C. of Sh. 1 at paras. 22, 24, 31, 43 (*per* Manderson J.) at para. 62 (*per* Yachnin J.).

2. Allegiance to family is greater than allegiance to the state

[20] If the state unreasonably restricts the way parents can care for the spiritual well-being of their children, it risks losing the obedience of its citizens. “In Shakespeare, obedience is a virtue when it is chosen as a sacrifice of individual will to a greater good.” Responsibility for

the spiritual well-being of their children will be stronger than the responsibility to adhere to a strict requirement for an abstract common good. As Justice Yachnin notes in the *Same Sex*

Marriage Case:

“Shakespearean characters do not often seek primary recognition from some entity called ‘society’ or ‘the public’; instead, they turn their hungry gazes toward a variety of legitimating institutions and figures [such as] their children, their family or blood-line, the Dead, [...] It’s worth noting the drama’s general distrust of characters, such as the “vile politician” Henry Bolingbroke, who actively pursue the good opinion of the commons.”

In re Attorney General for Canada; ex parte Heinrich, [2003] 1 C. of Sh. 1 at para. 42.
Attorney General of Canada v. Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors., [2004] 2 C. of Sh. 1 at para. 60.

[21] “It is equally clear that legitimate, blood relationships are taken to impart to society an order that cannot be counterfeited.” The family is a naturalizing and cultural institution that cannot be replaced by state initiatives. The state must assume that parents act in good faith.

Attorney General of Canada v. Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors., [2004] 2 C. of Sh. 1 at paras. 25, 29, 33, 35, 39, 44, 49.

3. Children are key to personal and familial memory

[22] Memory is important in Shakespeare and children are vessels of intergenerational memory and patrimony. Religion also relies on memory for passing on revelation and proper teaching. Forgetting familial and religious bonds is too great a sacrifice for the law to demand and is both a secular and religious sin.

In re Attorney General for Canada; ex parte Heinrich, [2003] 1 C. of Sh. 1 at para. 45.
Anthony Dawson, "Shakespeare and Secular Performance" at 12.
The Winter's Tale, 5.1.219-220.
Hamlet, 1.5.91.

[23] The Sonnets strongly emphasize the importance of procreation as an extension of individual and familial memory:

But if thou live remembered not to be,
Die single, and thine image dies with thee. (*Sonnet 3*)

So though, thyself outgoing in thy noon,
Unlooked on diest unless thou get a son. (*Sonnet 7*)

But were some child of yours alive that time,
You should live twice; in it, and in my rhyme. (*Sonnet 17*)

4. Parents do not always know best but this does not weaken the child-parent bond

[24] “The obedience of a child to a parent is normative” but also contains a discretionary element. In *Winter's Tale*, Leontes' irrational fear and anxiety leads to the suffering and death of his family. Yet the family bonds are not forsaken and the play only comes to an end when his family is reunited. Likewise, Hamlet listens to the ghost of his father despite his doubts about his very identity. What is advocated is not blind obedience, but responsibility, respect, forgiveness, and repentance, even in the face of fatal error.

The Bard de la Mer (Du Parcq v Pedersen; Pedersen v Vidaloca), [2005] 3 C. of Sh. 1 at para. 113.

Attorney General of Canada v. Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors., [2004] 2 C. of Sh. 1 at para. 23.

The Winter's Tale, 5.3. 130-133.

Hamlet 2.2.575-580.

C. The revealed truth of God is not subject to secular jurisdiction

1. God's authority is not subject to secular jurisdiction

[25] God's authority is integral to morality. According to Yachnin J. 'religion' constitutes one of the institutions of society in Shakespeare's works. Religion is a legitimate source of God's authority. It has already been established that “the tendency in Shakespeare [is] to represent the moral universe as a loosely articulated network of legitimating figures and institutions.” We can therefore think of God's authority as an integral component of morality in the world.

Attorney General of Canada v. Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors., [2004] 2 C. of Sh. 1.

[26] We can think of religion, in this case Islam, as an institution to whose edicts its devotees are subject. Justice Yachnin emphasizes that the well-being of social institutions such as marriage, the community and the monarch can in particular cases outweigh the well-being of an individual. According to the law of Shakespeare, God's authority exceeds that of Quebec

law. In this particular case, the concern with the well-being of Sahar's immortal soul comprises a higher cause than the concern of the Quebec law regarding the secularity of public space.

