
The Representation of Female Speech in Shakespeare's Late Plays

Thongrob Ruenbanthoeng

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

School of English Literature, Language and Linguistics

Newcastle University

July 2019

Abstract

This thesis explores the representation of female speech in Shakespeare's late plays. The critics seem to group *Pericles*, *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest* together as "romances" because common elements and recurrent motifs in these four plays. The story of family and of parents and children, especially the father/daughter relationship, seem to be keywords for critics when grouping these four plays together. Moreover, the daughters in these plays play the most important roles in redeeming and restoring the male characters. For several critics, Shakespeare's romances are the plays where daughters become redeemers and restorers, but none of them explain how they do that. This thesis will closely examine female redemptive language in Shakespeare's four romances and argue that through the use of their language, the female characters in those plays are able to restore and redeem the male characters. The female speech in Shakespeare's four romances is redemptive, restorative, healing and forgiving while the female redemptive language becomes rhetorical resistance in the other last two plays, *King Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, which were written in collaboration with John Fletcher. All virtuous female characters in the first four plays exercised their rhetorical ability in redeeming the male characters from illness, suffering, sorrow, vengeance and futility. Their speech has therapeutic, restorative and redemptive power. However, in the last two plays, female speech is rebellious. Redemption is not the main concern of the two last plays. The female speech in *King Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* focuses on how to use female rhetorical strategies to persuade, negotiate or challenge patriarchal authority without being condemned or punished. The thesis will conclude that Shakespeare's late plays are the best places to investigate the complication of female rhetoric, female rhetorical strategies, the representation of female speech and controversial Renaissance rhetorical tradition.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my deep gratitude to The Royal Thai Government for giving me a scholarship to pursue my PhD research at Newcastle University from 2003-2007 which I feel truly grateful and appreciative.

My supervisors Professor Jennifer Richards and Professor Kate Chedgzoy have been the incredible mentors and teachers. I have benefited from their marvelous insights, sound advice and their rigorous questioning of my arguments and ideas. I thank them for their ongoing advocacy of me and my work. They have always engaged in the demanding task of helping me to find my own voice. Their confidences in my abilities and assiduous supports at every stage of my research have been invaluable. I have also greatly benefited from their expertise, accurate criticism, useful and constructive suggestions. The impact of our long discussion can be felt in the form and substance of this thesis. Their generosity with their knowledge and unwavering energy is hugely appreciated and I have been fortunate enough to have my work supervised by both of them. I wholeheartedly know that I have put them in several difficult situations and I apologize for the troubles I have caused.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Professor Alison Findlay and Dr. Ruth Connolly for being my examiners. They worked very hard in giving me constructive comments and suggestions for the revision of this thesis. I am very appreciative of their insights, encouragements and comprehensive advice.

I would like to thank Professor Tom Cain and Professor Mike Pincombe who have given me brilliant comments every year at the meeting for Annual Progress Report. I thank them for sharing with me their intellectual thoughts and knowledge of Shakespeare as well as their continued encouragement of my research.

Thanks, also, are owe to my colleagues at the Faculty of Humanities who had to work harder and had more responsibilities during my research leave. I owe a particular debt of gratitude to Ajan Wanna Navikamoon who is the best imaginable head of department.

Thank you for the loving support of my friends. I appreciate everyone coming along for this ride as I pursue my doctoral degree. I have received much-appreciated assistance from my friends in Newcastle and in Thailand.

Finally, I want to thank my parents whose love, patience, understanding and laughter sustained me throughout. Without their support, the whole thing would never have happened in the first place. I dedicate this dissertation to both of them.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Introduction	1
-Scholarship on Female Speech in the Renaissance	10
-Female Speech in Shakespeare and His Contemporary Plays	20
-From King Lear to the Late Plays	30
Chapter I: Therapeutic Power of Female Speech in <i>Pericles</i>	41
-The Diseased Language of Patriarchy	44
-Therapeutic Power of Female Rhetoric	57
-Father-Daughter Relationship	71
Chapter II: The Language of Estimation of Worth and Women's Speech in <i>Cymbeline</i>	84
-The Language of Estimation	87
-Imogen's Self-Realization and the Challenge of Patriarchal Evaluation of Worth	105
-Reconciliation, Self-Discovery and Female Agency	114
Chapter III: Failure of Courtly Language and the Rhetorical Triumph of the Shrew in <i>The Winter's Tale</i>	121
-The Failure of Female Rhetoric	123
-The Triumph of Paulina the Shrew	138
-The Female Rhetoric of Silence	149
Chapter IV: Language of Redemption and Forgiveness in <i>The Tempest</i>	158
-'Art you not my father?'	160
-'My foot my tutor?'	171
-'Mercy itself, and free all fault'	178
Coda to Chapter IV: Female Speech in <i>King Henry VIII</i> and <i>The Two Noble Kinsmen</i>	185

-Queen Katherine's Language in the Trial Scene	186
-Queen Katherine's Sarcasm	190
-Jailer's Daughter's Soliloquies and the Language of Madness	195
Conclusion	203
References	206

Chapter 1: Therapeutic Power of Female Speech and in Shakespeare's *Pericles*

In 'Pericles and the Pox', Margaret Healy argues that the audience of this play would be horrified by its ending in which Pericles marries off his only daughter, Marina, to a frequenter of the brothel, Lysimachus, who, it is intimated, is a pox-ridden governor of dubious morals.¹ I agree, and I also agree with Healy's topical reading of the poxy body in the play: that it indicates the corruption and hypocrisy of the Roman Church and James' policy of seeking Catholic marriages for his offspring. However, this is only part of the problem, and there is more to be said about disease in this play. Indeed, syphilis is not the only kind of disease found in the play. Though the play is preoccupied with mortality and the frailty of the human body, there is another facet to take into consideration. The play shows us that it is also possible to become 'infected' or corrupted by the wrong kind of language. This is manifested in this play by the riddle at the beginning of the play and there are many more occasions of linguistic infection later in the play such as the language of the pox in the brothel scene, and Pericles' silence. All of these are the infected languages that need to be healed before the play reaches its end.

In this chapter, I will use the novel term 'diseased language' to refer to language in the play that is deceptive, ambiguous, corrupted and immoral and mostly associated with the patriarchs in the play. I describe such language as infected since it literally brings physical and mental sickness into the play and simultaneously it metaphorically reduces the ability of characters to distinguish illusion from reality, conceals the truth, and also leads to the moral degradation and corruption of the characters. In the first scene, we can see Pericles' simplistic identification of outward appearance and inward reality. Antiochus's daughter is 'apparelled' in outward beauty like the spring and on this basis Pericles judges that her inward 'thought' is virtuous. It can be fairly said that the contaminated language is everywhere right from the start and that the characters infected are in need of medication and healing.

This is the first point I want to defend in this chapter. The second is that this kind of contagious language is always associated in the play with the exercise of patriarchal

¹ Margaret Healy, 'Pericles and the Pox,' in *Shakespeare's Late Play: New Readings*, eds. by Jennifer Richards and James Knowles (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1999), pp. 92-107.

authority, which in turn is represented as diseased. The unhealthy language frequently comes from the abuse and over-exercise of patriarchal power especially in terms of familial relationships, and it is exercised through the use of language, such as the riddle of incest between father and daughter which shows the abuse of patriarchal power. The language is corrupting because its aims are not intended to reveal but to conceal the truth.

But if the play reveals the sickness at the heart of the domestic polity in the play, it also offers a cure. The relationships of father and daughter and the use of language are the source of the problem. At the same time, language is also a means to the effective resolution of that problem. The diseased language implies diseased relationships between characters in the play. The ambivalent riddle which signifies a corrupted relationship between father and daughter in Antioch is remarkably contrasted with the riddle-like dialogue between Pericles and Marina in Mytilene at the end of the play which implies a restorative relationship. It is also quite extraordinary that Pericles' resumption of speech celebrates his ability to break through the symptoms of the disease after having discourse with his daughter at the end of the play. The infectious language of the riddle of temptation and sin is replaced by Marina's riddle of resurrection at the end of the play. Both kinds of language are ambiguous and ambivalent, but the former is a disease and the latter an antidote: the riddle aims to conceal while Marina's rhetoric reveals the truth. While the riddle creates suspicion, Marina's language leads to understanding and healing. As Gower states in Act IV scene v: 'we commit no crime/ To use one language in each several clime' (IV.v.5-6).² The same kind of language has been used to convey meaning. However, it largely depends on who uses it and how it is used in revealing/concealing its genuine meaning.

Initially, I shall explore the different kinds of polluted speech found from the outset of the play. It is clear that all of these kinds of rhetoric have influenced and affected Pericles and other male characters in the play, and I will explain how. But I am also interested in exploring the linguistic cure the play offers through Marina, and will turn to this in the next part. The discovery of Marina and her art as a gifted speaker

² William Shakespeare, *Pericles*, ed. by Suzanne Gossett (London: Bloomsbury, 2004. All quotations from the play are from this edition.

becomes a turning point in Pericles' life. In the second section of this chapter I will examine Marina's character as a physician who uses language as an effective medicine. The fact that it is Marina – Pericles' daughter – who provides the key to his restoration is not accidental. The relationship between patriarchal power and the healing properties of female characters will be at the centre of discussion in this part of the chapter. It is evident that the infection, both physical and linguistic, spreads from the use of patriarchal power by male figures. Shakespeare seems to argue that in order to bring order and good health back to the male figures, the rhetorical power of female characters must be recognized in the play. *Pericles* can possibly be seen as Shakespeare's first declaration of victory for femininity over the power of patriarchy.

However, Margaret Healy's discomfort with Pericles' intention in marrying his only daughter off to the frequenter of the brothel at the end of the play will not be ignored; I will return to this in the last part of the chapter. Like Healy I find the ending of the play troubling. If patriarchal power is indeed diminished, how is it that Pericles when he marries Marina off to Lysimachus without asking her consent? The end of the play seems to repeat the problems critics and readers frequently encounter when reading *Pericles*. How is it that a gifted rhetorician like Marina becomes mute when she is offered in marriage to Lysimachus? Does the play really suggest the possibility of the triumph of femininity over patriarchy or is it just an illusion of victory? Could it be fairly said that *Pericles* is the play in which 'the female generation of story comes closest to being openly recognized rather than taken under the charge of an organizing male figure' as Helen Hackett believes, or have we been misled?³ I would like to propose that if *Pericles* is considered as a form of romance, with many references to the peculiar nature of the human experience of wonder, one cannot help but conclude that wonder, both for protagonists and audience alike is the key intention of this mysterious play. The meaning of female silence is conditioned by the genre. Instead of being seen as a form of obedience or resistance, female silence at the end of *Pericles* becomes a form of wonder, disconcerting and thought-provoking perhaps more than marvelous, waiting to surprise the audience as the play reaches its e

³ Helen Hackett. "Gracious be the Issue": Maternity and Narrative in Shakespeare's Late Plays,' in *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, ed. by Richards and Knowles (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1999), p. 38.

I: The diseased language of patriarchy

Pericles begins with a conundrum. Pericles opens the play by reading out a riddle that reveals the moral degeneracy at the heart of the world of Antioch. The riddle implies an incestuous relationship between Antiochus and his daughter:

I am no viper, yet I feed
On mother's flesh which did me breed.
I sought a husband, in which labour
I found that kindness in a father.
He's father, son and husband mild;
I mother, wife and yet his child.
How they may be and yet in two,
As you will live, resolve it you (I.i.107-114).

To solve a riddle, one must identify the hidden referent. Here the hidden term reveals to whom 'I' refers. The riddle shows that Antiochus writes it by using his daughter's point of view in describing the incest. The pronoun 'I' in the riddle refers to the daughter. Instead of using himself as a narrator of the riddle, he blames his daughter by inserting her narrative. The patriarchal appropriation of female voice is obvious here. The image of a daughter as a 'viper fed on mother's flesh,' (I.i.65) is shocking. Incest now becomes a facet of tyranny and a disease in society. In *Pericles*, it is evident that the incestuous relationship between father and daughter is an abuse of the patriarchal power of Antiochus and that it is disguised and admitted through the use of ambiguous, metaphoric language. The metaphors in the riddle create the atmosphere of uncertainty.

The language here can be seen as disease because Antiochus destroys the legitimate relationship between parents and children and because its end is deception not revelation. The language here is used to disclose a hidden sin. The riddle which should give solution to its solver instead turns him to dilemma because he can neither answer the question nor cleanse the contamination he just finds. To expose it as fabrication is as dangerous as to reply or keep silent; therefore, the language of the riddle reduces everything to the same conclusion: disease and death. The next metaphor 'fair Hesperides, with golden fruit, but dangerous to be touched' (I.i 28-29) also reveals the fact that Pericles' eyes have lured him to risk his life to touch death. He initially believes in the virtue of Antiochus' daughter and sees her as a 'fruit of that celestial tree' (I.i. 18). The comparison between Pericles' adventure and Hercules'

labour is highlighted here. One of Hercules' labours is to get a golden apple from a tree in the Garden of Hesperides. The metaphors of the 'golden fruit' and 'the fruit of that celestial tree' emphasize the obscure meaning and allow meaning to become distorted and ambivalent. Antiochus ends his threat with the metaphor of silenced heads with 'speechless tongues' counseling silently. This threat not only reminds Pericles of his own mortality but also warns him of the danger of the riddle which he is about to solve. The metaphors repeatedly used in the opening scene underscore ambivalent position of metaphor in revealing and concealing true meaning of language. It also reminds the readers that language plays very important role in this play which involves riddle about incest. Incest in Antioch 'breeds corruption as though the whole of nature were one homogenous organism infected by a diseased member, a theory popularised anew by Renaissance preachers anxious to portray the advent of syphilis in similar terms.'⁴ Thus for both classical and Renaissance audience, nature take infection from sexual perversion, therefore, the prolific imagery of decay and disease engulfs both innocent and guilty.

It can also be seen that the language of the riddle is written in metaphors. There appear three metaphors operative in figuring out the riddle. The first one is the comparison between 'I' and 'viper' and the second one is the metaphor that confuses 'father' to a 'son' and 'husband' at the same time. The third metaphor compares 'I' as a 'mother' and 'wife,' In the first metaphor, Pericles must have been helped by the correspondences that be obtained from the target concept of 'I' and the source domain of 'viper.' 'I' is not a viper but she 'feeds on mother's flesh.' The ambiguous relationship between 'I' and 'viper' might initially confuse Pericles, but with the operations of the second and third metaphors, he finally gets the true meaning. The second metaphor 'father is son and husband' and the third metaphor 'daughter is mother and wife' leads Pericles to a full understanding of the first metaphor and finally realize what is meant: incest. The metaphor in the riddle seems to conceal rather than reveal the truth. Josef Judah Stern noted that 'metaphor and other figures are also used in order to conceal truths from the communities at large.'⁵ Metaphor is usually used to explain to seemingly different things in order to better explain one of

⁴ Richard McCabe, *Incest, Drama and Nature's Law 1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 67.

⁵ Josef Judah Stern. *Metaphor in Context* (Cambridge, MIT Press, 2000), p. 195.

them, but here metaphor is exploited as a means to conceal the truth leading to confusion.

Richard A. Lanham defines metaphor as ‘changing a word from its literal meaning to one not properly applicable but analogous to it; assertion of identity rather than, as with simile, likeness.’⁶ Metaphor aims to provide us a more vivid picture of the object than when we use the ordinary simple language. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, metaphors suffered from the attack of philosophers because of their ambiguity and obscurity which lead to misunderstanding and deceit. Metaphor ‘becomes a deviant use of words in other than their proper senses, which accounts for its tendency to confuse and to deceive.’⁷ However this traditional view of metaphor is challenged by the twentieth century philosopher, Max Black whose essay; ‘Metaphor’ becomes a landmark in attempting to understand the recent philosophical dimensions of metaphor.⁸ Black seems to argue that if we think of the possible meaning that a metaphor can have, we are ‘filtering’ ideas of similarities between two concepts. If we think a man as wolf, certain qualities of man will pass through the filter and others will be caught, such as the ability to alarm and be wild. In this way, we see qualities in man which may not have previously struck us and some aspects will come more clearly into focus. Thus, metaphoric expression seems to allow us to ‘redefine reality.’ It can be said that any concept or idea which is expressed metaphorically allows us to look beyond what is previously experienced. And this would not happen with literal language. Andrew Goatly, moreover, observes the various functions of metaphor and finds that ‘because the understanding of metaphors depends on shared ground, metaphor can become a means of activating the ‘assumptions shared between two people, or a small group’⁹ Ted Cohen a philosopher from University of Chicago also argues that metaphor depends upon shared knowledge, attitude, intention:

⁶ Richard A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), p. 100.

⁷ In the introduction to his book on metaphor, Mark Johnson gives a brief account of development of the traditional philosophical devaluation of metaphor from Greeks to mid-twentieth century. He uses Thomas Hobbes’s argument (1588-1679) to show the most complete examples of the ‘epistemological basis for the empiricist attack on metaphor’ during the period of the Renaissance. Mark Johnson, *Philosophical Perspective on Metaphor* (Twin Cities: University of Minnesota Press, 1981), pp. 11-12.

⁸ Black argues the merit of the ‘interaction’ view and stresses the inadequacies of the ‘substitution’ and ‘comparison’ views of metaphor. Max Black, ‘Metaphor,’ *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* N.S.55 (1954-1955). 273-294.

⁹ Andrew Goatly, *The Language of Metaphors* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 160.

I want to suggest a point in metaphor which is independent of the question of the cognitivity and which has nothing to do with its aesthetical character. I think of this point as the achievement of intimacy. There is a unique way in which the maker and the appreciator of a metaphor are drawn closer to one another. Three aspects are involved: 1) the speaker issues a kind of concealed invitation; 2) the hearer expends a special effort to accept the invitation; and 3) this transaction constitutes the acknowledgement of a community. All three are involved in any communication but in ordinary literal discourse their involvement is so pervasive and routine that they go unremarked.¹⁰

The sharing of experience and knowledge is a key concept to understand metaphor. Metaphor frequently aims to provide us a more vivid picture of the object than we could have if it were explained in simple terms. In *The Arte of Poesie*, George Puttenham gives definition of metaphor as ‘a kinde of wresting of a single words from his owne right significance to another not so naturall, but yet of some affinitie or conveniencie with it’¹¹ During the sixteenth and seventeen centuries, metaphors also suffered from the attack of philosophers because of their ambiguity and obscurity, which were seen to lead to misunderstanding and deceit. While scholars have praised and approved the use of metaphor, they simultaneously concerned of its misuse. For example Aristotle warns that metaphors are ‘inappropriate if far-fetch.’¹² *Ad Herennium* also asserts that ‘a metaphor should be restrained so as to be a transition with good reason to a kindred thing, and not seem an indiscriminate, reckless, and precipitate leap to an unlike thing’¹³ These concerns derived from the belief that metaphor might lead the meaning to become displaced, ambiguous and distorted.¹⁴

To this point, the play seems to show us how metaphorical language has been used to convey the insinuation. The play has asked us to think about the truth and deceit in

¹⁰ Ted Cohen, ‘Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy’, *Critical Inquiry*, 5.1 (1978), 6.

¹¹ George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (London, Richard Field, 1589), p. 148.

¹² Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, trans. by George Kennedy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 228.

¹³ Cicero, *Ad Herennium*, trans. by Harry Caplan (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981), p. 345.

¹⁴ A century later, Thomas Hobbes describes what he takes to be the various uses of speech. He then goes on to describe four abuses: inconstancy of signification, using word metaphorically, deceit and insult. He also condemns the use of metaphors instead of words proper. Hobbes claimed that metaphors were inaccurate exploitations of language that lure readers away from the correct and precise denotative meaning. Metaphor becomes ‘a deviant use of words in other than their proper senses, which ‘accounts for its tendency to confuse and to deceive.’ In the introduction to his book on metaphor, Mark Johnson gives a brief account of development of the traditional philosophical devaluation of metaphor from Greeks to mid-twentieth century. He uses Thomas Hobbes’s argument (1588-1679) to show the most complete examples of the ‘epistemological basis for the empiricist attack on metaphor’ during the period of the Renaissance. Mark Johnson, *Philosophical Perspective on Metaphor* (Twin Cities: University of Minnesota Press, 1981), pp. 11-12.

really challenging ways since the conundrum is very pervasive. Once the riddle has been solved, its poison will spread through the play. This is what Pericles has to say when he finally understands the riddle:

‘Sharp physic is the last: but, O you powers
That gives heaven countless eyes to view men’s acts:
Why cloud they not their sights perpetually,
If this be true, which make me pale to read it?
Fair glass of light, I lov’d you, and could still,
Were not this glorious casket stor’d with ill.’ (I.i.73-78)

Here, for Pericles, the last condition of the riddle is not sweet but a bitter medicine. The language and the meaning of the riddle also ‘make [him] pale’ and Antiochus’ daughter is metaphorically the ‘casket stor’d with ill.’ ‘The ‘sharp physic’ mentioned in the last line of the riddle implies that the riddle is some kind of disease that needs to be treated with medication. But the language here is intentionally used to conceal the wickedness of Antiochus and his unnamed daughter. The riddle itself is deception not revelation and the function of the riddle has been abused and refashioned to fit Antiochus’ wicked use. The riddle connotes and emphasizes these two aspects of the unity of the play, which depends largely on the ambiguous language and the ways to heal them. What makes the riddle become hazardous is the fact that it indicates the suitor’s double jeopardy: that he who answers the riddle correctly is just as doomed as he who does not. For the previous suitors, it was a fatal disease and it also spread to whoever became involved in this monstrous, corrupted affair.

It would be fair to say that the adventure of Pericles and his need for redemption at the end come initially from his experience with the fatal riddle; the incest, an infection that torments Pericles throughout the play.¹⁵ Since he realizes the truth hidden behind the riddle, Pericles seems to be haunted by the suspicion of language. The riddle is not only ‘a question or statement intentionally phrased to require ingenuity in ascertaining its answer or meaning’¹⁶ but also evidence of moral sickness. The riddle becomes a

¹⁵ Platt observes that Pericles in Antioch ‘is exposed to the dark side of the marvelous, and the remainder of the play represents, at least, Pericles’s journey toward the recovery of cleansed perception and healthy wonder.’ Peter Platt, *Reason Diminished: Shakespeare and Marvelous* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 134.

¹⁶ “riddle, n.” OED Online. October 2013. Oxford University Press. 20 October 2013
<<http://dictionary.oed.com/>>

representation of infectious, corrupted language and moral sickness becomes the inevitable trait for the people who associate with it.

The symptom of Pericles' sickness is obvious when he flees back home. Perplexed by his own condition, Pericles cannot understand why, with pleasure surrounding him and the evil of Antiochus seemingly far removed and without effect, he should be unable to find either joy or comfort. The danger of speech is strictly emphasized again by Hellicanus, a lord of Tyre who serves as his counselor. Upon his first appearance in the play, Hellicanus demonstrates that he has a sure awareness of the peril of Pericles' present situation; indeed, he is well aware of those forces that are particularly unhealthy for his prince: the flatterers of his court who appear under benevolent and friendly guises. His first speech to Pericles has caused confusion among readers of the play, since he accuses the other two lords present of flattery, when it seems that all they have done is to wish Pericles 'joy' and 'all comfort' in his 'sacred breast' and to desire that he 'keep his mind till you return to us/ Peacefully and comfortable' (I.ii.34-36). However, in the play, Hellicanus argues that in this case the desires expressed by the lord really do amount to a dangerous flattery that will not help Pericles remedy his melancholy, which comes from 'the passions of the mind,/That have their first conception by misdread.' (I.ii.11-12)

Peace, peace and give experience the tongue
They do abuse the king that flatter him,
For flattery is the bellows that blows up sin
The thing which is flattered, but a spark
To which that wind gives heat and stronger glowing;
Whereas reproof, obedient and in order
Fits kings as they are men, for they may err.
When Signor Sooth here does proclaim peace
He flatters you, makes war upon your life (I.ii.37-45).

Hellicanus, here, is tacitly making the point that Pericles himself is susceptible to flattery, especially in his present condition which Hellicanus considers 'sinful.' The important thing to note is Hellicanus' judgement that Pericles' grief is self-imposed and no amount of well-wishing by flatterers will remove the tangible consequences of having excited the tyrant Antiochus' wrath. Hellicanus' enjoinder, 'bear with patience' is received by Pericles with some exasperation. Hellicanus, according to Pericles, is like 'a physician.../That ministers a potion unto me,/ That thou wouldst

tremble to receive thyself' (I.ii.66-68). Like a good physician, Hellicanus listens to Pericles' account of events. However, Hellicanus does not give Pericles a remedy. His advice after being asked: 'What wouldst thou have me do?' (I.ii.64) is not exactly curing or cheering. In his view Pericles has no choice but 'To bear with patience/ Such griefs as you yourself do lay upon yourself' (I.ii.65-66). His advice might give Pericles spiritual relief for a while but his illness has not yet been cured.

Pericles encounters the same kind of deceptive language again when reaching Pentapolis. And this deceptive language threatens to make him give up his dream of marriage. Simonides pretends to verbally assault him with harmlessly deceptive language. Though Simonides' language does not intentionally make Pericles seriously anxious, it inevitably establishes a feeling of mistrust because his previous experience has understandably taught him fear. It is, nevertheless, also the case that at Pentapolis Pericles is not free of the tendencies associated with corruption in the form of illness. This idea is expressed initially in the exchange between the shipwrecked Pericles and the fishermen who provide his armour. They praise Simonides' 'peaceable reign and good government,' (II.i.106) but they also complain of the scarcity of justice. Men on land, one claims, live as fish in the sea:

The great ones eat up the little ones. I can compare our rich misers to nothing so fitly as to a whale: a plays and tumbles, driving the poor fry before him, and at last devours them all at a mouthful (II.i.29-32)

The sea-tempest is used here to echo the tragic event and suffering of Pericles. The analogy between sea storm that had already steered the ship of Pericles' life and the storm of grief he underwent. 'He bears a tempest/Which his mortal vessel tears/ And yet he rides it out' (IV.iv.30). However, the ocean, which is frequently seen as dangerous and catastrophic, can be seen as a metaphor of life. Marina is a sea-maiden. Pericles explains the meaning of her name that she is named Marina for she was born at sea during the tempest (III.iii.14-15). Therefore, it can be said that sea can be both a destroyer and giver of life. She later said to her nurse Lychorida that 'Born in a tempest, when my mother died,/ This world to me is like a lasting storm,/ Whirring me from my friend' (IV.i. 17-19) Moreover, since Marina has therapeutic properties, it can be assumed that sea or ocean also has healing power in cleaning contaminated disease especially the one that infected Pericles in Antioch.

The role of the fishermen is also very interesting because fishermen had never appeared in Gower's version. When we first meet them they are talking about how the bigger fish in the ocean hunt and gobble all the smaller one which is kind of what people do on land (II.i.25-37). They use sea as a metaphor for social power in society. The Fishermen restores Pericles from the stormy sea and retrieves his armor from the water. Pericles begs the fishermen for it and now he becomes the debtor of the fishermen. His overconfidence and pride found in Antioch seems to disappear after being rescued by the fishermen from the stormy sea. Moreover, the fishermen's conversation seems intended to remind Pericles of the political sickness that lawlessness creates; therefore Pericles' expectation of corruption and illness in the land where he is now ashore, is quite understandable. Moreover, the image of regurgitation is very vivid in the fishermen's dialogues. It can be metaphorically interpreted as the illness of the land and its people and Pericles also notices that 'these fishers tell the infirmities of men' (II.i.49). However, when he hears the story of the tournament,

Then honour be but equal to my will
This day I'll rise, or else add ill to ill. (II.i.164-165)

The situation of Antioch is repeated at different points in the play. Here, Pericles, who has been spiritually ill since he left Antioch, has a strong belief that his vulnerable body and his honour will be restored and his illness can be healed here if he can win the tournament. Nevertheless, a deception is still waiting to attack him even though not a fatal one compared with that he had encountered in Antioch. The attack comes in the form of the highly ambivalent language employed by the father figure, who seems to recall the kind of father Pericles experienced in the past, especially when Simonides hands him Thaisa's letter:

What's here?
A letter that she loves the knight of Tyre!
Tis the king's subtlety to have my life (II.v.42-44).

The letter affirming Thaisa's love for him is not, as Pericles fears, a subtlety to find an excuse to execute him. The experience with corrupted language turns him into a victim with the feelings of mistrust in language, making him and his judgment vulnerable. Even though the ultimate aim of his attack is not fatal, it is sufficient to

make Pericles anxious and fearful. With close reading, readers are likely to discover the unexpected truth about Simonides' idiosyncratic behaviours, not clearly evident, yet sufficient to evoke the possibility of a suspected incestuous relationship. It is quite obvious from the outset that Simonides is possessed by an obsessive desire to choose a son-in-law after his own image. The characteristic of resemblance of a father and his would be son-in-law is conspicuous throughout the scene.

Even though there is no cruel intention in the use of his language, Simonides' language implies and reminds Pericles that the incestuous relationship between father and daughter could have repeated itself in Pentapolis. Moreover, his sexually laden expressions in front of his daughter make it more complex and difficult for Pericles to overlook the possibility of incest in this family. When the King encourages the knights to dance, the use of sexual connotation is striking.

Come gentlemen, we sit too long on trifles,
And waste the time which looks for other revels:
Even in your armours, as you are addressed,
Will well become a soldiers' dance;
I will not have excuse with saying 'this
Loud music is too harsh for ladies' heads'.
Since they love men in arms as well as beds (II.iii.93-99).

Using the pun 'arms' suggests sexual activity with the linkage to 'beds.' Moreover when he eggs Pericles on to dance with his daughter, he says 'I have heard you knights of Tyre are excellent in making ladies trip.' The sexual innuendo employed by Simonides here is inappropriate because 'making trip' can be interpreted as standing for sexual intercourse.

Though without hidden cruel intention behind the language used by Simonides, the deceptive language created the idea of the possibility of incest in Pentapolis, therefore, Pericles' anxiety and fear of a repeated experience is understandable. However, this kind of misleading language here is not a severe one. Unlike Antiochus, Simonides seems to respect the limitations on his paternal and patriarchal rights. Even though he wholeheartedly loves his daughter, he has no intention of keeping her for his own use:

Tis well, mistress; your choice agree with mine;
I like that well: nay, how absolute she's in't,
Not minding whether I dislike or no!
Well, I do commend her choice (II.v.18-21).

Despite a good deal of playful dissembling, Simonides receives her letter declaring her love for Pericles by rejoicing that her choice agrees with his, as if acknowledging her right to that choice. It can be said that the pattern of Pericles' adventures and the turning points of his life seem to be thematically associated with the concept of trust in language: the riddle; the sailor's insisting that he throw his wife overboard without choice; the deceptive language about Marina's death and Marina's redemptive language in the last scene. Pericles' fortunes seem to depend largely on how strongly he trusts the meaning of language. While the riddle of Antiochus teaches him not to trust in beautified appearance since it may carry deadly consequences, Simonides' dissembling language makes Pericles feel more uncertain about the truth and meaning that language tries to convey. What is interesting here is that when Simonides reveals his harmless intention, Pericles' faith in language is totally shattered. His inability to distinguish appearance from reality seems to be more severe after leaving Pentapolis for Tyre. Being told by the sailors that

Sir, your queen must overboard: the sea work high,
The wind is loud and will not lie till the ship
Be cleared of the dead (III.i.48-50).

Pericles responds with a response by saying that 'that's your superstition?' (III.i.51). By posing a question instead of giving a command, he seems taken aback and uncertain about the sailor's words. Moreover, the death of Thaisa is told to him by Lychorida, the nurse. He does not examine Thaisa's body closely before dumping her into the sea. He seems to believe everything reported to him by the third party and the very same situation again happens when he is informed by Cleon and Dioniza of Marina's death. It is possible to conclude that Pericles' spiritual illness at the end comes partially from Simonides' use of dissembling language in seeking the most appropriate husband for the heir to the kingdom.

Though Annette Flower argues that Pericles in Pentapolis is 'adept at seeing through surface appearance to the true worth that lies within', Pericles' language and

behaviour do not support her argument.¹⁷ The other evidence that demonstrates the vulnerability of his judgment is when the sailors throw Thaisa overboard because of their custom, and Cerimon brings her back to life. Pericles, in contrast to Cerimon who has healing power, fails to notice that Thaisa is still alive. The main difference, therefore, between Cerimon, Pericles and the sailors is that he notices the sign of life and they do not. This symptom will be developed to its ultimate degree when Pericles refuses to use language as a mean of communication. Even though Simonides' playful dissembling is harmless, it attacks Pericles with anxiety and horror especially when he is accused of using witchcraft to lure Thaisa and of being a traitor. The highly ambivalent language of Simonides, however, emphasizes Pericles' impaired ability in dealing with language.

Again the contagious language is ready to attack him in Act IV when Pericles goes to pick up his daughter Marina in Tarsus. Cleon and Dioniza conceal their guilt with a show of grief; Marina's tomb is an arranged stage - set under Dioniza's direction for the acting of 'borrow passion' (IV.iv.24), and the monument and epitaph in glistening golden characters, no more than the prop of 'foul show'(23). As Gower describes it, the 'visor' for 'black villainy' is the 'soft and tender flattery' (44-45) of the epitaph: words which persuade Pericles to accept things the way they appear to be. This is another kind of infected language that poisons Pericles' ears and deceives his eyes. Again the infection makes him blind and ignorant, he vows not to 'wash his face, nor cut his hairs/ He puts on sackcloth, and to sea.' (IV.iv.28-29); and becomes 'a man who for this three month has not spoken/ To any one' (V.i.24-25). It may be unmistakably concluded that Pericles' refusal to speak in Act V is a symptom of the sickness that has been attacking and haunting him throughout the play; therefore, his silence can be recognized as fear and mistrust of language that always brings sorrow and pain into his life.

However, it is not only Pericles that is infected by the contagious language.

In Mytilene, the association between the abusive power of patriarchy and the corrupted language is clearly illustrated. Lysimachus' language in the brothel scene

¹⁷ Annette C. Flower, 'Disguise and Identity in *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*.' *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 26 (1975), 33.

leads to questions of his honour and his social status as a governor of the land. His behaviour seems hypocritical and evokes the curiosity of the audience about his virtue and morality. Even though he hides his dishonourable intention with euphemistic language, he cannot hide his lust and the degradation of his morality when he starts using infected language in communicating with the Bawd and Boulton. The infection of language and corrupted behaviour is cured and restored by Marina's language. The governor leaves the brothel claiming that Marina's speech has altered his corrupted mind.

In the brothel scene, the connection between the infection of language and the physical disease caused by the pox is apparent. The spread of the pox is analogous to the spread of infected language used by the Bawd and her companions. After finishing doing business with the pirates, the Bawd commands Boulton to mark Marina's character 'with warrant of her virginity' (IV.ii.54), and cries: 'He that will give most shall have her first' (55). Shortly, he comes back to report that he has spread the news to bring the customers to the brothel. But the regular customers seem to carry venereal disease with them including, as Margaret Healy observes, Lysimachus, the governor. Therefore, when Marina uses her language to purify the minds of her customers, she not only prevents the spread of infected language but also stops the spread of the pox, the physical disease in the brothel.

There is a language clash in the environment of the brothel as the bawds find it difficult to understand Marina's use of words, and at the same time she does not understand the meaning of the bawds' words when she says: 'I understand you not' (IV.ii.121); she does not belong in the brothel and therefore speaks a different language:

Boulton: Worse and worse mistress, she has here spoken holy words to the Lord Lysimachus.

Bawd: Oh abominable (IV.vi.120-121)

Marina: Hark, hark you gods.

Bawd: She conjures! (IV.vi.133-4)

Bawd and Boulton's complaint about Marina's language is very comical. Marina's language does not only have effect on Bawd and Boulton but also on the audience. The

dialogue between Marina and Lysimachus also shows that they speak in different languages. The language spoken by the governor seems to be infected and immoral while Marina's language is healthy, innocent and virtuous

Bawd: Is she not a fair creature?

Lysimachus: Faith, she would serve after a long voyage at sea. (IV.vi.41-42)

Further explicit evidence of the differences between Marina's healthy language and the infected language is when she asks the Bawd about her definition of a woman:

Marina: Are you woman?

Bawd: What would you have me be, and I be not a woman?

Marina: An honest woman, or not a woman (IV.ii.82-84).

Marina implies that a dishonoured woman is, in fact, no longer a woman. Having lost the honesty by which womanhood is identified, the Bawd has perverted all values, so that she sees good as evil. That is why when Marina calls for the gods' aid, the Bawd cries, 'She conjure!' (IV.vi.134). Furthermore, Marina's language also refers to the disease and sickness in the brothel 'in this sty, where, since I came,/ Disease have been sold dearer than physic' (IV.vi.96-97). She believes that the place and its people are infected with disease that costs more than the doctor's cures. Lysimachus also believes in the healing power of language that tries to heal his disease by saying that: 'Had I brought hither a corrupted mind,/Thy speech had alter'd it' (IV.vi.102-103). Of course Lysimachus did really bring 'a corrupted mind' to the brothel, but the mind is not hopelessly beyond healing. Whereas Lysimachus enters the scene intending to deflower a virgin to gratify his lust, he leaves the scene thinking only of Marina's good: '...a curse upon him,/ Die he like a thief that robs thee of thy goodness,/ If thou dost hear from me it shall be for thy good' (IV.vi.105-107). Lysimachus, like Pericles, is finally cured by the healing power of language as practiced by Marina. Now Marina becomes a capable physician who successfully uses her language as a means of healing the illness caused by infected rhetoric.

It is obvious that deceitful language is unhealthy because it breeds mistrust between the user and perceiver. Marina as a gifted physician, in order to bring her patient back to the healthy world needs to show him the importance of faith and trust in language.

In the scene of recognition, Pericles is going through the process of restoring faith and trust by being led to believe that the impossible is possible. The recognition between father and daughter and the healing of the ailing king could not have been achieved if the concept of trust and faith were not recognized at the end. It is difficult, yet possible for Pericles to learn to trust again after he had been robbed and betrayed by deceitful, contagious language. Refusing to use language as a means of communication with other people could be interpreted as his losing faith in language and the people using it. This idea can be vividly seen when he meets Marina and finds that she 'look'st modest as Justice /And seem'st a palace/For the crown'd Truth to dwell in' (V.i.120-122). Pericles' good health seems to depend on his faith and trust in Marina's use of language in the telling of her story. The same thing repeats itself in the final scene when Pericles hears 'the voice of dead Thaisa!' (V.iii.34). To make himself healthy, in other words, Pericles has to believe in the unbelievable and have faith in the impossible as Paulina does in the statue scene in *The Winter's Tale*: 'It is required/ You do awake your faith.' (V.iii.94-95).

II

Therapeutic Power of Female Rhetoric

The discovery of Marina and her art as a gifted speaker is a turning point in Pericles' life after his prolonged suffering since the beginning of the play. It can be seen in Act IV that Marina also uses her gift to stop the spread of the pox in the brothel. She successfully heals Lysimachus spiritually, if not physically, by bringing him to repent. Marina's language is employed again in healing Pericles in Act V but her use of language is slightly different. In Act IV, although she has to defend her chastity, she refuses to mention anything about her princely parentage. It can be seen that that in the middle of the crisis, instead of referring to her background as a king's heir, she immediately realizes that the best means of defence is to attack. Marina's character here is juxtaposed to that of Cerimon who also has healing power. Elena Glazov-Corrigan observes that Marina's role in the play is related to that of Cerimon.¹⁸ The play is interested in cure as well as diagnosis both literally and metaphorically.

¹⁸ Elena Glazov-Corrigan, 'The New Function of Language in *Pericles*. *Shakespeare Survey* 43 (1991), 131.

Cerimon's and Marina's roles are different, however. Though both of them are gifted healers having the power of resuscitation, they perform different role in healing, the one spiritually and the other physically restoring the health of their patients. Moreover, in the process of healing, music is employed in for its thaumaturgic properties. Cerimon calls for 'rough and/Woeful music' (III.ii.86-87) as part of his medical knowledge whereby a patient in a coma can yet be restored to life. And Pericles hears the 'music of the spheres' (V.i.212) when he finally recognizes Marina as his daughter. Meanwhile, it is Marina's 'sweet harmony' (V.i.40) which Lysimachus believes may offer a remedy to the ailing Pericles.¹⁹ However, Unlike Cerimon's success with Thaisa, Marina's music fails. Pericles apparently does not mark her music, nor even look at her.

The role of Cerimon's power of observation, in the exercise of his healing art, cannot be overestimated. It is certainly true that his cure of Thaisa is not the miraculous performance of a magician who knows no limit to his power. Thaisa is restored to life because there are signs indicating that she may be living. Marina also develops similar gifts when threatened by dishonour in the brothel. The language used when she talks to Leonine, a murderer sent to kill her, is different from the language used in persuading Lysimachus to spare her virginity. In the brothel scene Marina changes her line of persuasion to suit the character of her interlocutor. In order to survive and keep her chastity, she has to have full understanding of the people with whom she is brought into contact.²⁰ This is the major characteristic of her art with words. In the brothel scene, she immediately attacks Lysimachus' honour by asking him the penetrating question; 'Do you know this house to be a place of such resort, and will come into't? I hear say you're of honourable parts and are the governor of this place.' (IV.vi.78-79). Thus deflated and reduced, Lysimachus is ready to be worked on by Marina's exhortation to show that he is 'born to honour.'

¹⁹ The full discussion of the use of music in Shakespeare's Plays can be found in David Lindley's *Shakespeare and Music* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006)

²⁰ Inga-Stina Ewbank contrasts Marina of *Pericles* and her prototype in Gower and Twine. She observes that the Marina of Gower is defensive and pathetic in giving 'full account of sad fate', where as Marina in *Pericles* is 'aggressive and shines forth as verbal wit,' Inga-Stina Ewbank, 'My name is Marina': The Language of Recognition.' *Shakespeare's Style: Essay in Honour of Kenneth Muir*. eds. by Phillip Edwards, Inga-Stina Ewbank and G.K. Hunter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), p. 116.

Marina's language of healing in the brothel scene is also very interesting and worth investigating. The brothel scenes contain a clear demonstration of Marina's persuasiveness, and even witness several conversions of its customers, including Lysimachus. In a number of key regards the first brothel scene resembles the scene of Marina's attempted murder. First, before Marina is brought in, there is the initial suggestion that an apparently evil man pursuing profit- in this case one of the brothel staff, Pander, is having doubts about the basis of his actions, just as Leonine did in his exchange with Dioniza. In fact, Pander is pondering retirement on account of both his lack of 'credit' or good reputation, regardless of his substantial wages, and the 'sore term we stand upon with the god' (IV.ii.24, 27,28). Moreover, as in the Leonine scene, the notion of conscience is also raised by Pander who first laments with ridiculous seriousness, 'if there be not a conscience to be used in every trade we shall never prosper,' but who then by the end of the scene concludes that a bawd like him 'offend worse' than any: 'neither is our profession any trade, it is no calling...' (IV.ii.8-10, 30-31). At least one of the bawds then is aware of a disjunction between his present condition and what his conscience may be calling him to be. Even though Marina's persuasive power does not convert the brothel staff, it emerges as a rhetorical wonder, and the most unbelievable responses of others to her foreshadow her eventual triumph with Pericles in Act V.

Marina's first words in the brothel, however, are characterized by the desire for death as an escape from her present predicament; this desire is perhaps an inevitable result of the collision between her new suffering and her earlier view of the world as a lasting storm. Her desire to escape her present situation is so strong that she laments the fact that the pirates are not altogether wicked, and she even regrets her earlier attempts to persuade Leonine to goodness:

Alack that Leonine was so slack, so slow,
He should have struck, not spoke or that these pirates
Not enough barbarous , had not o'er board thrown me
For to seek for my mother (IV.ii.50-54).

Curiously, though, Marina's lament and desire for death is interrupted by a question from Bawd, Pander's wife. Their exchange illustrates Marina's characteristic manner of speech in the brothel scene. In this opening scene in the brothel, Marina rejects her initial desire for death as an escape from the world and goes on to manifest a concern

and desire for the good of others, even those who are deeply ill-intentioned toward her. The conversation between two customers of the brothel shows that Marina possesses 'divine' power: 'But to have divinity preached there, did you ever dream of such a thing?' (IV.v.4-5). Their response to Marina's persuasive speech on divinity which can mean either theology or holiness, though in either case the content is unspecified is a sudden conversion, witnessed by the desire to renounce their past habits and to pursue a new path in life.

After receiving strict order from Bawd not to attempt her skillful rhetoric or 'virginal fencing' (IV.v.56) on Lysimachus, Marina and the Governor are left alone and of course the fencing or quibbling starts immediately, as Marina refuses to answer Lysimachus' question, 'Now pretty one, how long have you been at this trade?' (IV.v.63), unless he first specifies what 'trade' he means. Therefore the healing process starts with Marina forcing Lysimachus to speak literally. In this scene Lysimachus cannot bring himself to specify that he means 'whore' though he does approach that term by asking how long she has been 'a gamester' (IV.v.69). At last, out of frustration, Lysimachus exclaims: 'why the house you dwell in proclaims you to be a creature of sale' (IV.v.72-73). Marina immediately follows up his remark, which indicates that he knows what kind of house he is in. She directly questions the governor's honour with a sarcastic tone: 'If you born to honour, show it now/ If put upon you make the judgment good/ That thought you worth of it' (IV.vi.90-92). She intends to attack his honour which is representative of his identity as a governor. Lysimachus' astonished reply: 'How's this? How's this?' (87) indicates that he too marvels at the power of Marina's speech. Lysimachus's conversion is startling though he tries to conceal the change that has suddenly occurred in him:

I did not think
Thou couldst have spoke so well, ne'er dreamed thou couldst.
Had I brought hither a corrupted mind,
Thy speech has altered it (IV.v.94-97).

Of course, Lysimachus did indeed bring a 'corrupted mind' to the brothel, but as noted above and demonstrated through his conversion, that mind is not hopelessly beyond curing. The therapeutic power of Marina's speech is well-expressed here by Lysimachus. Marina's speech has thus initiated the curing and the conversion that will lead Lysimachus away from 'the road of rutting forever' and towards a nobler

fulfillment of his human nature and she has done so largely by appealing to conscience. It is also worth noting that Marina converts Lysimachus in a mere 50 lines implying the efficiency of her rhetorical power.

It can be seen that in the defense of her chastity, Marina successfully uses all three of artistic proofs: *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*. She refers herself as an innocent victim: ‘My life is yet unspotted,/ My chastity unstained even in thought’ (IV.v.115-116). Marina reviews her personal history in a modest, plain way which reveals her past good conduct. She also emphasizes her credibility by saying that she is ‘made up for good,/And not for exercise of sin’s intemperance’(IV.v.120-121). She also appeals to *pathos* by asking him to kill her rather than ‘deflower’ her. She *kneels* and *weeps* when she pleads that her ‘death more happy far than was [her] birth’ (IV.v.145). When asked if she is chaste and innocent why she is living in the brothel she uses *logos* in a series of rhetorical questions to explain her situation in a brothel:

My yet good lord,
If there be fire before me, must I fly
There straight and burn myself? Suppose this house-
Which too too many feel such houses are-
Should be the doctor’s patrimony and
The surgeon’s feeding, follows it that I
Must needs infect myself to give them maintenance? (IV.v.127-133).

Even though Ewbank observes that Marina’s eloquence in the brothel scene is that ‘lies in her very literalness and that it is this quality which is therapeutic’(117), Marina’s use of metaphoric language is evident when she talks to Boulton and tries to convince him that he will be better off with a more decent business. She chooses to attack his moral degradation and his inferiority: ‘Thou art the damned door-keeper to every/ Coistrel that comes inquiring of his Tib;/ To the choleric fisting of every rogue’ (IV.vi.164-166). It can be seen that her words bite, as Ewbank observes, because ‘even what look like a metaphor has a terrifying literalness about it.’ The defeat of Boulton’s desire to make Marina malleable is evident in his parting words. He has had his mind altered sufficiently by Marina’s speech to believe that he will find Bawd and Pander accept Marina’s request. Act IV thus has witnessed the therapeutic power of Marina’s medical rhetoric which makes her patient heal through its powerful appeal to conscience.

In the final act of the play, after her music fails to revive Pericles from his sickness, Marina chooses to approach Pericles a second time. This time she employs her artful speech, a rhetoric we recall has worked several remarkable conversions in the brothel. It is in this turn to speech, to the 'holy words' that the pimps so abhor that Marina demonstrates the aptness of Lysimachus' claim that hers is a 'sacred' or spiritual medicine, as opposed to Cerimon's simply natural medicine. Whereas Cerimon revives Thaisa according to what he has learned about such cases in his study of nature and Egyptian rarities, here Marina must attempt to revive a nature that is self-wounded, wounded not in body, but in mind. In such cases, traditional medicine that addresses the problem of the natural body is useless, and the medicine for the soul, if such a thing be, seems required.

In using language to relieve her father from his agony and suffering, Marina can again be considered as a physician, able to use the power of words to heal the depression possessing her father's soul. As mentioned earlier, Marina, herself has learned and developed her art of persuasion to the fullest degree when her language is considered as 'holy words' in the brothel scene; therefore, when she enters the reunion scene, she is well-equipped to work on people's minds. Pericles at the beginning of the scene is apathetic and unresponsive while Marina is a rhetorician who tries to use her words and persuasive conversation to cure the sickness that has afflicted him since leaving Antioch. Lysimachus, from his past experience with Marina's power of words, feels very confident that Marina will be able to cure Pericles with her 'sacred physic' (V.i.73). And he believes that Marina's words will be the effective medicine curing Pericles from the illness he has been infected with throughout his life.

By finding something in common between herself and the mourning king, Marina successfully gains Pericles' attention. After being rebuffed she does not directly make her points, rather she is indirect for a while and her language is deliberately equivocal, yet by asserting her trials and tribulations and her derivation from kingly ancestors, she evokes Pericles' curiosity because what she is saying apparently echoes what he has experienced. This is the reason why she has to mention her own grief and misfortune (V.i.75-85).

Moreover, Pericles has a faint hope of discovering his wife's character dissolved in Marina's. One of Thaisa's unique characteristics, found again in Marina, is the way she gives speeches that make the hearer, including Pericles, want to hear more.

And Juno, who starves the ears she feeds
And makes them hungry the more she gives them speech (V.i.111-112).