Attorney General of Canada v. Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors., [2004] 2 C. of Sh. 1.

[27] The *niqab* is a manifestation of Sahar's relationship to God. In *Hamlet*, authority disseminates from prince Hamlet as the embodiment of his kingdom:

on his choice depends
The sanity and health of this whole state.
And therefore must his choice be circumscrib'd
Unto the voice and yielding of that body
Whereof he is the head. (*Hamlet* 1.3.20-24)

The desires of Hamlet the individual are superseded by the responsibilities of Hamlet the head of state. His individual "body" must 'yield' to the body of the state even as it is embodied in him. The individual body is imaginatively substituted by the body of the state. It is in this sense that the authority of the institution is manifested in the body of its subject. This relationship can be compared to Sahar's obedience to the authority of God even and especially where this authority is manifested in her *niqab*.

[28] Sahar's *niqab* is an integral aspect of her relationship with God. Hamlet is the head of state. The body of Hamlet the individual cannot be physically or conceptually removed from the body of the head of state. Sahar's *niqab* as a manifestation of her obedience to the authority of God cannot be deducted from her religious obligations as a Muslim.

Hamlet 1.3.20-24.

[29] The manifestation of God's truth as revealed in the *niqab* does not threaten the neutrality of public space. Hamlet's responsibility as the head of state is to act in such a manner that ensures the "health of [the] whole state." Where God's authority can be imagined as analogous to that of the state in this particular passage, the *niqab* becomes an example of a

'healthy' relationship between the individual and the authority. The *niqab* enriches rather than threatens that space.

Hamlet 1.3.20-24.

2. The *niqab* constitutes the revealed truth of God

[30] The *niqab* is not a representation of Sahar's relationship with God but its manifestation. *The Winter's Tale* creates a distinction between icons and original entities. The statue of Hermione is revealed to be not her image but herself. A vision of idolatry is invoked on the stage in order that the statue is shown to be not idolatrous. That which appears to be sign is in fact the original entity. Sahar's *niqab* can be understood not as a representation but as a manifestation of God's authority.

Huston Diehl, "'Does Not the Stone Rebuke Me?': The Pauline Rebuke and Paulina's Lawful Magic in *The Winter's Tale*" at 13.

[31] The "revealed truth" of God is manifest in the *niqab*. The *niqab* is the place at which the authority of God is revealed on the individual's body. Autolycus' performance of selling "worthless trinkets" presents the play's audience with a vision of a false idolatry. The audience of *Winter's Tale* recognizes the objects as sign rather than original entity and therefore understands them to be idolatrous. We submit that the Court recognize the *niqab* as the place in which the authority of God is located. The *niqab* is a legitimate location of God's authority.

Huston Diehl, "'Does Not the Stone Rebuke Me?': The Pauline Rebuke and Paulina's Lawful Magic in *The Winter's Tale*" at 13.

3. Quebec law has no jurisdiction over an individual's soul

[32] *Measure* finds that the individual's soul is not subject to state jurisdiction. The demand that Angelo makes of Isabella in *Measure*, to exchange her virginity for Claudio's life, constitutes a tyrannous misapplication of the law.

Redeem thy brother
By yielding up thy body to my will

[...]

Answer me tomorrow
Or, by the affection that now guides me most,
I'll prove a tyrant to him. (*Measure for Measure* 2.4.174-70)

The demand that his subject 'yield' her body to him in order to gratify his sexual desires is an example of an unjust exercise of state power. The state's exercise of power over its subjects, namely Claudio and Isabella, is shown to be immoral. In this instance, the subject has no moral obligation to obey the demands of the head of state. We can think of Sahar's *niqab* as an aspect of her life into which the state is unjust to intrude. Sahar therefore has no moral obligation to obey the Quebec law. This court must respect its jurisdiction and not force her to do so.

[33] Quebec law's demand that Sahar remove her *niqab* is a misapplication of the law. As Angelo himself admits, his rule is 'tyrannous' here. Unlike the concept the individual body's subjugation to the state body in *Hamlet* in which relationship the desire to maintain the overall well-being of the state is expressed, the demand that the state makes of the individual body in *Measure* is *ultra vires*.

Hamlet 1.3.20-24.
Measure for Measure 2.4.174-70.