The image of appetite for words is striking here. While Thaisa's words starve the ears of her listeners, making them want to hear more, Marina's language, in contrast, is riddle-like evoking the curiosity in Pericles. Pericles can wait no longer to ask her more questions about her background: 'Where do you live?' (V.i.113); 'Where were you bred?/And how achieve'd you these endowments which/ You make more rich to own?' (V.i.115-117). In this case, Marina's speech and her language, not her actions, attract Pericles' attention and evoke his interest; however, her powerful language does not lose its influence and effect here. The healing process which happens gradually through the equivocation and ambiguity of metaphoric language creates curiosity and makes the conversation go on. The conversation keeps it moving forward because on one hand, Pericles' anxiety to hear more about Marina's life and, on the other, her awareness that these facts may be incredible and she will be regarded as 'an imposter'²¹ (V.i.178). Here the ambiguous language becomes healthy which is different from the damaging language in Antiochus.

Though in Act IV, the audience witnesses several persuasions by Marina, in Act V, the challenge is far greater, for the patient does not speak at all. At first, Pericles shows no reaction at all to human life or beauty. The two who both have endured the uttermost loss confront one another, and the contrast is interesting. Pericles is literally speechless and has only endured 'wayward fortune' by completely withdrawing from life and its duties even from his own humanity. In contrast to Pericles' resignation is Marina's eloquence which evokes Pericles' desire for more medicinal speech from her.

Marina's healing language seems to become gradually more complicated, yet less unequivocal. It is notable that she does not mention moral conscience in the process

²¹ Ibid., p. 119.

of healing of her father which is obviously different from the language used in the brothel scene. There are two ways to explain the absence of moral conscience in the recognition scene. One way to see it is, in terms of reunion, not to look at the recognition scene as a scene of repentance or forgiveness. Pericles had had to leave his daughter not because of his moral degradation. Second, Marina has learned how to change the rhetoric to suit the character of her interlocutor. In the dialogue with her father the equivocation and ambiguity of her metaphoric language is strange enough to remind the audience of the riddle in the first scene of the play. What is interesting here is that not the explicit, lucid and direct but the ambiguous, indirect and riddle-like language that seems to be more effective and suitable for the healing in the play.

Marina's language in the scene of recognition is a riddle. Her riddle-like language for resurrection rewrites the riddle of temptation and sin with which the play started. It is a riddle in the sense that it evokes her father's curiosity and hope that is beyond the reality and successfully draws his attention into the conversation:

I am a maid,
My lord, that ne'er before invited eyes,
But have been gaz'd on like a comet
My lord, that, may be, hath endur'd a grief
Might equal yours, if both were justly weigh'd.
My derivation was from ancestors
Who stood equivalent with mighty kings
But time hath rooted out my parentage,
And to the world and awkward casualties
Bound me in servitude (V.i.84-94).

And when she is asked about her nationality she says that,

No, nor of any shores;
Yet I was mortally brought forth, and am
No other than I appear (V.i.102-104).

When Pericles asked her where she lived she said that she lived in a place

Where I am but a stranger; from the deck
You may discern the place (V.i.113-114).

Then Pericles insists she tell her story but she reluctantly responds that if she tells her story, it 'would seem/Like lies, disdain'd in the reporting'(V.i.118). The metaphorical language employed by Marina in the scene of recognition becomes healing because it leads Pericles to share his experience with Marina and it creates intimacy and trust as he looks at her not as a woman who comes to entertain him but as 'a place/For the

crown'd Truth to dwell in' (V.i.121-122). As a means of communication, metaphoric expression needs to link the 'shared experience' of two people. It means that both speaker and hearer need to have something in common in terms of the state of their affairs in the world to experience intimacy and trust. Thus, each time Marina equivocates Pericles seems to understand. Paradoxically, he does repeat questions because Marina's answers to him are comprehensible because her life also reflects his life-long experience. Pericles is interested in Marina's speech because he also shares her experience as a woeful human being facing sorrow and loss in life. It is quite clear that the ambiguity of indirect language in the recognition scene is important because it gives Pericles a chance to have trust in language again after being tortured by corrupted language throughout his life. He needs to have trust in the language again even though it may be ambiguous. Moreover, Lakoff and Johnson point to another concept we have of direct sensory experiences and emotional experiences.²² While sensory experience can be articulated with literal language, there often appears to be a metaphorical component in our talking of emotional experiences. It could be that it is an intrinsic part of our culture to use metaphor as part of our discourse of emotion. In the scene of recognition, not only does Marina use ambiguous and indirect language in the dialogue but Pericles himself also employs figurative language in expressing his feelings. Thus, metaphoric expression in the dialogue between father and daughter in the scene of recognition is very appropriate in terms of healing spiritual and emotional sickness.

Marina's language is able to re-establish the 'control and faith' of her father, undoing the sinister implication of Antiochus' twisted logic with a riddle of her own. It can be seen vividly that the language of recognition and redemption is another kind of riddle but Marina's riddles are healthy, normal ones, riddles whose end is clarification instead of deception, healing instead of sickness. While the first riddle dissolves social distinctions, Marina's restore them, returning to their proper roles the Governor, Lysimachus, the server, Boult and the king and father, Pericles. In other words, Marina's language is healthy and healing because of the nature of the riddle itself and the good intention of her language. Marina's language, compared with the riddle in Antioch, heals not kills. When she says that she 'will use [her] utmost skill in his

²² George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphor We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980)

recovery' (V.i.75-76), there is no ulterior motive in her speech; her riddles, posed to him in the conversation, are aimed at keeping the dialogue going whereas Antiochus' riddle aimed to keep hidden cruel intention and tyranny.

From her past experience, Marina learns that the only way she can evoke Pericles' speech is to adjust her talk to suit the character and emotion of her interlocutor. It can be seen clearly that Marina's language in the scene of recognition is dominated by the power of emotion. Pathos and ethos play vital roles in helping Marina achieve rhetorical success. Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, the most comprehensive Roman technical manuals and which was influential within Tudor grammar-schools during the sixteenth century, explains the idea of ethos as follows:

The ethos which I mean, and which I want to see in a speaker, will be that which is recommended primarily by goodness: not only mild and calm, but usually attractive and polite, and pleasing and delightful to the listeners. The great virtue in expressing it lies in making it seem that everything flows from the nature of the facts and the persons, so that the speaker's character shines through his speech and is somehow recognized.²³

For Pericles, Marina is imbued with *ethos*. While she feels that her impossible story 'would seem like lies,/ Disdained in the reporting,' Pericles, in contrast, is confident that

Falseness cannot come from thee, for thou look'st
Modest as Justice, and thou seem'st a palace
For the crowned Truth to dwell in (V.i.111-113).

Her speech is very calm and simple. She speaks appropriately, pleasantly with no elevation or exaggeration. She simply tries to tell the truth but the only thing that disturbs her is the fact that the truth sounds impossible. However, her credibility does not derive only from her politeness and calmness but also from her resemblance to her mother. Pericles, recognizing Marina's resemblance to his wife, is prepared to force his senses and mental faculties to believe her reporting of her history.

²³ Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*. trans. by Donald A. Russell (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001), p.51. I use Quintilian as a source here due to the fact that in the English Renaissance the most important classical rhetoricians are those whose works had the greatest influence on the pedagogic tradition of the sixteenth century. Renaissance rhetoric is based mainly upon the work of Cicero and Quintilian. The influence particularly noticeable in this period is that of Quintilian. Lee A. Sonnino notes that Ben Jonson remarks that 'a thorough knowledge of Quintilian was all that a poet needed.' See the introduction of his book, Lee A. Sonnino, *A Handbook to Sixteenth-Century Rhetoric* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968), p. 2.

Moreover, in order to enable her listener to share her experience, what she is trying to convey, Marina makes an attempt at arousing Pericles' emotion by assimilating herself to the emotions that her listener really suffers. Quintilian has this view of the point:

Will the hearer feel sorrow, when I, whose object in speaking is to make him feel it, feel none? Will he be angry if the person who is trying to excite his anger suffer nothing resembling the emotions he is calling for?... The first thing, then, is that those feelings should be strong in us which we want to be strong in the judge and that we should ourselves be moved before we try to move others. But how can we come to be moved? Emotions after all, are not in our own power. The person who will show the greatest power in the expression of emotions will be the person who has properly formed what the Greek call *phantasiai* (vision) by which the images of absent things are presented to the mind in such a way that we seem actually to see them with our eyes and have them physically present to us.²⁴

What Quintilian urges the speakers to do is to believe that the misfortunes of which they are to explain have happened to them. They should identify with the person who experiences grievous, lamentable misfortunes. However, for Marina, the 'vision' is there. She does not have to employ *phantasiai* in delivering her story because those experiences that happened to Pericles have also happened to her. She feels what he feels and she fully understands his tragedy and pain because she has also experienced the very same situations throughout her life. She takes his pain for herself. When she is pushed back by Pericles, she says that her grief 'might equal [his], if both were justly weighed' (V.i.79). Marina's eloquence in fact lies not only in attempting to deliver the facts but also arousing emotion and making an existing emotion more intense. Marina's rhetorical power has inspired Pericles' speech and finally restored him to his health.

David Bevington, in his introduction to the play, proposes that Marina perhaps has helped restore Pericles to life and heal his melancholic depression since she is the demonstration of how the 'dangerous sexuality of women can be legitimated.'²⁵ However, what really makes Marina a power in healing her patients is her possession of language uncolonized and uncontrolled by her oppressors. Marina's figure as a

²⁴ Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, Loeb Classical Library Edition, Vol 2 (Harvard University Press, 1920), p. 61.

²⁵ David Bevington, *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* (New York: Longman, 1997), p.1400.

physician would not be powerful and efficacious without her good intentions, and her ability in controlling and manipulating her language. If Marina is a physician, her language is the effective medicine, bringing Pericles back to the world of health. Marina's declaration of her identity: 'My name is Marina' is the climax of the healing process. The revelation of each other's identity seems to depend on the ability to recognize the name.

The declaration of her name 'startle[s]' Pericles and it leads to the process of story-telling. It can be said that the process of story-telling is very powerful in this scene because it eventually reveals the truth and restore Pericles' health. Marina's story-telling gradually reveals her true identity starting from explaining why she was named Marina²⁶ to the name of her father. Her name symbolically echoes the image of the sea and tempest. The image of the sea or the use of sea terms is another important issue so pervasive that it shows the unity of the whole play. In its negative aspects the sea threatens, separates and destroys with cruelty and mercilessness but for everything which it destroys and takes away, the best gift of good fortune is also part of its tides. The sea provides, restores and unites in action which turns death into life, suffering to happiness. The sea in *Pericles* can also be seen as a pivotal part in constructing the concept of healing and rebirth which is closely associated with Marina's character.

Pericles' trials are also defined or expressed in terms of the chaos of a tempest. It can be seen that the first tempest wrecks Pericles' ship and takes away all his possessions and drowns his crew, leaving him destitute on the Pentapoline shore. However, this very same sea that almost takes his life, also gives him his father's armour back:

Thanks, Fortune, yet, that after all thy crosses
Thou giv'st me somewhat to repair myself;
I thank thee for't; my shipwreck now's no ill
Since I have here my father gave in his will (II.i.120-124).

The image of the sea here is used to baptise Pericles, the sea has changed his identity from a princely figure to the humiliated knight and he has to conceal his royal lineage and true title when he joins the jousting competition in Simonides' court. The sea,

²⁶ The sea is never far away in *Pericles*: to ignore it is to miss the play's meaning altogether. Wilson Knight argues that 'to analyze the tempest in *Pericles* would be to analyze the whole play.' Wilson Knight, *The Shakespearian Tempest*. (London: Methuen, 1953), p. 218

here, is symbolically associated with the concept of rebirth. The second tempest, even though more severe than the earlier one, gives him the seeming death of Thaisa but simultaneously gives birth to Marina. However, this tempest forces Thaisa's burial in the same sea which delivers her to Ephesus and to Cerimon who '[has] studied physic' (III.ii.29), and knowhow to bring her back to life.

Early in blustering morn this lady was thrown
Upon this shore: I opened the coffin, found there
Rich jewels, recover'd her, and placed her here(V.iii.20-22).

The sea in Thaisa's understanding is the place where birth and death is symbolically united.

Did you not name a tempest,
A birth and death? (V.iii.33)

The image of the sea as a burial ground is superseded by its generative and creative function, the great womb of life which heralds the birth of Marina and the rebirth of her father. The image of the sea as a midwife helping the delivery of fortune and life to different characters is vivid. The sea's benevolent tides and winds bring Pericles' ship to Mytilene and reunion with his daughter Marina, who cures the sick king a victim of corrupted language so the image of the sea poignantly informs recognition: birth and death in tempest are the keys which reveal name and identity. It can be concluded that the sea imagery of rebirth and recognition is closely associated with the healing power of Marina. Therefore, when she declares herself saying 'My name is Marina,' she is not just revealing her identity but also the images of the sea and her restorative power to bring the mourning king and his vulnerable, sick spirit and body back to the healthy world. It is Marina who names King Pericles. The healing power of Marina and the sea imagery are, therefore, metaphorically connected.

It can be seen clearly that after Pericles realizes that the girl with whom he is speaking is named Marina, he suddenly becomes talkative and controls the dialogue, asking Marina several short but important questions: 'How, a king's daughter/ And call'd Marina?' (V.i.148-149); 'But are you flesh and blood?/ Have you a working pulse and are no fairy/ Motion? And wherefore call'd Marina?' (V.i.153-156); 'At sea! What mother?' (V.i.157). From being a passive interlocutor, Pericles becomes an active speaker, showing that his sickness is dramatically relieved. The recognition produces imagery of the 'great sea of joys' which does not destroy, but rushing upon Pericles,

overbears 'the shore of [his] mortality', joys that 'drown [him] with their sweetness' (V.i.187-189). The climax of the revelation, a spiritual delirium, is expressed again by a sea metaphor where drowning now becomes an ecstasy. The story seems to generally progress with a sequence of watery births: first Pericles and his armour and with Thaisa; next their child and then mother and daughter each reborn from the sea which appears to have ended them. With the sea imagery, *Pericles* offers reassurance, creating a world in which 'death is an illusion and dream of immortality is appeased without the postulate of an-after-life'²⁷

The evidence for Pericles' full recovery from his sickness is apparent when he immediately requests new attire and hears the heavenly music. When Pericles took a vow neither to wash his face nor cut his hair, he also changed his attire to sackcloth traditionally seen as a symbol of remorse and mourning. The change of his clothes can be read metaphorically as a transformation from healthiness to illness and signals his alienation from and restoration to society.²⁸ Furthermore, social order and bodily health are deliberately related to music in *Pericles*. Music is required for its thaumaturgic properties. In the resuscitation of Thaisa, Cerimon also calls for 'rough and/ Woeful music' (III.ii.85-86) as part of his practice of medical knowledge whereby a patient in a critical condition can yet be restored to life. Moreover, when Marina's resurrection in the reunion is achieved, the music of the spheres is heard. If music is generally considered as a symbol of harmony and immortality and restoration, the 'heavenly music' (V.i.232) heard by Pericles after he is totally cured by his daughter is truly appropriate.²⁹

From the beginning of the play the contagious language have infected Pericles and later, Lysimachus; both are representatives of patriarchy. However, at the end of the play, both of them have been rescued by a physician who can heal those infections with her use of language. It can be concluded that the patriarch's language is a source of deception and corruption whereas Marina, a female character, has linguistic power

²⁷ J.P. Brockbank, 'Pericles and the dream of immortality', *Shakespeare Survey*, 24 (1971), 105-116.

²⁸ According to the Bible, Jacob also changes his attire to sackcloth when he heard the false news of his son Joseph's death.

²⁹ Nosworthy believes that the music comes to occupy a conspicuous and effective position in the moral fabric. Romances 'are basically a mirror of the creation in human terms, with love shaping a new world out of chaos to the sound of music.' (68) The significance and functions of music in the romances is partially investigated in his essay. J.M. Nosworthy, 'Music and its function in the romances of Shakespeare', *Shakespeare Survey*, 11 (1958), 60-69.

in the healing of sick patients. However, this kind of gender politics is quite complicated but interesting in terms of constructing father-daughter relationships and the concept of patriarchal authority and its connection with femininity in the Shakespeare romances. If the romance is to become a new genre of Shakespearean play, it should establish a new concept of the relationship between male and female characters in the play making it unique and different from the tragedies and comedies.

III: Father-Daughter Relationship

Cyrus Hoy believes that of all the possible relationships of man and woman that of father and daughter seems ultimately to have been the one that moved the dramatist most, for from it he derives the mysterious story of suffering and grace, of loss and restoration that resound throughout the last four plays.³⁰ Hoy also observes that behind all the fathers and daughters in Shakespeare's romances are the most affecting father and daughter he ever draws, Lear and Cordelia:

In *King Lear*, Cordelia is reconciled with her father who begs her forgiveness and who is in effect, restored to life by her ministrations in a memorable scene (IV.vii) which would comprise the play's finale if *King Lear* were a romance. As it is, the tragedy sweeps on to its catastrophe, but the sort of recognition scene Shakespeare composed for Lear is recapitulated with ever-increasing brilliance in *Pericles* where it serves as the appropriate occasion for demonstrating the daughter's redemptive powers (78).

In Hoy's view, it is the 'psychological climate' that produces the romances because the dramatist tries to liberate his thought from female figures who play important roles in tragedies and to create, in their place, an ideal of femininity. Thus a daughter becomes the feminine ideal of the romances. But I would like to add that in *Pericles*, it is essential that a daughter be the redemptive figure who rescues the father from the corruption with which he has been infected because all of the conflicts and adventures in the play initially derive from the incestuous relationship between a father and daughter. The discovery of evil in the King of Antioch's incest with his daughter leaves its mark on Shakespeare's treatment of father and daughter relations in everything that follows. The riddle of incestuous relationships also demonstrates the

³⁰ Cyrus Hoy, 'Fathers and Daughters in Shakespeare's Romances,' *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*. eds. by Carol McGinnis Kay and Henry E. Jacob (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978), pp. 76-90.

abuse of patriarchal power that can be seen as an image of violated rights of ‘property and propriety.’³¹In Constance Jordan’s view, to the patriarch, both children and wife are possession or property, however, according to Jordan in the case of a child, especially a daughter, paternal rights of ownership extended to the right ‘to dispose of the child at will but they are also legally circumscribed by the child’s right to protection and nurturance.’³² Therefore, a child is a possession that cannot be ‘used’; patriarchal governance in placing a child, although virtually absolute, is not to be based on paternal interest. The character of father-daughter relationship does not entail classifying the weaker member as a mere object. It means that if father uses daughter inappropriately, he violates the fundamental right of his child. This is a kind of violation of ‘propriety.’ This is exactly what happens in Antiochus where the monarch, as a father, violates the rights of his daughter. Incest becomes a facet of tyranny and a disease in society. In *Pericles*, it is quite evident that the incestuous relationship between father and daughter is an abuse of the patriarchal power of Antiochus. Gower’s summary of the story in the opening scene is a good example how to correctly judge these two evil characters:

This king unto him took a peer,
 Who died and left female heir,
 So buxom, blithe and full of face
 As heaven had lent her all his grace;
 With whom the father liking took,
 And her to incest did provoke.
 Bad child, worse father, to entice his own
 To evil should be done by none (I.chorus. 21-28).

In the relationship, from Gower’s narrative, Antiochus ‘took her to incest.’ He abuses his paternal and patriarchal power by forcing his daughter to commit incest with him. She is ‘bad’ in participating in the evil, corrupted relationship but Antiochus is worse because he uses his power in the wrong way. He violates his rights in the ‘property’ embodied by his daughter to be his wife. Moreover, the riddle shows that Antiochus writes it by using his daughter’s point of view in describing the incest. The pronoun ‘I’ in the riddle refers to the daughter. Instead of using himself as a narrator of the

³¹ The concept of property and propriety in *Pericles* is fully discussed in Constance Jordan’s ‘Eating the Mother: Property and Propriety in *Pericles*.’ *Creative Imitation: New Essays on Renaissance Literature in Honour of Thomas M. Greene*. ed. by David Quint (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Text and Studies, 1992), pp. 331-353.

³² *Ibid.*, p.337.

riddle, he blames his daughter by inserting her narrative. The image of a daughter as a 'viper... feed on mother's flesh,' (I.i.65) is shocking. Antiochus' tyranny can also be detected by looking at his daughter's only speech in the play:

Of all, say'd yet, may'st thou prove prosperous!
Of all, say'd yet, I wish thee happiness (I.i.61-62).

This is the only place we hear her voice, but her speech is very interesting. Antiochus' daughter wishes Pericles good luck and happiness before he enters the trap by trying to solve the riddle. Her wishing Pericles luck possibly echoes the mourning and suffering inside her that she is a victim of her father's abuse and wants to be out of this vicious cycle. The problem at the beginning of the play evidently derives from the abuse and corruption of power of the patriarch who forces his daughter to commit a sin. If the incest is the symptom of corruption of patriarchal power, then the use of daughter as a redemptive figure in healing is most appropriate. This is a first step of his education that royalty is particularly vulnerable to sins. 'Kings are earth's gods; in vice their law's their will/And if Jove stray who dares say Jove doth ill' (I.i,146-147). Since the patriarch here is a lawmaker, he can use the law and authority to justify his action, to disguise his sin.

In Mytilene, the association between the abusive power of patriarchy and the corrupted language is clearly illustrated. Lysimachus as a governor uses his power in an abusive and corrupted way by being a frequenter of the brothel with the possibility of being pox-ridden. Lysimachus' language in the brothel scene leads to the questions of his honour and his social status as a governor of the land. His behaviour seems hypocritical and evokes the curiosity of the audience about his virtue and morality. Even though he hides his dishonourable intention with euphemistic language, he cannot hide his lust and the degradation of his morality when he starts using infected language in communicating with the Bawd and Boulton. Lysimachus's first bawdy comment also, ironically, picks up on her name 'she would serve after long voyage at sea' (IV.v.40). The infection of language and corrupted behaviour is cured and restored by Marina's language. The governor leaves the brothel claiming that Marina's speech has altered his 'corrupted mind.' What is interesting here is Marina's power in restoring and curing the infected language and the corrupted mind of the patriarchal characters. In the brothel scene, the connection between the infection of

language and the physical disease caused by the pox is apparent. The spread of the pox derives from the spread of infected language used by the Bawd and her companions. After finishing doing business with the pirates, the Bawd commands Boult to mark Marina's character 'with warrant of her virginity' (IV.ii.54), and cries: 'He that will give most shall have her first' (55). Shortly, he comes back to report that he has spread the news to bring the customers to the brothel. But the regular customers seem to carry venereal disease with them including, as Margaret Healy observes Lysimachus, the governor. Therefore, when Marina uses her language to purify the minds of her customers, she not only prevents the spread of infected language but also stops the spread of the pox, the physical disease in the brothel.

In the final Act of the play, Marina, as has been discussed earlier, also has the power to restore her father to life and sanity. Arriving on the barge so as to minister to the surly Pericles, she takes upon herself the responsibilities, perfected earlier by the charitable Cerimon. The deceptive, corrupted language attacking Pericles throughout his life leading to the melancholic, unresponsive and psychological depression finally disappears. His spiritual sickness is totally healed and his psyche is restored by the power of Marina's language. It is her healing language, a contrast with Pericles' silence, which restores him to his wholesome state; her language competence is a remedy or midwife like the imagery of the sea in giving birth and fortune to the characters, especially when Pericles says 'Thou that beget'st him that did thee beget' (V.i.195). Marina's redemptive acts at the end of the play also correct the original matricidal, incestuous transgression of the Antiochan princess: both daughters in a sense 'feed' on the mother's flesh, but whereas one eats it away, the other gives and draws nourishment. Hart claims that mother and daughter, both of whom incorporate the virginal-maternal power of Diana, ultimately embody 'the law of mother.' From this position of power it is they whom ultimately confer 'legitimacy upon the father/ Father in his role as monarch.'³³It can certainly be concluded that in *Pericles* the patriarchal sickness needs a healing power from a feminine character to bring healthiness and sanity back to the patriarch. In other word, the triumph of femininity over the concept of patriarchy is quite vivid in *Pericles*. The sickness and disorder of the patriarch from corrupted language cannot be healed and restored if the power of

³³ Elizabeth Hart, "'Great is Diana' of Shakespeare's Ephesus," *Studies in English Literature*, 43 (2003), 347-374.

femininity is not recognized or introduced into the play. Therefore, it can also be said that Shakespeare's *Pericles* can be seen as the first step of the declaration of the victory of femininity over the power of patriarchy.

In Act V scene iii, however, when Pericles decides to marry his daughter off to the frequenter of the brothel, Margaret Healy raises the question about the appropriateness of the match considering that Lysimachus may be pox-ridden. But the horror of the marriage between a gifted physician and a pox-ridden governor is not only a striking issue to the contemporary audience's experience. The redemption and a restoration of a father and a repentant governor by the power of femininity seem to have been overlooked. In *Pericles*, it is quite obvious that the patriarchal power exercised by the patriarchs in the earlier plays is diminished and the healing power of femininity has thematic significance throughout the play. In other words, the patriarchy cannot be restored to health without acknowledging the importance of feminine power. The end of the play seems to repeat the problem critics and readers/audience frequently encounter when reading/seeing *Pericles*. What has happened for Pericles to marry Marina off to Lysimachus without asking her consent? Margaret Sommerville notes in her book *Sex And Subjection* that in early modern theory, when a woman married she accepted subjection to her husband but 'only by consent to marriage did a woman become subject, and nobody could be forced to marry.' Early modern theorists are almost unanimous in insisting that 'valid marriage required the voluntary consent of bride and groom.'³⁴ The questions and problems of Marina's consent play a vital role in interpreting the relationship between patriarchy and femininity. The victory of feminine power over the patriarchy possibly becomes an illusion of reality when Pericles speaks his last words that 'our son and daughter shall in Tyrus reign'(V.iii.83-85). Marina's reaction to this matter is worth investigating. The last time we hear her voice is when she kneels to Thaisa and says 'My heart/ Leaps to be gone into my mother's bosom' (V.iii.44-45). How is it that a gifted rhetorician like Marina becomes mute when she is offered in marriage? If the play suggests the possibility of the triumph over the patriarchy what is the meaning of Marina's silence?

³⁴ Margaret Sommerville, *Sex and Subjection* (New York: Arnold, 1995), pp. 174-182.

Traditionally, silence in a woman is considered a virtue and a quality much preferred over loquaciousness. Early modern women are instructed to be chaste, silence and obedient. This idea is based on a dominant gendered ideal of the active, shaping power as male and passive receptivity as female, a binarism often represented as male speech and female silence.

Marina's silence echoes what happened to Isabella in *Measure for Measure*. The audience does not hear Isabella's voice after she kneels before the Duke and asks for forgiveness for Angelo long before the play ends. In the very last line of the play the Duke proposes to Isabella but she does not articulate a decision on whether or no she is going to marry him.

Dear Isabel,
I have a motion to imports your good,
Whereto if you'll a willing ear incline,
What's mine is yours, and what is yours is mine(V.i.545-548).

Like Marina and Isabella, Katharina in *The Taming of the Shrew* also seems to have the same problem in responding to the proposal of marriage. Moreover, it also paradoxically recalls the roles of daughter in *Othello* and *King Lear* regarding the matter of marriage. Despite the fact that the dramatic structures of tragedy and romance are quite different, the concept of marriage and the roles of daughter on account of marriage can be traditionally considered as a code of conduct of the early modern England. Sommerville notes that

early modern theorists believed that a daughter should follow her father's guidance in choosing a husband, but he could not compel her to marry if she did not want to. Parents might make arrangements without their children's explicit consent, but the child had right to disagree if there were just grounds (180).

Thus, when Desdemona is brought into the council chamber before Othello and Brabantio, she enunciates with great clarity a principle of duty which places her directly in the tradition of wife and daughter:

My noble father,
I do perceive here a divided duty:
To you I am bound for life and education;
My life and education both do learn me
How to respect you; you are the lord of duty;
I am hitherto your daughter. But here is my husband;

And so much duty of my mother show'd
To you preferring you before her father (I.iii.180-187).

This is the position on which Cordelia will take her stand in *King Lear*:

Good my lord,
You have begot me love'd me bred me: I
Return those duties back as are right fit,
Obey you, love you and honour you.
Why have sisters husbands if they say
They love you all? Happily, when I shall wed,
That lord whose hand must take my plight shall carry
Half my love with him, half my care and duty.
Sure I shall never marry like my sisters,
To love my father all(I.i.95-104).

In both instances the daughter's role as victim of the tragedy is unmistakable, and the father's share in contributing to her victimization is firmly woven into the tragic pattern. When Brabantio says to Othello: 'Look to her Moor, if thou hast eye to see;/ She has deceive'd her father, and may thee' (I.iii.292-293), he is planting a seed of suspicion in Othello's mind. And Lear's rejection of Cordelia is an aspect of his tragic fault that leads to his destruction and to hers. He had no more expected to be crossed by her than Brabantio had expected his daughter to elope with a Moor. But the daughters themselves attempt to make new lives and finally end up with death and sorrow. However what is interesting here is that both Desdemona and Cordelia speak out about their feelings on marriage, the duty of a daughter towards a father, and the duty of a wife towards a husband. They choose to speak to express their standpoint and disagreement. Unlike Marina, they fully aware of what is going to happen after marriage and they explicitly make their own choice. Marina who throughout the play has acted as a gifted rhetorician instead of speaking out to protest at or to consent to Pericles' decision in marrying her off to Lysimachus keeps silent and the audience do not hears her voice again. The play ends with suspicion and ambiguity, not only in term of the geographical and political ambiguity explored by Constance C. Relihan, but also in term of the relationship between the power of patriarchy and the power of femininity.³⁵

³⁵ The geopolitical implication of Shakespeare's topography in *Pericles* is explored in his essay. Constance C. Relihan, 'Liminal Geography: *Pericles* and the Politics of Place,' in *Shakespeare's Romances*. ed. by Alison Thorne. (New York: Palgrave, 2003), pp.71-90.

The difference between Shakespeare's tragedies and his romances can be explained by scrutinizing the treatment of conflict in the father-daughter relationships. Desdemona and Cordelia choose to articulate their disapproval of patriarchal power in controlling their freedom of choice in selecting their husbands; however, the consequence of the courage of their struggle against the patriarchy is death while Marina and Isabella, in *Measure for Measure*, choose to keep silent as a means of expressing *obedience or resistance* to the power of male figures in the plays. Silence is not only sign of chastity, obedience and modesty, which are frequently regarded as feminine values, but also a gesture of resistance, disobedience and seductiveness.³⁶

It can be concluded that Katharina in *The Taming of the Shrew*, Isabella in *Measure for Measure* and Marina in *Pericles*, by responding to the idea of marriage with silence, are inscrutable and unreadable. The autonomous meaning of the silence seems to be impossible since silence can be interpreted as both obedience and resistance in early modern England. The interpretation of silence now depends totally on the acting of the actor on the stage because on the stage we see silence in action. The gestures of the actor will convey the meaning and the interpretation of silence to the audience. However, since the context and language of the play are not sufficient or clear enough to give the explicit meaning of silence, if, and only if, the actor truly retreats into silence with no indicative gestures or facial expression, will silence again become unreadable and inscrutable.

If we believe that a feminist character has to recognize the structure of patriarchy and challenge masculine authority in order to assert her agency, then Marina's role as a feminist character who seems to have healing power on which the male characters depend appears as a failure. Marina's character at the end of the play, even though she has healing power in curing and redeeming male characters in the play, is still uncertain and problematic. It is open to interpretation, and much depends on the performance of Lysimachus. If he has converted, then her role is like Christ's touching of the lepers and dying for the sinful. The triumph of femininity over the power of patriarchy in a male-dominated society could be either an illusion or a

³⁶ Luckyj, p. 9

deception of reality or the true achievement of femininity depending on how one is to interpret the meaning of silence.

In 'Gracious Be the Issue', Helen Hackett concludes that it is the late plays in which 'female generation of story comes closest to being openly recognized, rather than taken under the charge of an organizing male figure.'³⁷ However, I propose instead that in *Pericles*, female generation is seemingly controlled and dominated by the patriarchal power of a male figure. Pericles, as a redeemed figure still fully exercises his authority and power to control female characters in the play. His decision to marry Marina to Lysimachus without asking her consent and his authority commanding Thaisa to embrace Helicanus 'Embrace him, Thaisa' (V.i.55), vividly indicates that he regains his authority and is ready to use it in controlling female characters in the play. The silence of Marina may be problematic in reaching an interpretation and conclusion regarding the relationship between patriarch and female characters. However, through the use of language, in some ways the immediate emergence of patriarchal power at the end of the play seems to secure its place in *Pericles*. Pericles' language at the end of the play echoes his language in the first two acts where he presents himself as a young prince who 'think[s] of death no hazard' (I.i.5) and is willing to 'die in the adventure' (I.i.23). However, all of his masculine qualities seem to disappear when he chooses to live his life in the world of melancholy and silence. Pericles loses his masculine identity, and instead turns to maternal roles.

Pericles' sexual transformation through the use of language begins in Act V when he sets his mind 'for this three months hath not spoken/ To any one.' (V.i.24-25). In Luckyj's investigation she mentions that in early modern society,

a man speaks to exhibit his best qualities and take part in public life; a man who does not speak beats a fearful retreat from self-defining, combative, phallic modes of courtly speech and risks appearing as a woman (47).

Luckyj also observes that silence could thus intimate 'a feminising reduction in male power.'³⁸ Pericles, just before seeing Thaisa's image in his daughter, says 'I am great with woe, and shall deliver weeping' (V.i.105-106). The maternal image here is very

³⁷ Hackett, p. 39.

³⁸ Luckyj, p.31

vivid because according to Hoeniger, the phrase ‘deliver weeping’ suggests that ‘Pericles’ woe is so overpowering that he will deliver his tears as a mother frees herself from her burden in the process of birth.’³⁹ Pericles responds to Marina’s riddle about her identity ‘No, nor of any shores/ Yet I was mortally brought forth, and am/ No other than I appear’ (V.i.101-103) by depicting himself pregnant with grief. The anticipated delivery will bring forth joy as it frees Pericles from the immobility of mourning. This is the first time in the play, yet not last, that Pericles’ role as a patriarch is drastically diminished to the degree that his character is seemingly feminine and turns to take a maternal role. His character here resembles Lychorida, a nurse who ‘had oft deliver’d weeping’ (V.i.159).

However, when he consciously recognizes his own title declaring ‘I am Pericles of Tyre’ (V.i.204) and his immediate request for new attire indicates the transformation of his roles from feminine mourning king to a redeemed father. What is interesting here is that after resuming and recognizing his roles as a father and a king of Tyre, Pericles, with no delay, exercises his authorities and takes his responsibility as a father and a king.

I am Pericles of Tyre: but tell me now
My drown’d queen’s name, as in the rest you said
Thou hast been godlike perfect, the heir of kingdoms
And another life to Pericles thy father (V.i.204-207).

Pericles, instead of posing a question to Marina, gives her a command to ‘tell [him] now’ her mother’s name and suddenly declares himself as ‘Pericles [her] father.’ For Pericles finally the quest for the generative properties that were early lost from the play is achieved. As ‘the heir of kingdoms,’ Marina provides a restorative to the country because she guarantees the continuation of Pericles’ line. The use of the word ‘kingdoms’ as a plural suggests what lies beneath Pericles’ mind. He realizes that Marina now is his only heir and she has to marry someone to secure the generative function of the country. Through marriage, the expansion of the land is finally achieved and fulfilled. Constance Relihan notes that with the restoration of Marina ‘the second generation of rule is assured and the geographical area governed by the dynasty increases.’ (82) As a king of the land Pericles’ concerns about the political

³⁹ F. D. Hoeniger, *The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare: Pericles*: (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. lxxxvi-lxxxvii.

position of his country are understandable. Pericles' agreement in marrying Marina off to Lysimachus in his last speech deliberately confirms the regaining of his authority as a patriarch and indicates the possibility of the expansion of the kingdoms. It might be incorrect to interpret the silence of Marina as the failure of femininity however it is true to say that at the end the shadow of the patriarchy and its power is still hanging over the play.

Not only is Marina controlled and directed by her redeemed father, Thaisa as a mother who has never seen her daughter before must leave for Pentapolis to rule that land soon. After all Pericles, Thaisa and Marina have never really had time to know each other even in pairs. Shakespeare, it seems, never fails to include among the attributes of the figure of the reunited family some increase in its territory. Thus, Pericles rejoins Thaisa to discover her father is dead and this death extends Pericles' domain to his father-in-law's kingdom as he places Tyre under the titular rule of his daughter and son-in-law. However, the play seems to have a twisted ending destroying in claiming total victory over the power of patriarchy. *Pericles* is a place where patriarchal power is diminished yet still apparent and effective.

However, if *Pericles* is considered as a romance, containing unexpected events and surprises, one cannot help noticing that wonder is used throughout the play.⁴⁰ T.G. Bishop's *Shakespeare and The Theatre of Wonder* explains wonder in terms of experience of the theatre, he argues that wonder occurs at moments of 'intense emotive response' and he focuses his study on articulating the character of wonder that seizes audiences at those moments:

What happens at such moments, for those within this fiction, those on the stage, and those in the audience and especially what happens in the relations between these constituencies, where the central work of the theatre takes place, is my subject... The emotion known as wonder is a characteristic and heightened experience of this 'between' quality of theatricality. Wonder particularly raises the question of the theatre's interest in the emotions it generates through its characteristic creation of a dynamic space of flux and intermediacy –between stage and audience... More particularly, as Aristotle observes wonder is an emotional response to certain events framed for

⁴⁰ This language includes, but is not limited to, expression like 'marvel,' 'admire,' 'rare,' or 'miracle' as well as variations of those words. See example in III.ii.104, V.iii.58.

inspection in the theatre as a particular action- events placed under a particular pressure towards the revelation of significance⁴¹

The key phrase here is ‘the revelation of significance.’ Marina’s silence, though very disturbing, is important to the genre of the play. As Healy argues in her essay ‘Pericles and the Pox’ that the audience might be horrified by Pericles’ decision in giving Marina to Lysimachus at the end of the play, but they are also surprised by Marina’s silence. Her silence can also be interpreted as anything from rebellion to submission. However, if Shakespeare’s *Pericles* is a romance, Marina’s silence at the end can be seen as a form of wonder to herself and to the audience. She might be speechless because of the overwhelming (dis)satisfaction with the wedding. But this kind of wonder can be diminished by reason as suggested in *As You Like It*: ‘Feed your mind with questioning, that reason wonder may diminish’ (V.iv.138-9), since Marina’s marriage is pivotal in political senses. If we fully understand the genre of the romance and the significance of wonder, Marina’s silence, instead of being surprising, may be familiar to all of us as Friar Francis notes in *Much Ado About Nothing*: ‘Let wonder seem familiar’ (V.iv.66).

The struggle of femininity against the power of patriarchy has never ended. However, it is possible that *Pericles* is not only a creation of new style of writing or the coming of a new genre in Shakespeare’s dramas, but also a caricature of the patriarch who, even needing restorative and redemptive power from a female figure, still, consciously or unconsciously exercises his authority in controlling females without recognizing their generosity in fulfilling, and restoring his healthy identity. As Simon Palfrey states in his book chapter ‘Women and Romance’ because ‘the patriarchal order is never finally dislodged, it is often argued that the women’s apparent autonomy is illusory.’⁴² Rachel Heard explores the way that the Renaissance writers tried to alter the female characters of antiquity from classical sources to fit the picture of the most desirable Renaissance woman and to create the figure of ‘suppliant’ woman that has ‘more in common with the behaviour expected of all well-brought up early modern women.’⁴³ Heard believes that Renaissance writer intentionally alters

⁴¹ T.G, Bishop, *Shakespeare and The Theatre of Wonder* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 3.

⁴² Simon Palfrey, *Late Shakespeare: A New World of Words* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p. 197.

⁴³ Rachel Heard, *Shakespeare, Gender, and the Rhetoric of Excuse* unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. (University of St Andrews, 2003), p. 170.

the threatening 'boldness' of female character in the classical sources and situates her 'firmly in her place as dutiful wife or daughter' to exhibit the 'female comeliness.'⁴⁴This very same idea that woman in the Renaissance was still shaped and controlled by an ideal standard of male- authored conduct manuals can also be seen in Shakespeare's *Pericles*, if we look at the play as a representation of one of them. The power structures of Shakespeare's period remain in place at the play's end, and men continue to hold the position of command and authority. It can be less severe and temporarily weakened but it is not totally eradicated or defeated.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 171.

Chapter II

The Language of Estimation of 'Worth' and Women's Speech in *Cymbeline*

In the opening speech of Act III scene II of *Cymbeline*, Pisanio, after receiving the letter from his master, Posthumus, ordering him to murder his wife Imogen in Milford Haven, believes that his master has been infected with some kind of disease during his stay in Italy: 'O master, what a strange infection/ Is fall'n into thy ear!' (III.ii.3-4). For Pisanio, the 'infection' obviously derives from the 'poisonous tongue' which 'had prevailed,/ On [Posthumus'] too ready hearing' (III.ii.5-6). It reminds us of what happens in *Pericles* where hypocrisy is pervasive and male characters seem to be infected by corrupted and deceptive language. However, whereas in *Pericles*, the power of female speech is striking and Marina's medicinal rhetoric can be considered as a vital instrument in constructing and shaping the play as a romance, in Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* female characters seem to play less important roles and their speech has no therapeutic power in the process of healing the sickness and disease nor in redemption.

In contrast, traffic in women seems to be everywhere in *Cymbeline*. It can be seen that the objectification of woman and the idea of male homosocial desire are presented from the first act and throughout the play. In *Between Men*, Eve Sedgwick defines homosocial desire' as a 'continuum' along which one may describe the social bond between individuals of the same sex.' She argues that, 'in any male-dominated society, there is a special relationship between male homosocial desire and the structures for maintaining and transmitting patriarchal power: a relationship founded on an inherent and potentially active structural congruence.'¹ Despite the fact that, the concept of homosocial and homosexual might sound synonymous, she argues that they do not convey the same meaning. She also believes that the maintenance of patriarchy is dependent upon heterosexuality. The relationship between them was explored by Gayle Rubin who sees them as-'the traffic in women'. Luce Irigaray, using Marx's theory, similarly states that women are exchanged as commodities and she also believes that 'women's role in exchanges manifests and circulates the power

¹ Eve Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), pp. 25.

of the Phallus as it establishes relationships of men with each other.² Levi-Strauss proposes that ‘the total relationship of exchange which constitutes marriage is not established between a man and a woman but between two groups of men and the woman figures only as one of the objects in the exchange, not as one of the partners.’³ Women become objects of transaction in the patriarchal network of exchange.⁴ It can be said that the pivotal element in Shakespeare’s *Cymbeline* is the concept of male homosociality as the mainstay of the culture that is typified by evaluation of women’s value within a socio-economic system that excludes them from possessing subjectivity. And it also falsely values their worth in monetary terms. The central problem of the play and the conflict between the characters seem to derive from the attempt of male characters to establish how much Imogen is worth in a patriarchal evaluative framework. The controversial argument about the worth of characters plays a vital role in constructing the theme of the play. Moreover, the main conflict of the play is the complicated relationship between the structure of patriarchy, homosociality and the objectification of femininity since the chastity of Imogen is deliberately made the object of a wager over her worthiness between two male characters.

In this chapter, I will closely examine how a woman’s ethical properties are valued and judged in Shakespeare’s *Cymbeline* - by exploring the way in which Imogen is treated and exchanged by her male counterparts in the play. Like in *Pericles*, the masculine language is contagious especially at the beginning of the play. Imogen’s rhetoric seems to be the only way to prove that this masculine diseased language is wrong. I will argue that Shakespeare’s *Cymbeline* challenges the patriarchal methods of estimating and measuring the worth of intangible virtues especially those of women. It is implied that Shakespeare is suggesting that it is impractical, inappropriate and impossible to evaluate immeasurable virtues in pecuniary terms.

Since the concept of how to measure the value and worthiness of characters is very important, the language of exchange and measurement provides the key words for each character in defining the meaning of worth. The link between the social and

² Luce Irigaray, ‘Women on the Market’, in *The Logic of the Gift: Toward an Ethic of Generosity*, ed. by Alan D. Schrift (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 12-13.

³ Levi-Strauss, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), p. 115.

sexual aspect of male-male and male-female estimation of value will be closely explored in the first part of this chapter. The fact that Posthumus is virtuous and therefore not socially unworthy, is ironically complicated by his low estimation of his wife's virtue. The play seems to explore the tension between male-male and male-female estimation of worth. Imogen's rhetoric in defending herself from Iachimo's sexual persuasion will be analyzed in details in the second part. It is her rhetoric that helps save her from being deceived by Iachimo in the wooing scene, which later becomes clear evidence that she is a paragon of virtue

However, the conflict and problem found in the first half of the play are relieved and later solved in the second half. The monetary images and the pecuniary language are still present but convey different meanings. Money plays less important roles and 'all gold and silver rather turns to dirt'(III.vi.53). Moreover, the social assumption that worth and virtue is a class-related issue is challenged by the bravery and integrity of the kidnapped sons,-Guiderius and Arviragus. The disguise of Posthumus as a lowly ranked peasant who 'will begin/ The fashion: less without and more within' (V.i.34) and his pecuniary language of repentance underscore the impracticality of measuring virtue in monetary terms. It can be seen that in this scene Posthumus' values are altered. In weighing the worth of his own life, he uses the language of accounting and coinage again but this time he use the terms with spiritual connotations and different from the famous 'woman's parts' speech in the first part of the play.

In the last part of the chapter, I will explore the common problem of female agency found at the end of Shakespeare's romances. The final scene of *Pericles* is full of female rhetorical power in restoring the health of the monarchy and the kingdom itself. In contrast, of her 840 lines, Imogen speaks only 27 lines in the final act. We rarely hear her voice and when she speaks her language does not seem to have the regenerative power of femininity. In the final act of *Cymbeline*, alternatively it can be seen that the rhetorical power transfers from female to male. Imogen, heir to the kingdom at the beginning (I.i.4), is not only displaced by her brothers at the end (V.v.374), but also seems to lose her rhetorical power to triumphant masculinity in the process of reconciliation and redemption. Even though she is in disguise, she is still in a passive position. Her submissiveness and passivity is emphasized again when she expresses her loyalty to her husband as a wife after her recognition of him: 'Why did

you throw your wedded lady from you?/ Think that you are upon a rock and now/
Throw me again' (V.v.260-261). However, Posthumus' response is significant, when he says: 'Hang there like fruit, my soul,/ Till the tree die' (V.v.262). Imogen's self-effacing has brought the play to the happy ending. Imogen's self-silencing gives her the room to exercise her agency in a subtle way. The image of Imogen as an object of male desire is replaced by her spiritual values. The language of precious objects such as 'jewel', 'gold' and 'ring' which had previously been used in comparisons with Imogen disappears and the language of intangible virtue finally emerges.

I

The Language of Estimation

In the early modern period, capitalism and mercantilism play a vital role in constructing a national economy.⁵ Money is used to measure and to exchange in commodity circulation. Karl Marx notes that the sixteenth century is the beginning of capitalism which creates 'world trade and the world market.'⁶ However, it can be said that in early modern England, money is not the only form of economic measurement. Credit also plays a pivotal role. The power of credit is very significant for building trust in early modern economic practice, as Craig Muldrew has noted, 'wherein most market relations were informed and done on trust, or credit, without specific legally binding instruments.'⁷ Credit, therefore, becomes the means and medium of exchange, representing the ability to transmute abstractions such as reputation or honesty into the material substance of a sum of money.

Money and commercial thinking also abound in the literature of the period. Linda Woodbridge observes that 'money is an issue in many standard plot motifs: arrest and imprisonment for debt, beggary, attempt to marry a wealthy widow, manipulation of wardship for financial gain, extravagant consumerism that ruins young heirs. In Jacobean comedy, the new ogres are usurers.'⁸ It is common that language of

⁵ For a detailed discussion of early modern capitalism and mercantilism see Andrea Finkelstein, *Harmony and the Balance: An Intellectual History of Seventeenth-Century English Economic Thought* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000) and Lars Magnusson, *Mercantilism: The Shaping of an Economic Language* (New York: Routledge, 1994).

⁶ Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume One*, trans. by Ben Fowkes (London: Penguin and New Left Review, 1976).

⁷ Craig Muldrew, 'Interpreting the Market: The Ethics of Credit and Community Relations in Early Modern England', *Social History*, 18. 2 (May 1993), 163-183.

⁸ See Linda Woodbridge, *Money and the Age of Shakespeare* (New York: Palgrave, 2003), p. 9.

commerce is pervasive even in the play whose themes are not chiefly money-oriented. *King Lear*, for example, shows inappropriate effort to qualify and measure; Tell me my daughter, .../ Which of you shall we say doth love us most (I.i 46-49). Cleopatra's opening question also indicates the same problem about the measurement of love, 'If it be love indeed, tell me how much' (I.i.14). This kind of language can also be seen in *Cymbeline* since the main problem of the play is how to measure the value and worth of each character especially women's worth.

The complexity of this question can be seen in the opening scene where the Two Gentlemen give the background to the play and introduce the conflict between Cymbeline and the newly married couple. In marrying Posthumus, Imogen has to pay 'her own price/ To proclaim how she esteemed him' (I.i.51-52).⁹ The language of the First Gentleman also represents the marriage between the couple in terms of merchandise. Moreover, the language of the lovers in the opening scene, by using words such as 'exchange,' 'lost,' 'win' and 'overbuy' (I.i.120-124, 147), also indicates the language of commerce which will lay the groundwork for the wager scene where money plays the most important role in measuring the worthiness of each character.

The First Gentleman's catalogue of Posthumus' virtues concludes with an appeal to the action of the Princess Imogen, who values Posthumus so highly that she is content to risk her status as an heir to the kingdom:

... To his mistress
(For whom he now is banished), her own price
Proclaim how she esteem'd him; and his virtue
By her election may be truly read
What kind of man he is (50-54).

The striking statement of Posthumus' virtue needs careful consideration. The First Gentleman notes that the price of Imogen's love is the kingdom. This is the first place in the play where marriage or love is represented in mercantile terms. *The Oxford English Dictionary* initially defines 'worth' as 'pecuniary value'. However, it goes on to give the second meaning as 'the character or standing of a person in respect of moral and intellectual qualities especially high personal merit or attainments.' It also gives the meaning of 'value' as 'the material or monetary worth of things' at the same

⁹ William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline* ed. by J.M. Nosworthy (London: Methuen, 1986)

time defining 'value' as 'worth or worthiness (of persons) in respect of rank or personal qualities.'¹⁰ Such ambiguity in the meaning of the words is extraordinarily useful in exploring the concepts of 'worth' and 'value' in a patriarchal evaluative framework since Posthumus and Iachimo seem to forget the second meanings of the words 'worth' and 'value' and they *only* ever measure the worth and value of Imogen in monetary terms.

In conversation between the Two Gentlemen, the recently banished Posthumus is lauded by the First Gentleman as

...creature
As to seek through the region of the earth
For one his like; there would be something failing
In him that should compare. I do not think
So fair an outward and such stuff within
Endows a man but he (I.i.19-24).