[34] Quebec law should not endanger the condition of Sahar's soul. Sahar's obedience to the Quebec law is contrary to her spiritual well-being in both this world and the next. For Isabella to submit to Angelo's rape would condemn her soul in the eyes of her religion. Sahar's immortal soul would be threatened by her obedience to Quebec law.

Measure for Measure 2.1.91-94, 2.4.99-104, 136-138, 185-188, 3.1.66-68.
Attorney General of Canada v. Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors., [2004] 2 C. of Sh. 1 at para. 62
(*per* Yachnin J.)

4. God's authority over Sahar is just

[35] Not all authority is good and we submit that the authority of Islam is higher and more appropriate than the authority of Quebec law.

O perilous mouths
That bear in them one and the selfsame tongue
Either of approbation or approval,
Bidding the law make curtsy to their will,
Hooking both right and wrong to the appetite,
To follow as it draws! (*Measure for Measure* 2.4.173-178)

[36] Sahar's desire to wear her *niqab* in public is reasonable and good. Even if we see Isabella's religiosity as inappropriate, our reaction to her does not stop us from sympathizing with her expression of concern for the state of her immortal soul. Similarly, no matter our personal opinion regarding Sahar's *niqab*, this particular relationship is outside of the jurisdiction of secular law. Isabella's decision to privilege the state of her and Claudio's immortal souls over Claudio's mortal life is not shown to be an "act of aggressive proselytism" in the play. The play is a comedy and as such its non-tragic resolution pronounces no judgment on Isabella's decision. Sahar's *niqab* produces no negative effect on the neutrality of public space.

Attorney General of Canada v. Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors., [2004] 2 C. of Sh. 1 (*per* Manderson J.).

5. Our responsibility to the law is dependent on our relationship to its maker

i) Enforcement of the Quebec law shows insufficient relationship to Sahar

[37] Law has a responsibility to foster a personal relationship to its citizens, as citizens have a sacred trust in their rulers. In *Measure*, Angelo is a neglectful and harmful ruler because he does not know his people and fails to understand the affect of his actions on their lives. This is juxtaposed to the Duke who, in full disguise, moves freely through his denizens, showing empathy and supporting them when they face injustice. Escalus provides another example,

looking beyond legal formalities to real problems to “craft a solution specifically sensitive to the experience of the people before him,” giving a “sympathetic and detailed response”.

Measure for Measure 1.3.34-54.

In re Attorney General for Canada; ex parte Heinrich, [2003] 1 C. of Sh. 1 at paras. 15, 40.

The Bard de la Mer (Du Parcq v Pedersen; Pedersen v Vidaloca), [2005] 3 C. of Sh. 1 [*The Bard de la Mer*] at paras. 34, 40.

[38] Furthermore, oppression is often found in a failure to individualize. We should promote a flexible and equitable law marked by good faith. Here, Sahar is true to herself and true to her faith. A sweeping law of this nature has a disproportionate effect on women who share Sahar's faith and is insufficiently tailored to meet their needs.

Martha Nussbaum, *Poetic Justice* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995) at 92.

Richard Posner, *Law and Literature: A Misunderstood Relation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988) at 99.

[39] Giving too much power to the public good can stifle the beliefs of individuals, families and communities. Stifling expression may have stronger implications in religious communities and create bitterness among its members.

O, for my sake do you with fortune chide,
 The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,
 That did not better for my life provide
 Than public means which public manners breeds.
 Thence comes it that my name receives a brand,
 And almost thence my nature is subdued
 To what it works in, like the dyer's hand.
 Pity me then, and wish I were renewed,
 Whilst like a willing patient I will drink
 Potions of easel 'gainst my strong infection;
 No bitterness that I will bitter think,
 Nor double penance to correct correction.

Pity me then, dear friend, and I assure ye

Even that your pity is enough to cure me. (*Sonnet 111*)

ii) The Quebec law does not sufficiently consider the After-life

[40] Fear of final judgment is a prevalent theme in Shakespeare. The law of Shakespeare “is enforced by the hope and fear of last judgment and the afterlife. Thus the integrity of a person is gauged by tests in this world but also by reference to judgment in the next.” This

fear legitimately shapes the behaviour of members of society when faced with laws that directly contradict or violate their beliefs.