The First Gentleman unabashedly presents Posthumus as an object worthy of any man's wonder. That Posthumus is an exemplar of humanity, of greater distinction than the other members of the court or even the world, seems high praise indeed, but the Second Gentleman's response suggests that there is something wayward in it: 'You speak him far' (24). The First Gentleman's denial that there is any hint of excessive exaggeration in his judgment contains more hyperbole: namely, that even in praising Posthumus so highly, he fails to do him justice: 'I do extend him sir, within himself,/Crush him together rather unfold/ His measure duly' (I.i.25-27). The Arden editor might be right to conclude that 'Shakespeare intends us to accept that estimate of his virtue' (4n), unless, of course, Shakespeare intends us to accept that estimate, not as accurate, but rather for another purpose entirely.¹¹ However, what is interesting in the conversation between these two gentlemen is the fact that Posthumus is 'a poor but worthy gentleman' yet in Cymbeline's eyes, he is the 'basest thing' and with his 'unworthiness', he 'poisons [Cymbeline's] blood' (I.i.127-128). This controversial argument about the worthiness of characters plays a vital role in constructing the theme of the play and in illustrating the relationship between the structure of patriarchy, homosociality and the objectification of femininity since the chastity of Imogen is deliberately made the object of a wager over her worthiness between two

¹⁰ 'worth, n'. *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. 14 Mar. 2012. <<http://dictionary.com/>>.

'value, n'. *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. 14 Mar. 2012. <<http://dictionary.com/>>.

male characters. It can be said that the question about Posthumus' worthiness will be answered through the suffering that follows upon his banishment. In doing so the play will correct the propensity for false rumour exhibited in Act I and eventually elicit the true value of Posthumus' character but only after he, like Pericles before him, has 'pass'd necessity' and proved 'awful word and deed' (II.i.4,6). Moreover, the king, blind to Posthumus' value, misreads the countenances of his courtly subject, who delight in the couple's matrimonial bliss, but feign displeasure in Cymbeline's presence: 'But not a courtier,/Although they wear the faces to the bent/of the King's looks, hath a heart that is not/Glad at the thing they scowl at'(I.i.14-17). Cymbeline's misperception thus not only affects his assessment of and relationship to his daughter and Posthumus, but also his authority and rapport with his subject. Unable to disclose their true feeling about the marriage, to acknowledge and express their estimation of the 'poor but worthy gentleman'(I.i.8) who has married into the royal family, the courtiers must deceive Cymbeline in order to eschew his unjust rage. Indeed, as Abartis notes, 'the radical disjunction between the apparent sadness of the courtiers and their real happiness is symptomatic of the deception and self-deception that permeate the country.'¹²

Cymbeline, we discover through the courtiers' discourse, has misruled his court for years. The court's inability to protect its own or to capture and justly prosecute the malefactors further signals the utter breakdown of Cymbeline's competence as an authority figure. Thus, from the apparently unbiased perspectives of the two unknown gentlemen, Cymbeline's court is plagued with deception and mistrust due to the king's irrationality and inability to properly judge those before him. Though, as William Thorn suggests, and as is typical of a Romance or Comedy, 'the conflict between the lovers and the old ha[s] signalized disruption in the community,'¹³ it is clear even from the First Gentleman's report that Cymbeline's court has suffered from disorderly conduct for some time. This kind of disorder as mentioned earlier is derived from the misinterpretation of value as well. In order to bring order back to the

¹² Carserea Abartis, 'The Tragicomic Construction of *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*', in *Jacobean Drama Studies*, ed. by James Hogg (Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur Universität Salzburg, 1977), p. 57.

¹³ William Thorn, 'Cymbeline: 'Lopp'd Branches' and the Concept of Regeneration', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 20.2 (Spring, 1969), 146.

kingdom, Imogen has to show the male characters in the play how to estimate and measure the intangible values of each other.

It is relatively clear from the beginning that estimation of value is not only pervasive but also complicated. The phrase 'poor but worthy', a compliment given to Posthumus by the First Gentleman is supported by delving into Posthumus' 'root.' Posthumus is not a mere servant in the court but his ancestors were the brave warriors of England. It can be inferred from the First Gentleman's speech that there is a close connection between social rank and the concept of worth in the patriarchal evaluative framework. Moreover, Cymbeline's language in measuring Posthumus' value vividly indicates that he uses class and rank in determining that Posthumus is unworthy. For Cymbeline, Posthumus is a 'basest thing' or a 'beggar' who 'would have made [his] throne,/ A seat for baseness' (I.i.126, 142-143). It is, therefore, noteworthy, that for men worthiness becomes entirely class-related.

Male-male estimation of worth is different from that of male-female. It can be said that the estimation of female worth is not only class-related similar to the measurement of male worth but also gender-related. Every character repeatedly estimates Imogen's value and worth by referring to her position as a Princess. And the marriage between Imogen and Posthumus is considered inappropriate because of their differences in rank. However, simultaneously Imogen's value is closely associated with her chastity and fidelity. In other words, there is a close association between sexual worth and social worth for women. Imogen's worth not only derives from her position as a princess of England but also is dependent on her ability to convince the male characters of her chastity and honesty.

It is true that the only evidence that the First Gentleman can give to support his statement about Posthumus' worthiness is the fact that he is a son of a great English soldier, nothing more than that. However, Posthumus' insistence that he will persist in singularly dutiful fidelity to Imogen suggests that he shares the First Gentleman's high estimation of himself. The audience has known him but only through the First Gentleman's story and through Posthumus' own presentation of his faithfulness and virtue. However, the question of whether 'this gentleman in question'(I.i.38) will prove loyal and worthy to those high estimations of his admirable character remains.

Posthumus's preoccupation with the idea of worth and value is evident from the outset of the play. Before her love leaves for Italy, Imogen gives him a ring as a love token while Posthumus gives her a bracelet as 'a manacle of love' which he 'will place upon this fairest prisoner' (I.i.53-54). In placing the 'manacle of love' on her arm, Posthumus not only reminds her of his love but also of her subservient position as his love prisoner. The language of possession is present from as early as the leave taking of Posthumus. In the exchange of love tokens, it can be seen that Posthumus is very concerned about the value of the 'trifle' when he says that:

As my poor self did exchange for you
To your infinite loss, so in our trifles
I still win of you. For my sake wear this (I.i.50-52)

Imogen initiates this exchange, presenting Posthumus with a diamond ring, which belonged to her mother. By offering him an heirloom piece, Imogen stresses Posthumus's new place within her family, despite Cymbeline's protests. As Posthumus reciprocates his bride's gift with a bracelet, he suggests that he has perpetually been the winner in the exchanges they have made thus far: 'As I my poor self did exchange for you / to your so infinite loss, so in our trifles / I still win of you. For my sake, wear this' (I.i.140-2). Posthumus's language implies that it is he who actively participates in the exchange that causes Imogen's 'loss,' subtly denying her any agency of consent, while simultaneously casting her as utterly disadvantaged in all matters great or petty. Imogen's 'manacle of love' (1.1.143) serves not only as a physical reminder of her husband, but also of her inability to successfully, participate equally in exchanges, forever overbidding on Posthumus. This is also clear evidence showing that Posthumus is preoccupied with the concept of worthiness. His concerns about the value of the love token, which is supposed to be immeasurable in terms of spiritual and sentimental value, will lead him to wager on the chastity of his wife, whose value is also spiritually and morally inestimable. The inequality of the initial value of the gifts they exchange may be looked upon as Posthumus's inability to provide, allowing his worth and manhood to be questioned. Iachimo immediately suspects and questions Posthumus's worth and declares that Posthumus is worthy only because he had the good fortune to marry Imogen and that good fortune is purely a matter of luck:

Iachimo: This matter of marrying his king's daughter, wherein he must be weighed rather by her value than his own, word him (I doubt not) a great deal from the matter (I.v.14-15).

However, some men in early modern England tried to find alternative sources of male identity and worth such as violence, heavy drinking or creating fraternal bonding to assert their manhood. This is what has happened to Posthumus in the wager scene. He is trying to build up his 'worth' by participating in the wager with another man on his wife's 'worth' and evaluating her worth in monetary terms.

The event that effectively initiates the measurement of worth of each character is the famous wager scene between Iachimo and Posthumus that occurs in Philario's house. In this scene, the audience learns of Posthumus' extraordinary high regard for his wife, her virtue and her person. Indeed, so great is his admiration that he professes himself 'her adorer, not her friend' (I.v.65-66). It indicates that Posthumus conceives of his wife as a kind of goddess, unparalleled by any earthly woman. While the first act thus presents two characters who earn the highest praise from their respective admirers, the opening scene of the play also subtly calls into question how believable such estimations are by repeatedly stressing the problematic relation between the genders.

The play first introduces us to the deceptive Iachimo - or 'little Iago' as Harold Bloom disparagingly calls him,¹⁴ by showing how he responds to and scrutinizes Posthumus's reputation. Unlike the gentlemen from the opening scene, Iachimo is sceptical of Posthumus's greatness:

Believe it, sir, I have seen him in Britain. He was then of a crescent note, expected to prove so worthy as since he has been allow'd the name of. But I could then have look'd on him without the help of admiration, though the catalogue of his endowments had been tabled by his side, and I to peruse him by items. (I.iv.1-6).

Iachimo's speech here is another example of the play's recurring association of things read with Posthumus: for instance, he has been allow'd the name' of worthy or honourable despite Iachimo's sceptical reservations which are based on his

¹⁴ Harold Bloom, *Shakespeare and The Invention of the Human* (New York: Riverhead, 1998), p. 616.

observation of Posthumus when the Briton was young. Most significantly, however, Iachimo also claims that he can read Posthumus without ‘help of admiration’; that is, without the help of the awe or rumour that surrounds him. The word ‘catalogue,’ refers to ‘list, roll, series’¹⁵ while ‘tabled’ means ‘to enter in a table or list; to tabulate’¹⁶ and ‘items’ refers to ‘an entry or thing entered in an account or register.’¹⁷ Iachimo’s language here also is ‘mocking the literary habit of itemizing a person’s qualities virtually like a shopping list.’¹⁸ These words interestingly signify how men evaluate the worth of each other. Iachimo, then, is immediately presented as the play’s most significant critic of Posthumus. Despite the unsavouriness of Iachimo’s character and his evident cynicism, the audience nonetheless wonders if Posthumus will ‘prove so worthy’ as those who praise him think he will.

The wager scene opens with Iachimo’s doubts about Posthumus’s reputation which appear to be cynically motivated. As Posthumus enters the scene, Philario, however, responds with assurance that ‘How *worthy* he is I will leave to appear hereafter, rather than story him in his own hearing’ (I.v.33-35). Philario’s faith that Posthumus’s worth will ‘appear hereafter’ (I.iv.33) and thus vindicate the admiration surrounding him evidently stands in contradiction to Iachimo’s cynical belief in Posthumus’s fundamental worthlessness.

After the Frenchman introduces himself by recalling their past acquaintance in Orleans, Posthumus replies, ‘Since when I have been debtor to you for courtesies, which I will be ever to pay and yet pay still’ (I.iv.36-37). The Frenchman’s reply, however, is perhaps more significant, for he both recognizes the lack of measure in Posthumus’s speech and indirectly suggests a key theme of the play: ‘atonement’ or reconciliation which follows upon the recognition.

Sir, you o’errate my poor kindness, I was glad I did atone my country man and you. It has been pity you should have put together, with so mortal a purpose as then each bore, upon importance of so slight and trivial a nature (I.iv.38-40).

¹⁵ ‘catalogue, n’. *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. 5 Jan. 2018. <<http://dictionary.com/>>.

¹⁶ ‘table, v’. *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. 5 Jan. 2018. <<http://dictionary.com/>>.

¹⁷ Item, n’. *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. 5 Jan. 2018. <<http://dictionary.com/>>.

¹⁸ Roger Warren explains the meaning of this word in his Oxford Edition. William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, ed. by Roger Warren (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 102.

Oddly, although he says very little except to agree with Iachimo (I.iv.11-13), the Frenchman is thus presented as a figure of good and sensible judgment who can 'pity' Posthumus's extremity and even work to counteract it. Posthumus's reply to the Frenchman's critique of his quarrel in Orleans likewise ambiguously announces two other key concerns of the play as a whole: 'pardon' which strangely connects with the Frenchman's 'atone' based on advice or counsel from another possessing experience:

By your pardon, sir, I was then young traveller, rather shunn'd to go even with what I heard than in my every action to be guided by others' experiences: but upon my mending judgment (If I offend not to say it is mended) my quarrel was not altogether slight. (I.iv.43-48).

Posthumus's desire for pardon and his protest that he possesses a mended judgment are ironic. While he claims to have corrected his past mistaken judgment in general, he is, in fact, maintaining that in the particular matter of the quarrel, his judgment or opinion of its seriousness was not in need of mending, despite the Frenchman's exasperated reminder that the quarrel was inappropriately 'put to the arbitrement of swords and by such two that would by all likelihood have confounded one the other or have fallen both' (I.iv.49-50). The Frenchman's report highlights the inappropriateness of Posthumus's behaviour and provides the first example of an accurate report, of speech free from what he calls 'contradiction.' If the play is examining the veracity of the First Gentleman's claim to have read Posthumus's worth truly, then this unflattering 'report' of him is a significant example of new Posthumus. It is noteworthy that the Frenchman's Christian language about 'pardon' and 'atonement' is different from Posthumus's pecuniary language in the same scene. However, Posthumus's ability to 'pardon' and 'atone' will later be the only means for Posthumus to prove himself worthy at the end of the play.

In the wager scene, Posthumus is ready to defend his belief in his wife's virtue in terms of tangible worth, and Iachimo uses this readiness to insinuate that the two concepts of value, the moral and the material, are in fact identical, that the one is only to be conceived in terms of the other. In fact, Posthumus has less confidence in his wife than he claims to feel, quite simply, he does not trust her. Whenever a man is ready to make a bet on his wife's purity, he shows his lack of trust in her. An ideal image of Posthumus as a heroic paragon gradually disappears, especially when he

puts up his ring in the wager. Therefore, Imogen is doubly imprisoned, first by a father who gives more credit to lineage than virtue: 'Thou took'st a beggar, wouldst have made my throne / A seat for baseness' (1.1.142-43), and by a Posthumus who attempts to constrain his wife.

What leads Posthumus into trouble is his confidence in Imogen's chastity, especially when her value is challenged by Iachimo's equation of her chastity with the ring, thus suggesting that her value is commercial. Posthumus is tempted into the wager by the connection that Iachimo shows between the ring and Imogen's value.

If she went before others I have seen, as that diamond of yours
outlustres many I have beheld, I could not believe she excelled many:
But I have not seen the most precious diamond that is, nor you the lady
(I.v.70-72).

Posthumus begins the second section of the wager scene by clarifying the difference between his wife and the ring that Iachimo judges a 'trifle':

One may be sold or given or if there were wealth enough for the
purchase or merit for the gift. The other is not a thing for sale and only
the gift of god (I.v.81-82)

Posthumus, however, finally reduces his wife's chastity into a mere object of commerce when he decides to make a bet with Iachimo on his wife's faithfulness. His turning to low commercial language strikes us as unsettling or as at least unworthy of an 'adorer' of a goddess: 'I prais'd her as I rated her, so do I my stone' (I.v.77). Indeed Posthumus' extraordinary 'esteem' for the 'stone,' his estimation of its value mirrors his extreme esteem of Imogen's merit since both, as Posthumus avers, are worth 'more than the world enjoys' (I.v.75). The conflation between ring and women becomes an indication of objectification of woman. It is interesting to see Posthumus's hesitation in putting his ring up in a wager when challenged by Iachimo to do so. He tries hard to keep Imogen's value outside the realm of exchange. He says:

I will wager against your gold, gold to it: my ring I
hold dear as my finger, tis part of it (I.v. 137-138)

Iachimo of course interprets Posthumus' unwillingness to wager his ring as a subtle indication of doubt in Imogen. By refusing to put up his ring as a wager, Posthumus, as Iachimo believes, has some 'fear' about losing it. Iachimo reiterates his belief that,

howsoever highly treasured Imogen may be in Posthumus' imagination, in reality she will inevitably yield to 'tainting' despite her husband's conviction of her constancy. (I.v.134-135). Posthumus' objection that Iachimo's strange and irreverent words are 'but a custom in your tongue' is countered by Iachimo's swearing that he is 'the master of [his] speech and would undergo what's spoken...' (I.v.138-41)¹⁹

It is to be noted that once entered into the realms of commodified value, Posthumus is very susceptible to Iachimo's revaluation.

Posthumus wants to claim that Imogen is absolutely the best of women, but good, better and best as Iachimo cunningly convinces Posthumus, have only relative meanings in an exchange economy.²⁰

Iachimo's reply introduces the idea of woman's faith and worth into the argument - insisting that whatever a man can keep a man can lose:

You may wear her in title yours; but, you know, strange fowl light upon neighbouring pond. Your ring may be stolen too; so your brace of unprizable estimations, the one is but frail, and the other casual. A cunning thief or a that-way accomplished courtier would hazard the winning both of first and last (I.iv. 86-89).

To Iachimo, apparently dispassionate, pure virtue is inconceivable. Iachimo's metaphors of the lost diamond and the 'neighbouring pond' suggests not only the instability of love, but also the emphasis on the degradation of woman's worth in a patriarchal framework of evaluation. Woman's chastity and virtues can be stolen like a diamond. In this case, as Anthony Fletcher observes, 'woman not only had to be chaste but had to be seen to be chaste'²¹

¹⁹ For an interesting alternative reading of Iachimo as 'master of [his] speech,' consider W H Auden's analysis of his character: 'His trouble is not a defective love for his neighbor but the lack of definitive relation even to himself...Iachimo does not want to destroy, he want to be chic. He talks so elaborately that no one understands him. He is much like Amando in *Love's Labour's Lost* than like anyone else. Iachimo suffers from glossolalia- a sign of no relation either with other or with himself...Iachimo proposes the wager to Posthumus because he has no relationship no real identity. He is related to others by accident and through competition. He wants to win, cheats and cause misery but he gets no satisfaction - he is miserable and unhappy.' W H Auden, *Lectures on Shakespeare* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2000), pp. 281-282.

²⁰ Lawrence Danson, 'The Catastrophe is a Nuptial': The Space of Masculine Desire in *Othello*, *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*, *Shakespeare Survey*, 46 (1993), 75.

²¹ Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 122.

The bond of male homosocial desire is strengthened by the two male characters making a wager on a woman's chastity. Posthumus' hesitation before putting the ring up in the wager shows his fear and his lack of faith in Imogen's purity. Within nine lines, however, he is prepared to strip the ring off:

'I shall but lend my diamond till your turn...I dare you
to this match: here's my ring.' (I.v. 147-151)

If we look at the ring in terms of a synecdochical comparison, it refers not only to Imogen's token of love but also her faith and her life: 'keep it till you woo another wife,/When Imogen is dead' (I.ii.43-44). Her chastity and her selfhood are transformed into tangible objects with measurable value as gold and the ring. Up to this point, Iachimo does not want to test Imogen's purity, rather, to make Posthumus lose face, his dignity and his confidence, as is made clear when he says 'I make my wager rather against your confidence than her reputation' (I.v.107). The interesting point here is that Imogen's chastity, in the circle of patriarchy, is not as important as the dignity and honour of the patriarchs. Her purity is not only reduced to and compared with currency and objects, but taken for granted in the gambling between two male characters. Posthumus suffers from masculine fantasies about women and because he regards women as male property, he is all too ready to engage in a contest with other males 'in praise of our country mistresses' and to boast that Imogen is 'more fair, virtuous, wise, chaste, constant and less attemptable' (I.iv.57-60) than any other lady. Imogen who herself is a model of fidelity was clearly objectified for a second time for in the previous scene she had also suffered from her father's parental authority in controlling her wishes in marriage. What happens to her when she refuses to marry Cloten can be seen as an abuse of her humanity. She is reduced to a 'disloyal thing' and a 'foolish thing' (I.ii.62, 82). The word 'thing' has a pejorative quality, a term of abuse. And when she marries her lover, Posthumus, the objectification of her identity haunts her until the middle of the play when she tries to insert herself into the bond of male homosociality. It is clear that participating in the wager allow these men to maintain their gender privilege by questioning the value of their female counterparts.

Alexandra Shepard investigates the way in which men in early modern England define themselves and assert their manhood in terms of economic autonomy and self-

sufficiency.²² She notes that to have doubt about a man's potential to provide for his family also disputes his worth. What is most interesting in her book is the fact that men often measure their worth in monetary terms:

This was partially conveyed by men's responses to the question often posed in civil law procedure which asked how much a witness was worth, all debt paid. So Robert Hillard of Wotton Rivers declared that he was worth £20. The notary Thomas Sherd answered that he was worth 40s (191).

Such statements are indicative of the importance of 'worth' in these terms to evaluate credit of men. Although the significance of the evaluation of their worth in pecuniary terms is difficult to make, it is suggested, as Shepard observes, that 'to be worth nothing is to be economically impotent, and by implication less than a man.'²³ It is quite understandable why men in Renaissance England seem to be preoccupied with the idea of worth in monetary terms. Their responses, with straightforward estimates in monetary terms, indicate that these men appeal to notions of provision in order to show their value and manliness. Moreover, since some conduct books encourage men to provide and keep themselves busy with commerce and business issue outside their household, they appear to become used to expressing themselves in terms of monetary evaluation.²⁴

In his essay, 'Monetary Compensation for Injuries to the Body A.D. 602-1697', Luke Wilson explores the cash value of a human organs, how much it costs for a severed ear or a hand in the era of Shakespeare and closely examines the interconnectedness between money and human life.²⁵ The compensation for bodily injuries indicates that all kinds of body part could have monetary values. It can be said that the

²² Alexandra Shepard starts her book with the quotation from John and Robert Cleaver's *A Godlie Forme of Householde Government* (1612) which summarizes the separate duties of husband and wife. It explores their separate duties of husband and wife in a household. It is important for a husband to have full responsibility to give and provide for his family and it is a wife's duties to manage the household and protect her honor. Although she argues that it would be wrong to conclude that all men in early modern England measured their status in the evaluative framework of economic autonomy because some acquire different codes of conduct when reaching their adulthood, she still believes that self-sufficiency and economic autonomy play a vital role in evaluating and interpreting the meaning of manhood in English Renaissance. Alexandra Shepard, *Meaning of Manhood* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 122.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 192.

²⁴ Robert Brathwaite, *English Gentleman* (London, 1628); William Gouge, *Domestical Duties* (London, 1622) and John Dod and Robert Cleaver, *A Godly Form of Household Government* (London, 1612).

²⁵ Luke Wilson, 'Monetary Compensation for Injuries to the Body A.D. 602-1697', in *Money and the Age of Shakespeare*, ed. by Linda Woodbridge (New York: Palgrave, 2003).

preoccupation with money in the period extended to the estimation of intangible values, such as honesty and virtue. They seemed to forget the fact that moral and ethical qualities cannot be valued and evaluated in monetary terms. The measurement of worth for men becomes a class-related issue. However, in the second half of the play, the false measurement of human worth found in the first part is corrected and re-evaluated. Shakespeare challenges the normative concept of worth as articulated in the course of routine social practice by suggesting the impracticality and the impossibility of the patriarchal evaluative framework which are evidently emphasized in the second part of the play.

It is true that in the wager scene, Posthumus exhibits nothing of his greatness. As Iachimo earlier observed, his qualities and his values are regarded and judged only in terms of exaggerated praise. John Scott Colley noted that ‘Iachimo’s words are prompted by malice, but there is a disquieting truth to his observations.’²⁶ Posthumus is expected to prove worthy, but he is really not impressive after all. If Posthumus is not worthy, could his decisions, his word or even himself be trustworthy? Shepard links the concepts of worthiness and word as follows:

A man’s worth was often referred to by litigants as synonymous with his word. To question a man’s word was a serious insult. A man suspected of betraying his word lost his worth, as he was no longer deemed trustworthy.²⁷

It can be inferred that perception of worthlessness undermines the credibility of a man’s words. It could be suggested that if Posthumus cannot prove himself to be worthy, how can he judge and evaluate the worthiness of others? As Craig Muldrew notes, to keep their word men seek to ‘construct and preserve their reputations for honesty’ so that they can be trusted and obtain credit which is very important in a system of judgment about trustworthiness.²⁸ Having no credit, therefore, is easily elided with dishonesty. It can be said that worth, credit and honesty are closely related in the early modern English economic system. And this is the main reason why

²⁶ John Scott Colley, ‘Disguise and New Guise in *Cymbeline*’, *Shakespeare Studies: Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism and Review*, VII (1974), 242.

²⁷ Shepard, p. 195.

²⁸ Craig Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (New York: St. Martin Press, 1998), p. 149.

Posthumus loses his faith in his wife: he gives more credit to Iachimo's words than his wife's nuptial vow.

Posthumus' faith in Imogen does not depend on what he thinks and believes about her chastity, but on to what he thinks about and believes of Iachimo's report and evidence. Here, Imogen's destiny now depends largely on the strength of Posthumus' faith in her and how he evaluates her worth. It is interesting that the bracelet he gave Imogen when he left court becomes the only evidence to prove Imogen's fidelity, neither the description of her chamber nor the description of her 'mole cinque-spotted: like the crimson drops' (II.ii.38) are considered. Posthumus immediately gives the ring to Iachimo when the bracelet is presented as proof.

Let there be no honour
Where there is beauty: truth, where semblance: love,
Where there's another man. The vows of women
Of no more bondage be to where they are made
Than they are to their virtues, which is nothing
O, above measure false! (II.iv.109-115)

Here the ring and the bracelet then become the evidence of Iachimo's triumph over his rival. The symbols of Imogen's sexual purity have been exchanged between them. Posthumus has called his own wife a whore and pays for it with the diamond: 'She hath bought the name of whore thus dearly/ There, take thy hire, and all the fiends of hell' (II.ii.31-32). Kay Stanton states that 'whore' is the term with 'most abusive punch, the dirtiest word' in Shakespeare's plays.²⁹ As Juliet Dusinberre suggests, 'to call a woman a whore as Othello calls Desdemona not only casts aspersions on her morals but takes away her place in society.'³⁰ His misogynistic outburst against women as 'half-workers' in the act of generation reveals his fear of betrayal by all women, including his own mother because he later suspects that his mother might have adulterous affairs with another man and he begins to wonder if it is possible for men to establish their identity without women being involved. This kind of fear is entrenched in the male world of *Cymbeline*, for we see it also in Cloten's warped desire to possess Imogen and in Cymbeline's troubled patriarchal relations with his

²⁹ Kay Stanton, 'Made to write whore upon' Male and Female Use of the Word 'Whore' in Shakespeare's Canon,' in *A Feminist Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. by Dymphna Callaghan (Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2000), p. 81.

³⁰ Juliet Dusinberre, *Shakespeare and the Nature of Women* (London: Macmillan, 1996), p. 52.

daughter and his domineering wife. In Posthumus, this kind of male perversity threatens disaster and his failure places a special burden on Imogen to endure his frailty and to redeem it, as only through her, - can he receive a second chance. Imogen, like Helena and Desdemona, virtuous women before her, must respond to undeserved tribulations with forbearance and forgiveness.

It can be seen that once Posthumus' jealousy is roused, it takes hold very quickly, on evidence that remains circumstantial. Posthumus, who goes about boasting of his wife's excelling beauty and virtue, believes a complete stranger's testimony that she is disloyal. The bracelet, now, does not only show the loss of his love but also signifies the loss of his power to control her as his 'prisoner.' His misogynistic expression of his hatred of all women ironically comes from his own 'measure false.' When Philario warns him about his quick judgement, Posthumus takes his ring back. However, when Iachimo swears by Jupiter that he 'had it from her arm' to save himself from perjury, Posthumus again gives the ring back and wholeheartedly believes in Iachimo's words:

Hark you, he swears, by Jupiter he swears
Tis true, nay keep the ring, tis true (I.iv.121-122).

On the basis of nothing further than a single, insufficiently tested, piece of evidence, Posthumus is completely persuaded and radically renounces the basis of all his former beliefs in Imogen which really amounted to belief in the possibility of goodness, beauty, truth and admirable love in human beings: 'Let there be no honour / Where there is beauty; truth where semblance ; love, / Where there's another man' (II.iv.108-109). Instead of having faith in his wife's vow, he refuses to believe in her purity and accepts the stranger's testimony as truth, blaming her in that 'she hath bought the name of whore' (II.iv.128). The power of a woman's nuptial vow, here, is defeated by the power of a patriarchal oath. Posthumus is more inclined to believe the oath of his tormentor, to trust in the 'sworn and honourable' attendants to Imogen, than to rely on his faith in his wife. For Posthumus, Imogen does not only act badly; she demonstrates that virtue is utterly impossible in woman: 'O above measure false!' (II.iv.113). It can be said that the attempt by male characters to measure the immeasurable value of moral abstractions such as women's chastity, their lack of faith

and the strength of male bonding in the play are also the main problems and play vital roles in forming the structure of the play.

In his soliloquy at the end of Act II, Posthumus seems to express his shock by taking refuge in generalization about female frailty, but later his words become specific to Imogen, drawing contrasts between Imogen restraining him from his 'lawful pleasure', yet allowing Iachimo to mount her like a German boar. His thoughts about his wife's infidelity lead him to the conclusion that 'we are all bastards' (I.iv.154). He also expresses his apparently illegitimate conception in terms of the making of counterfeit coins: 'I know not where/ When I was stamped. Some coiner with his tool/Made me a counterfeit.' (II.iv.155-156). Posthumus' integrity is damaged by his viewpoint about women in general. His rage at Imogen has evidently led him to question the wisdom of the natural order of things, wherein men and women work together to reproduce children. His doubt about his identity then seems to be associated with women's infidelity. More importantly he blames all vices in his character on 'the woman's part' with his remarkably venomous speech:

That tend to vice in man, but I affirm
It is the woman's part: be it lying, note it,
The woman's: flattering, hers; deceiving, hers:
Lust, and rank thoughts, hers, hers: revenges, hers:
Ambitions, covetings, change of prides, disdain,
Nice longing, slanders, mutability;
All faults that name, nay, that hell knows, why, hers
In part, or all but rather all. (II.iv.173-180)

It is interesting that Posthumus' catalogue of vices first attributes all forms of false appearance and speech to women and then singles out a fundamental 'mutability', a 'changing still,' even in vice as the most abominable of womanly vices. The biting irony, however, is that Posthumus himself is obviously distorting or falsifying women in this speech. He has suffered the greatest of 'change' thus far in the play in his movement from smitten 'adorer' of Imogen to deceived reviler of woman in a speech characterized by what he himself calls 'a true hate' (II.v.34). Frequently, a man's inability to achieve control of a woman is blamed on the woman herself. Like Othello, Posthumus decides to take revenge on his wife: 'O, that I had her here, to tear her limb-meal!/ I will go there and do it in th' court, before/Her father' (II.iv.148-149). At this point, the similarities between Posthumus and Cloten are apparent. Both of them

are willing and ready to kill and ruin their lover in public. Cloten wants to rape Imogen to get revenge not only on her but also on Posthumus: 'I will be revenged:/ His mean'st garment! Well.' (II.iii.154-155). The repetition of the words 'his garment' implies that now the target of his revenge is shifted to Posthumus. Posthumus wants to kill her in front of her father. There is a remarkably similar combination of violence and public humiliation in Cloten's plan to rape Imogen in her husband's clothes:

When my lust hath dined - which, as I say, to vex her I will execute in the clothes that she so praised - to the court I'll knock her back, foot her home again- (III.v.143-145).

The question in this matter is on whom they really want to take revenge, Imogen or her patriarchs? Even in revenge, she seems to be a victim of men's fury in their personal affairs. She is just an object they use to get revenge on each other. It is clear that in *Cymbeline* as well as in *Othello*, innocent female characters are used as instruments of the patriarchs in the matter of revenge. Women-, 'stand in, as victims, for the indirection or inadmissibility of rivalry between men.'³¹ Posthumus' misogynistic speech can also be seen not only as the devaluation of the opposite sex, but also as the diminution of his own worth. Posthumus expresses his apparently illegitimate conception in terms of the making of coins where 'some coiner with his tools/ Made me a counterfeit' (II.iv.157-158). His thought about the unfaithfulness of all women leads to the conclusion that all men must be illegitimate. A counterfeit coin is worth nothing. The coinage language here is similar to the language of repentance in Act V scene iv where Posthumus weighs the worth of his own life.

However, it can be seen that Posthumus, when weighing the worth and value of his wife, always considers Imogen's value according to her high position as a princess. There is a close connection between female social class or rank and the concept of female worth. However, the generalization of women's frailty and evilness in his 'women's parts' speech underscores the fact that the social position is not only a criterion used to evaluate women's worth. Women's virtues also play vital roles in judging the values of women and they are always subject to evaluation by their male counterparts. For women, contrary to men, the high social position or economic

³¹ Lorna Hutson, *The Usurer's Daughter* (New York: Routledge, 1994), p. 112.

autonomy does not guarantee their worth and values. For men, all women's virtues can be measured and evaluated as a form of commodity.

The apparent example of how men evaluate woman's virtues is also emphasized again in Act II scene iii where Cloten clumsily attempts to bribe one of Imogen's ladies-in-waiting. In his speech, he feels very confident that his money can buy the honour of Imogen's servant:

Tis gold
Which buy admittance (oft it doth) yea, and makes
Diana's rangers false themselves, yield up
Their deer to th' stando'th' stealer: and this gold
Which makes the true-man kill'd, and saves the thief:
Nay, sometime hangs both thief, and true man: what
Can it not do and undo I? (II.iii. 66-72)

Here again, woman's virtues and worth have been valued in monetary terms by a male character. Woman's honour is degraded into an object for men to purchase. This problem of the evaluation of worth needs to be solved not by the male characters but by Imogen, who has to prove that the patriarchal evaluative framework of how much a woman is worth is impractical and morally unacceptable. It is interesting to see the close similarity between Cloten and Posthumus in terms of how they value the virtues of women which is totally different from Arviragus and Guiderius who look at the gold and money as mere 'dirt' and as only good for those 'who worship dirty gods' (III.vii.27). The princes' attitude toward money merits comparison with those of Cloten and Posthumus pointing, the contrast between unworthy and virtuous men. To this point it can be seen that the first three acts of the play, a woman's social worth is not as important as her sexual worth. Woman's sexual worth is closely related to her virtues and honesty. However, men are likely to measure female virtue in monetary term.

II

Imogen's self-realization and the challenge to patriarchal evaluation of worth

It is very important to have a full understanding of Imogen before analyzing the way in which she rhetorically challenges the patriarchal evaluation of worth established by her male counterparts in the first part of the play. Although Imogen might be

imperfect in persuading her father to agree with her about Posthumus, she is virtuous and skilled in speech in part because she is a careful listener. She is not an easy target—a credulous auditor-like Posthumus. In the wooing scene when Iachimo enters her chamber, the use of her language in questioning Iachimo about his intention and Posthumus's affair protects her from being deceived. Iachimo has arrived in England with a letter of introduction from Posthumus which helps establish *ethos* at the beginning of the conversation with Imogen. When she listens to his accounts and proofs about her husband's infidelity, Imogen's prudential judgement and spoken questions continue to slow each of Iachimo's arguments. Iachimo begins with *aposiopesis*. He offers three statements. First, he discourses on the wonders of the universe, but inserts a rhetorical question that seeks to distinguish 'fair' Imogen from that which is 'foul' (I.vi.38). He blathers a second time, distinguishing her from 'sluttry' (I.vi.44). Finally, the third part of the series laments the 'cloyed will,' which after enjoying the lamb turns to garbage (I.vi.47-50). Imogen is puzzled by each statement and interjects questions concerned that Iachimo may not be of stable mind. While continuing to arouse suspicion in Imogen concerning Posthumus's infidelity by what he omits in his account of Leonatus, Iachimo now moves through artistic proofs which he hopes will serve his ends. His first proof is his report, in answer to Imogen's questioning, that Posthumus is quite merry in Italy. Imogen seems to have opened herself to Iachimo's plan, to his suggestion that Posthumus does not miss her. But while she notes that such mirth does not fit the melancholic temperament of the man she knows, she—unlike Othello—is not immediately led to assume that he has found new pleasures in infidelity. In fact, Iachimo's masked suggestions lead her to partially reassert her trust in her husband (I.vi.77). Iachimo then turns to a second proof, linked to his initial statement. He wonders that the heavens gave Posthumus such a marvelous bride. The proof has potential both to compliment the lady he is trying to seduce and to suggest what her father has already insisted: that she is too good for Posthumus. Rather than allowing poison to be poured into her ears, Imogen evaluates critically the bearer of the news and his intentional ambiguity. This changes the dialogue from being exclusively Iachimo's act of persuasion to a sparring between two skilled speakers. Her counter-oratory makes Iachimo into an audience that she will persuade to be more open to abandoning the method of Iachimo's rhetorical technique:

Imogen: I pray you, sir,
Deliver with more openness your answers
To my demands. Why do you pity me?

Iachimo: That others do—
I was about to say, enjoy your—but
It is an office of the gods to venge it,
Not mine to speak on't.

Imogen: You do seem to know
Something of me, or what concerns me. Pray you,
Since doubting things go ill often hurts more
Than to be sure they do—for certainties
Either are past remedies, or, timely knowing,
The remedy then born—discover to me
What both you spur and stop. (I.vi.87-99)

Imogen's initial effort to take rhetorical control is ignored by Iachimo. He proceeds to speak vaguely and offers a new argument, submission to the gods. Perhaps aware of Imogen's piety from the praises which Posthumus offered of her person, he tries to perform humble piety. This pretend piety has potential to increase his *ethos* in Imogen's eyes and to provide a justification for why Iachimo both hints at and conceals a supposed secret that he keeps out of alleged concern for Posthumus and Imogen. Imogen, who can speak with the authority of one who is truly pious, rejects the silence which Iachimo has constructed. His pretend piety fails to increase his *ethos* or to maintain his silence. Imogen immediately seeks to discover the full truth, rather than to provide her own false conclusions to fill up his silence (I.v.93-99). Her reasoning seems to be wise. She refuses to fall under the magic of Iachimo's words and defends herself with her skilled rhetoric.

Iachimo takes this victory of Imogen as his opportunity to be bold. He pays her another compliment, stating that it is only by her graces that the secret is charmed from him (V.i.115-17), and bluntly lies that Posthumus is a companion of Rome's prostitutes. Such news could be met with any number of emotional responses by a scorned spouse: anger, denial, sorrow, rage. *Pathos* appeal arouses and directs emotions, so Iachimo uses this technique to lead her to the appropriate response for his purposes: 'Be revenged, / Or she that bore you was no queen, and you / Recoil from your great stock' (I.vi.126-128).

Though Iachimo persuades her to take revenge, she takes up her royal authority, to which Iachimo has appealed. She seems to be immune to the effects of Iachimo's rhetoric of disease:

Revenged?

How should I be revenged? *If this be true*—
As I have such a heart that both mine ears
Must not in haste abuse—*if it be true*,
How should I be revenged? (V.i.128-32; emphasis added)

The word 'if' here reveals her prudence, her unwillingness, to trust a complete stranger's words. She seeks a definition of what Iachimo means by the term 'revenge.' Here Imogen is very clever in unmasking Iachimo's sinful intention. By forcing him to explain how she can be sexually revenged, she has a full control over the exchange. Imogen's rhetoric and her continued questioning of Iachimo has brought into plain sight his end of seducing her which he had hoped to hide in vague, reticent language. Imogen, here, as hearer-turned-orator has exercised rhetorical skill to render Iachimo's act of persuasion useless. She sees through his appearance and calls out for Pisanio. While awaiting his arrival, Imogen once and for all claims control of the situation condemning the ears 'that have/so long attended' Iachimo (I.vi.141-142). She clearly articulates his lustful and ignoble intention as a 'base' and 'strange' 'end' (I.vi. 144) which wrongs her husband. She condemns his lack of virtue, calling to a viewer's attention her own temperance and courage. Her ethical rhetoric, even to such a defective and intractable audience suggests she has at least as great a power in speech as Iachimo. The diseased language cannot spread to ruin her soul. However, what eventually shake Imogen's faith in Posthumus is not Iachimo's glib words but his letter about her murder.

Imogen, after reading the letter given to her by Pisanio about her murder, is convinced in an instant of the truth of Iachimo's false speech. In her case, she is now suddenly persuaded that Iachimo is correct in his earlier slander against her husband after all: 'Iachimo,/ Thou didst accuse him of incontinency,/ Thou then look'dst like a villain; now methinks/ Thy favour's good enough' (III.iv.46-49). Like Posthumus' violent conviction about the truth of woman, Imogen's new 'certainty' leads her to renounce her former faith in the honour of men:

I must be ripp'd. To pieces with me! O!
 Men's vows are women's traitors. All good seeming
 By thy revolt, O husband, shall be thought
 Put on for villainy; not born where't grows,
 But worn a bait for ladies.
 True honest men being heard, like false Aeneas,
 Were in his time thought false; and Sinon weeping
 Did scandal many a holy tear, took pity
 From most true wretchedness. So thou Posthumus,
 Wilt lay in leaven on all proper men;
 Goodly and gallant shall be false and perjur'd
 From thy great fail ... (III.iv.53-63).

Although it is not first time she has heard about her husband's betrayal, this is the only place in the play where Imogen seems to lose strong faith in her husband. While Posthumus makes a misogynistic speech, blaming the woman's part in him, Imogen retaliates with a speech against men. Imogen's immediate reaction to Posthumus's accusation of adultery is to question her noble acts, examining them for falsity, attempting to redefine herself, exploring her acts in terms of Posthumus's words. Finding no possible fault in her actions, Imogen now believes Iachimo's false report of Posthumus' encounters with prostitutes to be plausible. Curiously, Imogen's reaction to the thought of Posthumus' adultery parallels Posthumus' desire to tear her limb for limb for the same act: 'Poor I am stale, a garment out of fashion, / and, for I am richer than to hang by th' walls, / I must be ripped. To pieces with me!' (III.iv.53-5) Yet, her self-pitying bemoaning ends abruptly as she expresses a bitter loathing for the fickleness of men. Unlike the misogynistic tirade Posthumus performs, however, Imogen is conscious of the overgeneralization in her brief hatred and pities the 'proper men' whose reputation will be tainted because of Posthumus. Both Posthumus and Imogen consider the threat of adultery as a challenge to their very identity, but while he laments his supposed bastard origins, further encouraging him toward revenge, Imogen validates her individuality – a movement that will allow her to work through the process of forgiveness.³² The speech can be seen as a revolution in her character. What she is thinking about here is man's lack of trust and faith. She

³² Compare this scene to that in which Imogen believes Posthumus to be dead and she sees herself as nothing. Though she does not explicitly seek revenge on Pisanio, who she believes has betrayed her and killed her husband, she curses him mercilessly: "All curses madd'd Hecuba gave the Greeks, / and mine to boot, be darted on thee!" (IV.ii.386-7). Ripped of all sense of her identity, Imogen can find no path toward forgiveness or reconciliation.

gradually understands her position as a mere reduced agent or an object in the web of male homosocial bonding.

However, it can be seen that although her claims approach extremity, they are far less extreme than those of Posthumus. Indeed, it is important to note that while she maintains that Posthumus' slander has seriously wounded perception, she does acknowledge that the victims are not simply or even primarily women. Though Imogen is deeply wounded and deceived, she still acknowledges the possibility of authentic truth, beauty and goodness in human beings. Such a response is in itself amazing and suggests perhaps that Imogen possesses an excellence from the start that Posthumus will not arrive at until the fifth act. Imogen's judgment then lacks the extremity of her husband's, which, on the basis of a questionably demonstrated infidelity, deems that all women are the perpetrators of 'all fault that name, nay, that hell knows' (II.iv.179). The difference in their judgment is what allows Imogen to be open to counsel and thus to Pisanio's strange plan which requires 'patience' to achieve its end.

At this moment, she realizes that she is only 'a garment out of fashion' but 'richer than to hang by th' wall' (III.iv.52-53). Though she compares herself to a garment, she still knows her true value and that she has to prove it. However, the only way she can prove her worth and true value is to be dressed as a boy.³³

When Imogen meets her kidnapped brothers in Wales, she is dressed as a boy, Fidele. They welcome her as their brother. Male bonding between the brothers and their disguised sister can be understood as possible in the patriarchal ideology. As Arviragus says 'He is a man, I'll love him as my brother' (III.vii.43). What kind of bonding would they have had if Imogen had not disguised herself as a pageboy? She would again have become the object of male gaze and desire. It can be clearly seen

³³ Imogen's disguise here is similar to that of Viola in *Twelfth Night* since both of them adopt male attire to be able to survive in the forest. Similar to Viola, Imogen has to don male clothing in order to pursue her husband safely in the strange land. Later she also complains that 'a man's life is a tedious one, / I have tired myself.' (III.vi.1-2). I propose that the whole narratives is to set these two women free from the men's clothes and return them to their positions as wife. It can be inferred that while cross-dressing might cause a chaotic and disruptive situation or ignites the disorder of society. However if the female characters maintain their feminine subjectivity and has no intention to challenge masculine authority, the cross-dressing should be acceptable.

that her brother Guiderius is ready to 'woo [her] hard' if she 'were a woman' (III.vii.41). As Jyotsna Singh notes when a woman is wooed, 'she is nonetheless part of an exchange system that prohibits her occupying the position of an autonomous, desiring subject.'³⁴

Examining Shakespeare's other cross-dressing characters, Hayles contends that 'the more closely linked the disguise is with the character's identity, the more the heroine will tend to take a passive role' while disguised³⁵. In analyzing Imogen's cross-dressing conduct, Hayles believes the disguise to be so enmeshed with Imogen's own personality, it renders the character androgynous. The majority of her documentation for such an argument comes from Imogen's supposedly helpless wanderings in the British countryside. Hayles views Fidele's existence as passive and underwhelming in comparison to Imogen's independent, king-defying agency presented in the first half of the play. Passivity, however, does not accurately reflect Imogen-Fidele's very active state of mind. While s/he becomes 'less vociferous and more reflective,'³⁶ this lack of physical action as Fidele should not be misconstrued as an absence of activity or agency. She realizes a world beyond herself, beyond Britain, and a world in which appearances are not reality and that the only way to determine reality is through experience. It is this worldliness that allows Imogen to realize, as Posthumous will later upon Iachimo's confession, that life must be 'not imagined, felt' (IV.ii.380) otherwise it is all 'but a bolt of nothing, shot at nothing' (IV.ii.373).

This emphasis on experience as a key mode of understanding ultimately leads to Imogen's initial forgiveness of Posthumus. As Fidele, Imogen actively wrestles with the appearance of Posthumus's guilt, her experiences casting doubts on that which she has only heard, not lived through herself. Upon waking from her restorative, albeit deadening, stupor,³⁷ Imogen's first thoughts are not of being 'a cave-keeper / and

³⁴ Jyotsna Singh, 'Gendered Gifts in Shakespeare's Belmont: The Economies of Exchange in Early Modern England', in *Feminist Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. by Dymphna Callaghan (Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2000), p. 151.

³⁵ Nancy Hayles, 'Sexual Disguise in *Cymbeline*', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 41 (1980), 236.

³⁶ Bonnie Lander, "Interpreting the Person: Tradition, Conflict, and *Cymbeline*'s Imogen," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59.2 (Summer, 2008): 179.

³⁷ Imogen's revivification may be associated to "the spirit of the maiden phoenix that flutters up periodically in women" (Frey 139). Moreover, upon meeting Imogen, Iachimo, overwhelmed by her beauty, compares her to "th' Arabian bird" (I.vi.20), the reincarnating phoenix, thereby foreshadowing Imogen's eventual revivification.

cook to honest creatures' (IV.ii.371-2), but rather of her need to travel to Milford Haven. She remembers first and foremost the course set out by Pisanio, the course that will lead her to a reconciliation with Posthumus. Reviving upon Cloten's headless body, which is dressed in Posthumus's clothes as part of the brute's rapacious revenge plan, Imogen clings to the corpse believing it to be that of her beloved:

A headless man? The garments of Posthumus?
I know the shape of 's leg. This is his hand,
His foot Mercurial, his Martial thigh,
The brawns of Hercules; but his Jovial face –
Murder in heaven! How? 'Tis gone. Pisanio (Iv.ii.381-5).

By imaginatively reconstituting the body before her 'into a whole that she yearns to love, to touch and to know again in its completeness,'³⁸ Imogen begins a process of reconciliation, and a reconfiguration of the matrimonial body previously rent by Posthumus's wager. Through her re-assessment of Posthumus' worth, a process which she has been undergoing throughout her sojourn into the woods, Imogen 'not only forgives her victimizer, indeed to the point of believing his crime non-existent, but loves him with the full force of erotic passion.'³⁹ Though she does not explicitly state her forgiveness of Posthumus, Imogen's willingness to re-consider what she think she knows about her husband functions as a kind of forgiveness. By re-appraising Posthumus's deeds, absolving him of treachery, and re-directing the onus of deceit onto Pisanio, Imogen thereby reclaims Posthumus' worth and refrains from castigating him.

With Posthumus re-esteemed as Imogen's lord, but believe dead, the heroine must now resume her introspection and re-consider herself. Addressed by Lucius, Imogen's first self-identifying words are: 'I am nothing; or if not, / nothing to be were better' (IV.ii.446-7). It is at this moment, when she has endured heartache and death and relinquished everything, she must identify herself: nothing. She has discarded all former identifiers through her introspective journey, questioning her 'self and its construction within the heavily coded frameworks of gender' (Lander 174). No longer wife, daughter or future queen of a corrupt court, Imogen sees herself as nothing.

³⁸ Maurice Hunt, 'Dismemberment, Corporal Reconstitution, and the Body Politic in *Cymbeline*', *Studies in Philology*, 99.4 (Autumn, 2002), 418.

³⁹ Joan Carr, '*Cymbeline* and the Validity of Myth', *Studies in Philology*, 75.3 (Summer, 1978), 325.