Martha Nussbaum, *Poetic Justice* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995) at 21.

Measure for Measure 2.4 184-187, 3.1.145-148.

Hamlet 3.3 73-75, 5.1 227-230.

Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory*, (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2001) at 243.

The Bard de la Mer (Du Parcq v Pedersen; Pedersen v Vidaloca), [2005] 3 C. of Sh. 1 at para. 106.

[41] Law also acknowledges its limitations and failings. Shakespearean characters believe that true justice does not come from this world. For example, after Angelo orders Claudio's execution, Escalus exclaims:

Well, heaven forgive him, and forgive us all!
Some rise by sin, and some by virtue fall.
Some run from brakes of vice, and answer none;
And some condemned for a fault alone. (*Measure for Measure* 2.1.37-40)

As such, Sahar is perfectly justified in trusting divine law over human law.

[42] This is also consistent with Justice Yachnin's statement in *Bard de la Mer*, wherein he agreed with the principle from *Heinrich*: that "there is no expectation that subjects will be slavishly and self-destructively obedient to their rulers." If the excuse "I was told to do so" is an insufficient defense for matters in this world, it will not likely hold up in the next. While he acknowledges our human weakness and our tendency to compromise our beliefs, Shakespeare makes clear that there are higher goods and that sacrifices for these goods should be applauded. Obedience to God is always a higher good than simple obedience to the state. As Justice Bristol noted, there is "nothing in Shakespeare that suggests unconditional obedience to the will of a sovereign as an overriding or even a particularly salient maxim for guiding actions."

The Bard de la Mer (Du Parcq v Pedersen; Pedersen v Vidaloca), [2005] 3 C. of Sh. 1 at paras. 60, 64.

In re Attorney General for Canada; ex parte Heinrich, [2003] 1 C. of Sh. 1 at para. 51.

6. Devotion is a virtue

[43] Finally, loving devotion to another or to God is uplifted in Shakespeare. In *All's Well That Ends Well*, Helen's devotion to Bertrund is eventually rewarded. In *Measure*, Marianna's devotion to Angelo is repaid. Similarly, Isabella's religious devotion to her beliefs is respected and her brother Claudio is freed in the end.

PART IV – ORDER SOUGHT

[44] For the reasons set forth herein the applicant respectfully requests that the Court of Shakespeare:

ORDER a mandamus admitting Sahar X to the William Shakespeare High School; and

ORDER the government of Quebec to engage in an ongoing discussion with the family of Sahar X and other members of religious communities to devise a law governing appropriate dress in public schools.

[45] All of which is respectfully submitted.

Caolan Moore
Faculty of Law
Counsel for the Applicant

Laura Brightwell
Faculty of English
Counsel for the Applicant

Signed in Montreal this 9th of March, 2007

PART IV – LIST OF AUTHORITIES

LEGISLATION (PLAYS)

All's Well That Ends Well.

Hamlet.

Measure for Measure.

The Winter's Tale.

JURISPRUDENCE

Attorney General of Canada v. Pete Pears, Ben Britten & Ors., [2004] 2 C. of Sh. 1.

In re Attorney General for Canada; ex parte Heinrich, [2003] 1 C. of Sh. 1.

Laird vs The Crown, [2005] 4 C. of Sh. 1.

Multani v. Commission scolaire Marguerite-Bourgeoys, [2006] 1 S.C.R. 256.

The Bard de la Mer (Du Parcq v Pedersen; Pedersen v Vidaloca), [2005] 3 C. of Sh. 1.

SECONDARY MATERIALS: ARTICLES

Anthony Dawson, "Shakespeare and Secular Performance".

Huston Diehl, "'Does Not the Stone Rebuke Me?': The Pauline Rebuke and Paulina's Lawful Magic in The Winter's Tale".

SECONDARY MATERIALS: MONOGRAPHS

Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory*, (Princeton: Princeton UP, 2001).

Jeffrey Knapp, *Shakespeare's Tribe: Church, Nation, and Theatre in Renaissance England*, (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2002).

Martha Nussbaum, *Poetic Justice* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995).

Richard Posner, *Law and Literature: A Misunderstood Relation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988).

Debora Shugar, *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: Religion, Politics, and the Dominant Culture*, (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1997).

OTHER SOURCES

The Book of Matthew.

The Sonnets.