From this claim, she can rebuild her identity through the process of reconciliation in the final scene. Indeed, her revivification and transformation is presaged by Cornelius, whose foresight encouraged him to concoct a restoring potion to the Queen instead of poison: ‘there is / no danger in what show of death it makes, / more than the locking-up the spirits a time, / to be more fresh, reviving’ (I.v.46-49). Imogen wakes up fresh, new and unknown even to herself. When asked her name, her answer reflects the root of her being, from where she may grow: Fidele, faithful. As Fidele, Imogen may re-discover herself and ‘in self-modifying fashion better [prepare] herself for the faithful service of marriage.’⁴⁰

Moreover, what is the most striking about Imogen’s disguise is how it affects the patriarchal evaluative framework posed in the first half of the play. From the beginning we can see that the objectification of woman and the language of commerce are pervasive, however, in Wales, money and gold are less significant and convey different meanings. Since Milford Haven’s pastoral world gives not only an picture of pastoral beauty to contrast with the illness of the court; it also reinforces the re-evaluation of worth that is woven through the whole play.⁴¹ Money and gold ‘rather turn to dirt/ As tis no better reckoned but of those/ Who worship dirty gods’ (III.vi.52-54). She starts learning how males hold values in patriarchal ideology when she thinks that ‘If brothers would it had been so that they/ had been my father’s sons, then had my price/ been less and so more equal ballasting/ To thee, Posthumus.’ (III.vi.73-76). Here she knows that Posthumus’ value cannot be compared to hers since she is an heir of the kingdom. However, simultaneously Imogen recognizes the spiritual value of man when she is asked by Arviragus ‘Are we not brothers?’ by responding that

So man and man should be,
But clay and clay differs in dignity,
Whose dust is both alike. (IV.ii.3-5).

The Oxford English Dictionary explains the word ‘dignity’ as ‘nobility’, but at the same time the word also means ‘the quality of being worthy or honourable;

⁴⁰ Hunt, p. 425.

⁴¹ John Boe notes that the changes of location from the city to the countryside “represent a movement from sick of consciousness to the healing world of the unconscious which is after all, nature.” John Bo, ‘Symbol of Transformation in *Cymbeline*’, *Readerly / Writerly Texts*, 2 (1995), 47-74.

worthiness or excellence.⁴² After spending some time with her kidnapped brothers, Imogen realizes that her brothers ‘had virtue/ Which their own conscience sealed them.’ Imogen learns earlier that in a patriarchal evaluative framework, male worth and value is measured by rank and economic autonomy but now she finally understands that virtue and honour are the qualities that should be used in evaluating one’s worth. The monetary evaluation of a person’s worth and the recognition of rank as an indication of worth have disappeared and are replaced by the abstract, intangible virtues. The confrontation between Guiderius and Cloten before they fight vividly underscores the conflicting attitudes on how to measure the value and worth of characters.

When confronted by Guiderius, Cloten is caught in a double bind when he says ‘Thou villain base,/Know’st me not by my cloth?’ (IV.ii.83-84). On the one hand, he expects respect to be paid to his court clothes- but then he realizes that the clothes are not his but those of Posthumus, so they would not command much respect. Then Cloten reveals his real identity as a ‘son to th’ Queen’ but Guiderius attacks him with undeniable truth: ‘I am sorry for’t, not seeming/ So worthy as thy birth’ (IV.ii.94-96). The denunciation of association between social rank and worthiness is repeatedly emphasized in the second half of the play. It can be said that after the challenge of patriarchal evaluation of worth and Imogen’s self-realization are achieved, the final act of the plays will be a place where reconciliation will occur.

III

Reconciliation, Self-discovery and Female Agency in the Final Act

In Act V, Posthumus too seems to have undergone a unique transformation while offstage: forgiveness. Though Posthumus’ last words were of vengeance, by the final act he has experienced a sudden conversion, mourning the loss of Imogen and regretting his merciless plot to have her killed. As Velz notes, ‘sudden conversions in Shakespeare’s time are standard in drama because they are traceable to the sudden reforms and sudden falls in medieval plays, especially morality plays.’⁴³ Posthumus’ forgiveness of Imogen, conveniently occurring off-stage, will be expressed more

⁴² ‘dignity, n’ *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. 12 May 2012. <<http://dictionary.com/>>.

⁴³ Velz, p. 154.

directly than Imogen's gradual process of self-discovery and reconciliation. Representing his isolated state, Posthumus is presented on-stage alone, addressing a bloody cloth in lieu of his wife. He recognizes his agency in Imogen's slaying, blaming himself for the stained textile and what it represents. In a revelation of remorse, Posthumus 'has worked to value her supposed sin of adultery'⁴⁴ into a minor offence:

You married ones,
If each of you should take this course, how many
Must murder wives much better than themselves
For wrying but a little! (V.i.2-5)

Posthumus' process of re-evaluation has taken place offstage and is presented in a matter of fact fashion presumably because the audience knows Imogen is innocent; the question of her guilt is a simple one for the audience and requires little emotional or philosophical reflection on our part. His reassessment of his own worth finds himself poor, a 'wretch more worth [God's] vengeance' (V.i.11), while Imogen is reappraised as 'noble' (V.i.10) from strumpet. Crucial to this transformation is Posthumus's continued belief that Imogen has indeed committed adultery. She has, by his understanding, trespassed against him and their marriage. However, carrying the bloody cloth like a hair shirt, Posthumus recognizes that his transgression of murder greatly outweighs the act of adultery, which he now considers a 'little fault' (V.i.12). Imogen's indulgence may have been repented (V.i.10), but his own crime deserves only punishment. Posthumus's willingness to forgive Imogen though she has been sexually unfaithful to him 'form[s] a remarkable exception to the more usual patriarchal assumption that female chastity is the primary marker of a woman's value and virtue and that loss of chastity is an unforgivable crime.'⁴⁵ Swander reminds us that in none of the source material does the hero repent his actions while he still believes the defamation of his wife: 'Traditionally, forces outside the romantic hero himself prevent him from carrying out his murderous intentions. Chance, fate, or the gods first save the heroine and then prove that she is chaste 'prove, that is, that she deserves to live.'⁴⁶ By forgiving his wife though he perceives her to be still guilty,

⁴⁴ Hunt, p. 425.

⁴⁵ Jean E. Howard, Introduction to *Cymbeline*. *The Norton Shakespeare: Romances and Poems*, 2nd edn, ed. by Stephen Greenblatt (New York: Norton, 2008), p. 279.

⁴⁶ Homer Swander, 'Cymbeline and the 'Blameless Hero'', *ELH*, 31.3 (September, 1964), 267.

Posthumus recognizes her worth and identity as distinct from her transgression; her alleged act of adultery no longer defines and limits her in his eyes.

This challenge to patriarchal evaluation of worth is seen again when Posthumus decides to disguise himself as an English peasant fighting against the Romans. Whereas Posthumus earlier told Philario that he was content to do nothing to affect the predicament with Cymbeline, he now, at last, decides to act. His decision to don the attire of a Briton peasant and to fight on Britain's side, though he has come to the battle with the Italian gentry, complicates any simple reading of his new disposition to obey god's will. On the one hand, he evidently conceives of his arrival in Britain in passive terms: 'I am brought hither/ Among the Italian gentry' (V.i.17-18), and yet his response to his situation seems a product of his altered reasoning:

Britain, I have kill'd thy mistress; peace,
I'll give no wound to thee. Therefore, good heavens,
Hear patiently my purpose: I disrobe me
Of these Italian weeds and suit myself
As does a Britain peasant; so I'll fight
Against the part I come with; so I'll die
For thee, O Imogen, even for whom my life
Is every breath a death... (V.i.21-27).

In striking fashion, then, Posthumus appears to have become an actor in his own drama. Posthumus' decision to 'die/For thee, O Imogen,' indicates that his new 'purpose' is characterized by an ardent desire to embrace suffering for the sake of justice or to make atonement for his past fault against Imogen. This realization will lead him to the new 'fashion' of authentic interior excellence:

...thus, unknown
Pitied or hated, to the face of peril
Myself I'll dedicate. Let me make men know
More valor in me than my habits show
Gods, put the strength o'th' Leonati in me
To shame the guise o' the world, I will begin
The fashion: less without and more within (V.i.23-27).

For Posthumus, this speech represents nothing less than a transformation of his earlier character. The surface shows of exterior that had won so much admiration from all are now consciously eschewed in favour of interior 'valour.' Posthumus now evidently accepts and affirms his present suffering as a consequence of his own fault and in this

disrobing soliloquy, 'false Aeneas' has made a new statement. Posthumus' transformation here suggests that the native excellence of Britain does not simply involve physical courage or fierceness but also seems to involve repentance and forgiveness.

After being arrested and put in jail, Posthumus delivers his most reflective soliloquy thus far in the play. He expresses his desire for justice in more explicit terms than earlier. His desire is now for 'penitence' that alone, he believes, can restore justice and thus free his 'conscience.' However, Posthumus' desire for penitence in death does not remain unchallenged, not even by himself. In his soliloquy struggles to reconcile his desire for justice with his belief in the merciful character of the gods:

Is't enough to say I am sorry?
So children temporal fathers do appease;
Gods are more full of mercy. Must I repent,
I cannot do it better than in gyves
Desir'd more than constrain'd. To satisfy,
If of my freedom 'tis the main part, take
No stricter render for me than my all.
I know you are more clement than vile man,
Who of their broken debtor take a third,
A sixth, a tenth, letting them thrive again
On their abatement... (V.iv.11-22).

Although he imagines divine mercy quite vividly - the gods are better than 'temporal fathers' and more 'clement' in their dealings with 'broken debtors' than men themselves are - Posthumus refuses to desire that mercy for himself and returns again to his insistence that the only way to justice is through his death: 'That's not my desire./For Imogen's dear life take mine, and though/ Tis not so dear, yet tis a life; you coin'd it' (V.iv.23-24). Posthumus sees himself as coined or stamped with the figure of gods, the way a regular coin bears the image of its king (25-26), but he only argues the point to prove the acceptability of his penitence to the gods he addresses: 'and so, great pow'rs,/ If you will take this audit, take this life,/ And cancel this cold bond' (28-30). Nonetheless, the question posed by this soliloquy and answered by the appearance of Jupiter in Posthumus' ensuing vision, is whether or not the god will 'take this audit' or accept Posthumus' account of things and view of justice. The disguise of Posthumus as a lowly ranked peasant who 'will begin/ The fashion: less without and more within' and his pecuniary language of repentance highlight the impracticality of measuring virtue in monetary terms. It can be seen that in this scene

Posthumus' values are altered. In weighing the worth of his own life, he uses the language of accounting and coinage again but this time he uses the terms with spiritual connotation and different from the famous 'woman's parts' speech in the first part of the play.

At the very end of the play, Cymbeline's recognition of Posthumus's judgment and action as noble suggests that the battle and this final scene have overturned his former belief in Posthumus's 'unworthiness' (I.i.127). Thus, in addition to pardoning the Romans by these words, Cymbeline tacitly acknowledges his fault in misjudging Posthumus and also the desire for pardon. Rather than weakening the politics between Britain and Rome, Posthumus' new virtue seems to create a new possibility of peace; a peace based both on a commitment to virtue as embodied in the new Posthumus, and a sober view of human potential for tragic misjudgement and false beliefs, for error and evil. Certainly the initial image of Posthumus presented as a man of worthiness is thoroughly discredited by the time Posthumus orders the murder of Imogen. Yet before the play reaches its end, Posthumus, in the lowest social position as a prisoner, has turned himself into a worthy man.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of Imogen-Fidele's burgeoning identity is that her/his last words are as Fidele. S/he speaks to Lucius as if still his page: 'My good master, / I will yet do you service' (V.v.491-2). Though her identity has been established by the others as Imogen, she continues to identify herself with her Fidele alter ego. Her Imogen identity perseveres, but has been transformed by her experiences as Fidele. Though bound to those identifiers of wife and daughter, Imogen continuously reasserts her new Fidele persona as well in an effort to maintain the agency she found in the woods. While it may seem that the Shakespearean heroine willingly submits to masculine power, Imogen claims her instrumentality in her own subtle way.

Unlike the destructive agency displayed by the evil Queen, however, Imogen's active interaction within the homosocial does not pose a threat to the masculine world, for she too appears as a man. As Mikalachki observes, 'the fact that Imogen re-establishes these bonds while still in her boy's disguise indicates the degree of anxiety

about female power to destroy them.⁴⁷ Dressed in her page disguise until the end, ‘Imogen never regains the visual trappings of her femininity’ so that the play, so concerned with the chastity of women, concludes with the appearance of an all-male community.⁴⁸ Moreover, the heroine does not adhere to the Queen’s nationalist conniving and recognizes, now through her sojourn, that there is a world beyond Britain, and a world beyond herself. Imogen-Fidele recognizes and embraces the complex relationship between Britain and Rome - as well as between herself and himself - seemingly realizing a need for a balance between the two, rather than the conquering of one over the other. It is through her identity as Fidele that Imogen may live the life she wants: not a queen of Britain, but queen to Posthumus (cf I.i.107, 114; I.iii.6), not as an isolated individual or country, but as a partner and friend like Britain and Rome, not as *nothing*, but as a daughter, wife, sister.

The play’s last scene is very interesting because there are multiple revelations including reunions and reconciliations that had happened. Everybody tells a story and each story seems to be ambiguous. However, all stories are intertwined and connected. When Imogen is reunited with Posthumus by telling her story and Cornelius announces the death of the queen and Belarius reveals that Guiderius and Arviragus are the true heirs of Cymbeline, the riddle-like plot is resolved by storytelling. However, the last riddle needs to be interpreted before the play reaches its end. The cryptic tablet on Posthumus’ breast placed by Jupiter is the final riddle. As in *Pericles*, so here a riddle must be resolved in order to bring order back to the land. The interpretation of the riddle by the Soothsayer is explained when he declares that the ‘cedar’ is Cymbeline and the two ‘lopped branches’ are his two lost sons. And the tree ‘now revived whose issue promises Britain peace and plenty’ (V.iv.455-458). Cymbeline now has become a father again. The riddle that is pervasive in *Pericles* reappears in *Cymbeline* and a correct interpretation is needed. Through storytelling, the Soothsayer finally comes up with the correct interpretation of the riddle leading the play to the happy ending.

⁴⁷ Jodi Mikalachki, ‘The Masculine Romance of Roman Britain: *Cymbeline* and Early Modern English Nationalism’, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 46.3 (Autumn, 1995), 321.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p322.

At the end, when Cymbeline finds his two lost sons, he immediately feels sorry for Imogen who is no longer the only heir to the throne: 'O Imogen/ Thou hast lost by this a kingdom' (V.v.374). Imogen's position as sole heir to the throne of England has been taken by the older male children. However, Imogen does not seem to be interested in her kingdom after all. She places a higher value on family and husband rather than her social position as an heir to the throne. For her, the reunion with her two brothers creates 'two worlds', and the reunion with her husband is presented as the dream of her life. And, by refusing to accept that she has lost a kingdom, Imogen successfully establishes her value outside the evaluative framework of patriarchal ideology.

Chapter III: Failure of Courtly Language and the Rhetorical Triumphs of the Shrew in *The Winter's Tale*

As we have seen in the previous chapter, female speech is represented as therapeutic. In *Pericles*, Marina is shown to have the power to heal and redeem the male characters; similarly, in *Cymbeline* the forgiving speech of Imogen at the end of the play restores and redeems her husband and father. The very same idea of female rhetoric as regenerative is emphasized again in Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*. However, in contrast to these other plays, the healing power of female speech is not only represented in the figure of the daughter. It is also represented by the mother/wife and female servant; they too play a vital part in the process of healing, restoring and redeeming male characters. In this play, Shakespeare presents a range of different possibilities for female speech through the character of three women: Hermione, Perdita and Paulina. These women in *The Winter's Tale* are severely condemned by male characters in the play. Leontes and Polixenes accuse all three of the principal female characters of committing similar types of feminized crimes. Leontes calls Hermione an adulteress, or a 'bed-swerger,' and declares that the child she carries is a bastard, and compares his wife to a 'flax-wench', which could have meant that she was a prostitute to early modern audiences (II.i.94, I.ii.276). Moreover, he blames Mamillius' illness (which eventually culminates in death) on Hermione: 'Conceiving the dishonor of his mother, / He straight declined, drooped, took it deeply, /Fastened and fixed the shame on himself, / Threw off his spirit, his appetite, his sleep, /And downright languished' (II.iii.13-17). Hermione commits a kind of indirect infanticide in Leontes' mind; she may not have meant to make her child so dangerously ill, but hers in effect poisons her son. Leontes slanders not only Hermione, but also Paulina. Leontes calls Paulina, 'A callet / Of boundless tongue,' representing her as a scold (II.iii.91-93). Finally, Polixenes slanders Perdita when he calls her an 'enchantment' and '[a] fresh piece / Of excellent witchcraft,' to impute that she has used witchcraft to enchant his son into loving her (IV.iv.414, 402-3). This extreme language is pervasive in the play and it is interesting to explore how female characters respond to or reform such extreme language.

This chapter examines the female speech represented in this play, assessing it against the rules for female eloquence as explained in contemporary conduct manuals. But it also argues, perhaps surprisingly, that the courtly and gracious language recommended in these books is less helpful for women than the mocking, humiliating and sarcastic language employed at the

end of the play, especially by Paulina. In *The Winter's Tale*, Paulina's unruly and ferocious language becomes therapeutic and restorative while the gracious courtly language fails.

To understand this strange state of affairs we need to address first of all the source of Leontes' jealousy. Like the previous two romances, the problem of the play begins with the male characters. Lynn Enterline has argued persuasively that Leontes' jealousy might derive directly from Hermione's rhetorical superiority.¹ I agree with this insight but I also want to take it one step further suggesting that the source of Leontes' jealousy is Leontes' anxiety about female speech more generally and his inability to read – to hear aright – Hermione's courtly speech. Hermione's courtly speech is entirely appropriate but it is shown in the play to be singularly unsuccessful. In the second part of the chapter, I will compare Hermione's language in the trial scene with Perdita's speeches in the pastoral scene. It is obvious that both of them are noble and persuasive speakers. They are both competent disputants, gracious in their speech and clear in their judgment. However, Hermione fails to convince Leontes of her innocence in the trial scene and Perdita fails to persuade both Polixenes and Florizel of her virtue in turn. In the first part of this chapter, I will argue that by presenting the failure of the gracious and courteous language of female characters in the play, *The Winter's Tale* tries to challenge the Renaissance rhetorical culture which encourages a woman to keep silence or to use only courteous, civil language. It shows us just how damaging this advice can be.

In contrast it is Paulina's language which has unexpected medicinal properties in healing Leontes' psychological infection. She is the only female character in the play whose voice is 'heard' even though her speech is far from courteous and gracious. In the second part of the chapter, I will examine Paulina's language including her rhetorical figures and tropes in order to explain why her speeches contain therapeutic properties. Instead of being severely punished for her aggressive speech, Paulina becomes Leontes' counselor. Paulina successfully uses her blatantly hostile and mocking language and Shakespeare again questions the rhetorical tradition which is based on Renaissance patriarchal assumptions of condemning female speech. The representation of female speech in this play, I would argue, reflects and shows up the Renaissance rhetorical culture which is an unstable and highly contested site. Lastly, I will look at Paulina's treatment and Hermione's reaction towards Leontes at the end of the play by arguing that the closing scene is very problematic since

¹ Lynn Enterline, "'You Speak a Language the I Understand Not': The Rhetoric of Animation in *The Winter's Tale*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 48.1 (Spring 1997), 17-44

Leontes gives Paulina a husband as a reward for her loyalty but without asking her consent and Hermione refuses to address her husband when she meets him again. The talkative Paulina now turns to silence but silence seems to be her best means to assert her agency – her non-compliance - at the end of the play. Both Hermione's and Paulina's silence at the end of the play leads to ambivalent and controversial interpretations.

The Failures of Female Rhetoric

It is very important to understand that Leontes' jealousy is unique and controversial. Unlike the other male characters in Shakespeare's previous plays, Leontes' jealousy is seemingly inexplicable, welling up into an uncontrollable anguish unwarranted by anything that has happened. Leontes himself urges Hermione to press Polixenes to stay longer in Sicilia at the end of a visit that has lasted nine months in perfect amity and love: 'Tongue-tied our queen? Speak you' (I.ii.28). Hermione's response to her husband's request is appropriate in terms of the way in which she interrupts this male conversation indicating that she possesses excellent wit, for she at once makes a virtue out of her failure to echo her husband's invitation.

I had thought, sir, to have held my peace until
You had drawn oaths from him not to stay. You, sir,
Charge him too coldly. Tell him, you are sure
All in Bohemia's well: this satisfaction
The by-gone day proclaim'd: say this to him,
He's beat from his best ward. (I.ii.29-34)

She waits to draw an oath from Polixenes that he is not willing to stay longer. She also chides her husband about the strategy which he used in his attempt at persuasion. Hermione teases her husband's friend, 'Verily, /You shall not go; a lady's verily is /As potent as a lord's' (I.ii, 49-51). Leontes' anger seems to derive from Herminone's rhetorical power. In a jovial manner, Hermione gives Leontes permission to stay a month longer than planned during his future visit with Polixenes. She sees this as a conciliatory agreement to appease her husband's demands and reassures him: 'Leontes / I love thee not a jar o' the' clock behind/ What lady she her lord' (I.ii.42-44). Hermione freely expresses her feelings to her husband and shows no jealousy regarding his attachment to Polixenes. Hermione's positive responses indicate self-assurance and contentment. Hermione knows herself and trusts her judgment, freely expressing her thoughts and emotions. Her conversation with Polixenes reveals mutual warmth and congeniality.

It is Leontes' intemperate response that become the focus of this scene especially when he considers Hermione's and Polixenes' walking in the garden arm in arm as the 'ocular proof' (III.iii.370) of their adultery. In contrast to Othello and Posthumus, there is no villain poisoning his mind with bestial images and calculated lies. Instead he becomes the victim of his own imagination and makes up stories of illegitimacy, adultery, treason and deception. From this point until the climax of the play, Hermione and her children become the innocent victims of Leontes' tyranny. Hermione's quick transformation in his imagination from faithful wife and loving mother to 'hobby-horse' and flax-wench' occur within a matter of hours and, ironically, she is oblivious to it.

Unable to persuade Polixenes to stay himself, Leontes is then annoyed when his wife is able to do so, as his brief response to her success suggests:

Leontes	Is he won yet?
Hermione	He'll stay, my lord.
Leontes	At my request he would not (I.ii.85-87)

This is the point at which Leontes' jealousy is aroused. His failure in persuading his friend to stay longer, and his wife's success in doing so, has provoked his madness. One way to understand this sudden, abrupt psychological shift is to see this success as a challenge to Leontes's hitherto hidden patriarchal assumptions. Leontes thinks that silent women are chaste, a view promulgated by early modern marriage manuals and in circulation at the time. Even a humanist like Juan-Luis Vives, who advocated educating royal women like Hermione for the purpose of their moral formation, considers public female speech to be dangerous: 'If she is a good woman it is best that she stay at home and be unknown to others. In company it is befitting that she be retiring and silent with her eyes cast down, so that some perhaps may see her, but none will hear her.'² Leontes performs the double standard that Vives writes about. Although Leontes seems to praise Hermione's speech when he says that she 'never spok'st / To better purpose', he actually draws attention to her silence during their courtship: 'Three crabbèd months had scoured themselves to death / Ere I could make thee open thy white hand / And clap thyself my love. Then didst thou utter, / 'I am yours forever' (I.ii.88-

² Juan-Luis Vives, *De institutione feminae Christianae*, ed. by C. Matheusen and C. Fantazzi, trans. By C. Fantazzi (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), p. 41. For more on the humanist debate about the dangers and values of educating women, see Merry E. Weisner, 'Literacy and Learning', *Women and Gender in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 143-174.

9,102-4). Even though Leontes solicits her speech in Act I, he prefers her silence. When Hermione wittily responds, 'Why, lo you now, I have spoke to th' purpose twice: / The one forever earned a royal husband, / Th'other for some while a friend' (I.ii.106-8), the stage directions indicate that she also gives her hand to Polixenes. She equates her commitment to Leontes with her hospitality to Polixenes at the wrong moment; her statement serves to augment Leontes' jealousy. Leontes witnesses Hermione's open palm and open mouth but later he also believes that his wife opens her entire body up: 'No barricado for a belly, Know't / It will let in and out the enemy / with bag and baggage' (I.ii.204-6). The speed of Leontes' slide from open mouth to open belly underscores his belief that an eloquent woman is never chaste. He leaps abruptly from the memory of Hermione's act of grace, in giving her 'white hand' to seal their love, to the present contemplation of her giving her hand in friendship to Polixenes; that is, he moves from satisfaction to the misery of 'tremor cordis' in the space of only six lines. Lynn Enterline observes that:

The scene's pronounced interest in acts of persuasion, one failed and the other successful, produces an odd effect: plunging into Leontes' jealousy, the scene makes his unreasonable emotion appear to be the consequence of this rivalry between male and female speech.³

Enterline argues that Leontes' jealousy of his wife's superior rhetorical skills derive from his interpretation of the act of persuasion as her sexual power. As mentioned in the introduction, female speech is closely associated with sexual promiscuity; therefore, Leontes' interpretation of Hermione's eloquence as an evident sign of erotic power is based on the Renaissance patriarchal assumptions about female speech. However, there is more to be said about this 'power' of Hermione's; as I will now explain, we find that her language and gestures are entirely in keeping with the advice on decorous female speech and conduct in several conduct books of the period.

In *The Book of the Courtier* (1561) Castiglione has Signor Magnifico offer a description of the female courtier's roles which anticipates the eloquence of Hermione's persuasive art:

Leaving therefore a part of the vertues of the minde that ought to be commune to her with the Courtier, as wisdom, nobleness of courage, staidnesse, and manie mo, and likewise the condicions that are meete for all women, as to be good and discrete, to have the understanding to order her husbandes goodes and her house and children

³ Enterline, pp. 31.

whan she is married, and all those partes that beelunge to a good huswief: I say that for her that liveth in Court, me thinke there beelongeth unto her above all other thinges, a certain sweetnesse in language that may delite, wherby she may gentlie entertein all kinde of men with talke worth the hearynge and honest, and applyed to the time and place, and to the degree of the person she communed withall: accompanyng with sober and quiet maners and with the honestye that must alwayes be a stay to all her deedes, a readie livelines of wit, wherby she may declare herselfe far wide from all dulnesse: but with such a kinde of goodnes, that she may be esteemed no lesse chaste, wise and courtesie, then pleasant, feat conceited and sobre: and therefore must she kepe a certain meane very hard, and (in a maner)dirived of contrarie matters, and come just to certain limites, but not passe them.⁴

It is clear that the female courtiers' role should be 'honest' and appropriate to 'time and place and to the degree of the person she communed withall.' Also she must show 'wit' to indicate that she is not dull. Hermione knows her position here. She keeps silent until her husband urges her to speak. All of these key concepts have been carefully practiced by Hermione. It is this balance of modesty and friendliness which Hermione appears to achieve to everybody's satisfaction but Leontes'. Hermione conducts herself as a friend towards Polixenes, taking walks with him, conversing informally, and even teasing him familiarly. She possesses the art of the ultimate hostess: the capacity to entertain and charm others with intelligent and entertaining conversation. Her lack of ostentation has led one feminist critic to remark with some condescension that Hermione 'expresses visually as well as in her words a dependent, sexist role.'⁵ Hermione's language and gestures are very appropriate according to the codes of conduct of a court lady.

And yet, her courtly language is badly misinterpreted by Leontes whose jealousy is derived from this inability to read or to hear her courtly speech aright. In Act I scene ii when Leontes congratulated his wife on her persuasive language, he said that there was only one time that she spoke convincingly in the past; this was when she confessed her love to Leontes, 'I am yours forever' (I.i.103). However, Hermione's ambiguous speech then makes Leontes mistrustful of his wife's language; 'I have spoke to th' purpose twice:/ The one, for ever earn'd a royal husband;/ The other, for some while a friend.' (I.ii.105-107). One of the definitions of the word friend in the sixteenth century, according to the Oxford English

⁴ Baldessare Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. by Thomas Hoby (London: David Nutt Publisher, 1900), pp. 149-150.

⁵ Irene G. Dash. 'A Penchant for Perdita on The Eighteenth -Century Stage', in *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, ed. by Carolyne Lenz, Gayle Greene and Carol Thomas Neely (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1983), p. 277.

Dictionary, is ‘lover or paramour, of either sex’⁶ The ambiguity of Hermione’s language makes Leontes misinterpret her meaning. Leontes suddenly says aside: ‘Too hot, too hot! / To mingle friendship far is mingling blood’ (I.ii.108-9). Leontes, at this point, mistrusts her language. When Leontes realizes that he is losing his control, and not only over her language, he spends much of the rest of the act trying to bring her speech under his control. It can be said that not only does Leontes mishear his wife, he also increasingly fails to listen to her. He accuses her of being pregnant by Polixenes: ‘for ‘tis Polixenes/ Has made thee swell thus’ (II.i. 61).

However, when she challenges his accusation, Leontes immediately stops addressing her and turns to his lords instead: ‘You, my lords, /Look on her, mark her well’ (II.i.64-65). When he turns to address her, he calls her a ‘thing’(II.i.82), which has a pejorative quality, and then turns again to address his lords until he sends her to prison. She is becoming isolated and marginalized onstage. It should be noted that Leontes concludes his accusation by saying that the man who even speaks for Hermione shall in so doing make himself indirectly a sharer of her guilt: ‘He who shall speak for her is afar off guilty/But that he speak!’ (II.i.103-104). Here we are watching Leontes degenerate from domestic tyrant into political tyrant. When his lords protest, rejecting his accusation of adultery, he snaps: ‘Hold your peace’ (II.i.139). He then dismisses their comments as an ‘infringement of his power’:

Why, what need we
Commune with you of this, but rather follow
Our forceful instigation? Our prerogative
Call not your counsels...
We need no more of your advice. (II.i.161-168)

It can be seen that Hermione’s voice in previous scenes has taught him that he should not let anyone talk. Leontes seems to lose his trust in language and is sceptical of what others have to say, including the oracular speech from Delphi: ‘this is mere falsehood’ (III.ii. 141).

Leontes’ failure to ‘hear’ is emphasized when he enters after Mamillius tells Hermione: ‘I will tell it softly, / Yon crickets shall not hear it.’ Hermione responds: ‘Come on then, and give’t me in my ear’ (II.i.32-43). Then Leontes enters and he is furious. His anger might come from seeing his son whispering in his wife’s ear and he is not able to hear. For Leontes, it reminds

⁶ ‘friend n’ *OED Online*. Oxford University Press. 9 October 2013 (<http://dictionary.oed.com/>)

him of Hermione's loose body and a sign of Hermione's sexual impurity. It can be said that Leontes' jealousy derives directly from his anxiety of female speech: his inability to control and hear, leading to the misinterpretation of those speeches and gesture. However, when Hermione realizes that she is wrongly accused by her husband with the charge of adultery and promiscuity, she does not hesitate to use courtly, persuasive language to try to convince her husband of her innocence and chastity.

In the trial scene, we see that although Hermione's speech is courteous and powerful, she cannot persuade Leontes to believe in her innocence. However, she seems to realize at the beginning of her speech that even if she were to plead 'not guilty,' Leontes would not believe her.

Since what I am to say must be but that
Which contradicts my accusation and
The testimony on my part no other
But what comes from myself, it shall scarce boot me
To say 'not guilty:' mine integrity
Being counted falsehood, shall, as I express it,
Be so received. (III.ii.20-27)

Even though Hermione wholeheartedly knows that she will fail to persuade her husband to believe in her innocence, she still tries to assert her honour and dignity. It is surprising to see that Hermione, as a woman, also foresees her failure even before she starts her petition. Therefore she seems to understand that her persuasive language is not sufficient to help protect her honour. The failure comes from the drastic misjudgment of her integrity. The speech anticipates the outcome and re-describes it as evidence of her virtue. Here, she is addressing the public and it gives her an opportunity to reveal herself as a victim and Leontes as a tyrant. Hermione is seizing the opportunity of a trial as a public deliberative occasion. It means that Leontes' tyranny is subtly revealed before the trial. However, her public speech is considered inappropriate because it is considered a negative trait for a woman. This is very important because it reflects the Renaissance rhetorical tradition which condemns female speech in public. Hermione's judgment of her own speech mirrors the Renaissance rhetorical convention. She knows that she will break the rhetorical convention by talking in the public sphere. Women are frequently judged by their use of language, and their chastity was intimately connected to their speech. And this connection is based on classical and biblical reference which sees verbal fluency and talkativeness in women as a sign of uncontrollable

sexual desire and the abandonment of their proper place in the social order. However, she still decides to use her courtly language to defend her chastity.

First, she speaks on her own behalf. Her defense is substantiated by her noble lineage and chaste behavior. She also defines her role clearly: she is the daughter of the Emperor of Russia (III.ii.109), 'the mother to a hopeful prince' (III.ii.40), and 'a fellow of the royal bed, which owe/ A moiety of the throne' (III.ii.38-39). She follows the rhetorical codes of conduct in constructing her argument by establishing her *ethos*, her credibility as a speaker.

According to Quintilian the establishing of a speaker's credibility and the appropriate use of language will make the speaker's speech more powerful and persuasive.

Ethos in all its forms requires the speaker to be a man of good character and courtesy. For it is most important that he should himself possess or be thought to possess those virtues for the possession of which it is his duty, if possible, to commend his client as well, while the existence of his own character will make his pleading all the more convincing and will be of the utmost service to the cases which he undertakes. For the orator who gives the impression of being a bad man while he is speaking, is actually speaking badly, since his words seem to be insincere owing to the absence of *ethos* which would otherwise have revealed itself. Consequently the style of oratory employed in such cases should be calm and mild with no trace of pride, elevation or sublimity, all of which would be out of place. It is enough to speak appropriately, pleasantly and persuasively, and therefore the intermediate style of oratory is most suitable.⁷

This means that *ethos* implies the reliability or honesty of the speaker. However, Leontes fails to recognize 'good character and courtesy' in Hermione. One of Hermione's problems in using *ethos* is that she is not 'a man.' Her credibility is lessened and her 'good character and courtesy' is ambiguous and misinterpreted by her husband. Therefore, in Leontes' eyes, even though she is 'calm and mild with no trace of pride,' her speech is insincere and not persuasive at all. Hermione knows that *ethos* alone is not enough for her to prove her innocence. She then employs another rhetorical strategy to support her position as a victim of Leontes' jealousy. Rather than seeking to manipulate the response by arousing emotion, she relies on reason and a range of proofs.⁸

⁷ Quintilian, p. 429.

⁸ Alexandra Shepard notes that both men and women express their honor and reputation not only in terms of sexual honesty but with reference to clothes, means and social status and honesty and credibility. Alexander Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 46-55.

After establishing her *ethos*, she moves to *logos* by explaining the reason of her action. She arranges the facts of her case and makes a reasoned argument. It can be seen that in the trial scene Hermione's words are carefully chosen and her speech is direct. She asks Leontes to judge her as the other member of their sacred union, for he is the only person who can vouch for her chastity. She also appeals to his conscience: he does not have any hint of her inconsistency before Polixenes's arrival. Courageously and calmly she addresses Leontes:

You my lord best know
(Who least will seem to do so) my past life
Hath been as continent, as chaste, as true,
As I am now unhappy (III.ii.32-35).

.....
To your own conscience, sir, before Polixenes
Came to your court how I was in your grace,
How merited to be so; since he came.
With what encounter so uncurrent I
Have strained t'appear thus... (III.ii.45-49).

.....
For Polixenes,
With whom I am accused, I do confess
I loved him, as in honor he required;
With such a kind of love as might become
A lady like me; with a love even such,
So, and no other, as yourself commanded;
Which not to have done, I think had been in me
Both disobedience and ingratitude. (III.ii. 60-67).

From the above quotations, it can be said that Hermione tries to offer the example of her past conduct before the arrival of Polixenes and she also tries to appeal to Leontes's memory and conscience by referring to his feelings and treatment towards her before Polixenes' visit. And she tries to clarify what kind of love she feels for Polixenes in order to deflect its misreading. She explains that as a lady of the house, she will be considered disobedient if she ignores Leontes' command to take care of his dear friend. Hermione's construction of her *logos* reflects the dilemma of the female code of conduct, especially with regard to speech and behavior. While her courtly, persuasive language and gracious, gentle behavior are interpreted as a sign of promiscuity, she would have been accused of 'disobedience and ingratitude' if she had treated Polixenes poorly without generosity and compassion. This is the truth that Leontes does not want to hear or accept. Throughout her speech in this scene, Hermione makes the word 'honor' synonymous with her behavior. In this way, Hermione provides irrefutable reasons to explain her behavior.

Hermione knows that this will not be sufficient for her to win the trial, so she also uses *pathos* to arouse her listener's emotion. As rhetoricians know, facts might help her listeners realize what actually happened but emotions sway their final judgement. Therefore when Leontes threatens to kill her, she employs *pathos* not only to move Leontes to pity but also to make him feel guilty about his cruelty. As mentioned in *Institutio Oratoria*, *deinosis* – or emotional amplification - should be used in order to evoke the listener's feeling.⁹ Hermione told Leontes that she has lost all the joys that make her life worth living:

To me can life be no commodity:
The crown and comfort of my life, your favour,
I do give lost, for I do feel it gone,
But know not how it went. My second joy,
And first-fruits of my body, from his presence
I am barr'd like one infectious. My third comfort,
Starr'd most unluckily, is from my breast,
The innocent milk in its most innocent mouth,
Haled out to murder: myself on every post
Proclaimed a strumpet. (III. ii. 93-102).

.....
Now my liege,
Tell me what blessings I have here alive,
That I should fear to die? (III. ii.104-106).

From her use of rhetorical strategies in defending herself in the trial scene, it can be said that Hermione closely follows the instruction on how to defend an argument by using rhetorical devices. She is rhetorically accomplished. The presentation of the facts is persuasive, the establishment of her good character is convincing and the emotional appeal is spontaneous and sincere; and yet Hermione still fails to persuade Leontes and to prove her innocence. The trial is useless because whatever happens in the courtroom, Leontes will not believe in his wife's purity. Even when he is confronted with the news of Mamillius' death, he understands

⁹ *Deinosis*, according to Aristotle, is 'a rhetorical *topos* common to all kinds of rhetoric' in order to exaggerate the responsibility for the action of a person. It is defined as 'emotional *amplificatio*' which aims to appeal. Michael Edwards and Christopher Reid, *Oratory in Action* (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2004), p. 35.

it as a punishment because of his doubts about the oracular speech rather than his act of tyranny. The oracles which should represent the ultimate truth become just a lie for Leontes: There is no truth at all i'th' oracle (III.ii 138). There is no language that can move Leontes out of his tyranny. His mistrust of the language of his wife leads him to mistrust the language of the oracle. The public and theatrical nature of her testimony thoroughly reveals Leontes' tyrannical behaviour. Her testimony is aimed not just at Leontes but at the public. Similarly, when the oracle is announced, everybody on the stage and audience witness the revelation of the Hermione's innocence and Leontes' tyranny simultaneously.

Hermione is not the only example in the play of this type of failure. Perdita's similarly gracious language also fails to persuade Polixenes to see her goodness and Florizel to understand her position in the pastoral scene. This makes clear that such failure is a theme in this play. In the pastoral scene, as observed by Carol Thomas Neely, the language of the shepherds and the clown is not complicated: 'Most of the sentences are short and grammatically simple.'¹⁰ Even Florizel after disguising himself as a shepherd, 'uses few metaphors or similes'¹¹ However, in contrast, Perdita's language is sophisticated and courteous and differs markedly from that of the other characters; this partly signifies her noble birth. We hear her voice first when she discusses her dress with Florizel. On this occasion she wears a costume like a goddess's robes and Florizel disguises himself as a swain (IV, iv.7-10). Their first conversation indirectly informs us of what happened before their conversation begins, including her rhetorical failure. We learn that Florizel dresses Perdita up gorgeously with 'goddess-like' attire which she has never desired to wear. Perdita mistrusts all artificiality, saying that she 'should blush/ To see [Florizel] so attir'd; swoon, I think, / To show myself a glass (IV.iv.12-14). The attire she wears is not her idea but she cannot persuade Florizel to understand her thought and she compromises by dressing up just for him.

Later, amid the merry-making Perdita feels apprehensive about concealing their betrothal from Polixenes: 'even now I tremble/ To think your father, by some accident/ Should pass this way' (IV.iv.18-20). Certainly Perdita recognizes the risk of falling in love. Her speech indicates that she realizes that 'by the power of the king, / [Florizel] must change this purpose.' (IV.iv.37-38). However, Florizel proves himself to be constant and devoted to her,

¹⁰ Carol Thomas Neely, 'The Winter's Tale: The Triumph of Speech', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, (1975), 330.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 331.

saying: 'I cannot be/ Mine own, nor anything to any, if/ I be not thine. To this I am most constant, / Though destiny say no' (IV.iv.43-46).

The significance of this declaration is that Florizel defines his own position in terms of belonging to Perdita. The royal women in the romances define their identities according to their different relationships to the royal men (for example, daughter, wife betrothed), but Florizel's behavior is atypical of the princes and kings. And Perdita's attitude of self-sufficiency, whether implicit in her behavior or explicit in her speech, following Florizel's disinheritance, is contrasted to her betrothed's. Apparently the position for royal men is sharply contrasted to that for royal women in terms of self-reliance and spiritual awakening. Each prince or king in the romances only gradually develops self-reliance, and they all must be led by their wives and/or daughters toward acquiring greater faith in the gods and experiencing a spiritual awakening. However, Perdita fails to convince Florizel of the danger of his dependence on her especially when she wholeheartedly knows that her future will be at risk as the consequence.

Like Leontes, Polixenes fashions a slanderous narrative about the feminine precisely because he fears a loss of self in the passage of one generation to the next. It is quite clear that Leontes does not trust Hermione as a mother of the heir of the kingdom because he confidently believes that the baby 'is the issue of Polixenes' (II.iii.94). Similarly, in Act IV, Polixenes authors a slanderous narrative of witchcraft because he finds the prospect that royal succession is dependent upon unruly bodies unbearable. Although he is crestfallen that his son has shown himself to be more faithful to his future bride than to his father, he seeks to exonerate his son from any responsibility from a transgressive cross-class marriage; he thus puts most of the blame on Perdita. He initially tells Florizel, 'Mark your divorce, young sir, / Whom son I dare not call; thou art too base / To be acknowledged' (IV.iv.397-9), and immediately rebukes him with a threat: 'If I may ever know thou dost but sigh / That thou no more shalt see this knack – as never / I mean thou shalt – we'll bar thee from succession / Not hold thee of our blood' (IV.iv.407-10). Polixenes seriously threatens to disown his son, even though he might not want to lose him or his heir apparent. Polixenes here is very controlling. Similarly to his harshness with Florizel is his increasing antagonism to Perdita. Although he tells the Old Shepherd that he will free him from the 'dead blow' of his displeasure, Polixenes furiously declares that he will disfigure Perdita's face with briars (IV.iv.414). When it comes to Perdita, he concludes,

And you, enchantment,
Worthy enough a herdsman: yea, him too,
That makes himself, *but for our honor therein*,
Unworthy thee — if ever henceforth thou
These rural latches to his entrance open,
Or hoop his body more with thy embraces,
I will devise a death as cruel for thee
As thou art tender to't (IV.iv.414-421, emphasis added).

By calling her an 'enchantment,' he recalls his assertion that she is a 'fresh piece / Of excellent witchcraft' and suggests that a spell is what causes Florizel to render himself unworthy. Polixenes makes it clear that his personal honor or dignity is at stake in their union, and he primarily blames her charms for this threat. Perdita's social status makes her a bad match for his son, so Polixenes labels her a witch to add her ambiguous sexual or marital status as a further detraction.

When she first meets her future father-in-law, Perdita discovers she can easily match wits with this well-spoken gentleman. She is talkative and intelligent. Her speech is decorous and logical. Neither intimidated by his argumentation nor abashed by his logic, she states firmly her purist views on gardening. The case she makes for natural beauty as far superior to 'grafted' beauty and her reply also reaffirms her relationship with Hermione. Derek Traversi notes that this is:

in effect, a statement of Perdita's position in the play as Hermione's daughter, and so ... a manifestation of the pure, undiluted essence of 'grace' ... For Perdita, in her simple integrity, the creation of 'art,' or artifice, is contrary to the creative simplicity of 'nature'; the ambiguous and the artificial are rejected by her, in flowers as in human beings, and her conception of life is one which admits no possible addition to, or 'sharing' with, natural perfection.¹²

Perdita's rhetorical talents can be seen from the beginning of Act IV when she has a conversation with Polixenes. The conversation between Polixenes and Perdita hinges upon the relationship between nature and nurture. A topic, introduced in *Cymbeline*, is discussed here at length. Perdita presents her argument, obviously thought out before this conversation, as follows:

¹² Derek Traversi, *Shakespeare: The Last Phase* (California: Stanford University Press, 1955), p. 146.

Sir, the year growing ancient,
Not yet on summer's death nor on the birth
Of trembling winter, the fairest flowers o'th season
Are our carnations and streaked gillyvors,
Which some call nature's bastard. Of that kind
Our rustic garden's barren, and I care not
To get slip of them (IV.iv.79-85).

Little does she know that she herself is a gillyvor; a product of nature, her royal blood, and nurture, her virtuous and poor upbringing, much like Cymbeline's sons, Guiderius and Arviragus. Polixenes' response seems to follow the notion that nature should be aided, if necessary, in the achievement of beauty:

Yet nature is made better by no mean
But nature makes that mean. So, over the art
Which you say adds to nature, is an art
That nature makes. You see, sweet maid, we marry
A gentle scion to the wildest stock
And make conceive a bark of baser kind
By bud of noble race. This is an art
Which does mend nature- change it rather-but
The art itself is nature (IV.iv.89-97).

Like Perdita, Polixenes does not know to whom he speaks. He is unaware that his son, of the nobler class, wishes to wed this girl, of baser kind, to produce a beautiful flower. When he discovers as much, he discards his abstract theory in favor of retaining the purity of his line. Eventually, the discussion of whether nature is better than nurture proves moot. Perdita is of noble stock and will be wed to Florizel, also of noble stock. However, her upbringing by the shepherd is important because it reveals that even a flower of noble or pure stock needs to be nurtured properly or the flower will wither. Perdita, in a strange acquiescence, agrees with Polixenes and then proceeds to show why she will not do what he suggests. She says:

I'll not put
The dibble in earth to set one slip of them,
No more than, were I painted, I would wish
This youth should say 'twere well, and only therefore
Desire to breed by me (IV.iv.100-104).

Her argument is sound in that she demands that beauty not be the only determination of a thing's worth. Perdita would argue that worth is characterized by the purity of the object, not its appearance. Her initial vagueness concerning this issue is clarified by her remarks and Polixenes appears to be at a loss for an answer. Whereas originally nature was said to be the source of worth in the presentation of this argument, now that source of worth is identified as purity. The interlocutors defend their respective arguments obstinately. Nevertheless, Perdita seems to be in command of the discourse as it progresses, and the argument comes to a close when she gives flowers of middle summer to Polixenes. However, most important to this study is the proof of Perdita's traits: she is argumentative but gracious in her speech, clear in her judgment and courageous in responding to this articulate stranger.

In her conversation with Polixenes, Perdita's self-assurance, wit and natural skills for argumentation indicate that she possesses rhetorical power. Perdita reveals her wisdom, grace and self-reliance through the use of the speech, though she is deprived of a courtly education. Perdita's reaction to Polixenes is an acceptance of the uncertainty of her future, for her life hangs precariously by a thread of kingly injustice, and her shepherd-father believes he is facing death (IV.iv.462-463). After Polixenes leaves, she tells those around her:

Even here, undone,
I was not much afeared; for once or twice
I was about to speak, and tell him plainly,
The self same sun that shines upon his court
Hide not his visage from our cottage, but
Looks on alike (IV.iv. 442-447).

Perdita points out the innate nobility of all mankind, whether prince or pauper, because her sense of nobility reaches far beyond social and political hierarchies. She expresses a true sense of man's noble worth and clearly understands the meaning of mutual generosity and genuine kindness—qualities of noble people. She knows that noble deeds do not necessarily describe the actions of royalty. Offering no reply to Polixenes, she says to Florizel: 'I told you what would come of this: I beseech you, / of your own state take care: this dream of mine--/ Being now awake, I'll queen it no inch farther,/ But milk my ewes and weep' (IV.iv.448-451). We see her as pragmatic rather than self-pitying; she releases her beloved from his vows and removes her garland. Therefore, her duties at the festival are ended, as well as Florizel's obligations to her. She can now return to her menial task of milking ewes.

Again her conversations with both Polixenes and Florizel in the pastoral scene are very remarkable because despite with her gracious, witty and rational language, she cannot persuade both father and son to understand her position. Polixenes does not accept her as a future daughter-in-law and her language cannot convince him to accept her nobility and grace. Her language might surprise Polixenes after he has had a debate about flowers with her:

This is the prettiest low-born lass that ever
Rain on the green-sward: nothing she does or seems
But smacks of something greater than herself,
Too noble for this place (IV.iv.156-159).

But finally he does not accept her, not even when she converses with him with noble and gracious language. Polixenes calls her a 'fresh piece/ Of excellent witchcraft' (IV.iv.424). He also threatens to 'scratch'd' her 'beauty with briars' (IV.iv.426). Like her mother, Perdita's witty and courteous language fails to persuade him to see her inner beauty and worth. For Polixenes the only worth a person can have is determined by class. He continues to waver when speaking to Perdita. Worth is no longer achieved by marrying the noble stock to the lesser stock. Worth is determined now by the arbitrary command of the gardener.

It is surprising to see that in Act V Perdita speaks only 10 lines out of 550 lines. She seems to be taciturn in the final act of the play. In the reunion between Perdita and Leontes happens offstage and is reported to the audience after Leontes is reminded of Hermione by young Perdita and suggests to Florizel that he fancies Perdita himself. (V.i.223-237). It can be seen that the incest found in *Pericles* seems to reappear again *The Winter's Tale*. However, Paulina's policing of desire prevents him from unnatural sexual attraction. The resemblance to her mother inevitably causes Leontes to have an incestuous desire for Perdita. After detecting Leontes' yearning, Paulina reprimands him that:

Sir, my liege,
Your eye hath too much youth in't: not a month
Fore your queen died, she was more worth such gazes
Than what you look on now. (V.i.225-228)

Paulina's rebuke here wakes Leontes up from his incestuous desire toward his own daughter. The disease language of the riddle revealing the incestuous relationship between father and

daughter in the first two scene of Pericles is barred by Paulina's sarcastic language. After she asks for her mother's blessing in the final scene, we hardly hear her voice even when she is asked by her mother about her past story. Paulina cuts the conversation short and encourages them to enjoy the motion of joy and exultation. Everybody's voice has been controlled by Paulina's authority.

While her mother fails to persuade Leontes of her innocence in the trial scene, Perdita here also fails to win the heart of Polixenes. The graciously courtly language does not help Perdita to prove her worth as a future queen of Bohemia. Both mother and daughter seem to lose their rhetorical power when using courteous, gracious language in defending their argument. Their exemplary speech, which conforms to the feminine rhetorical ideal, cannot shift deeply held misogynist and class-based prejudice. It is surprising that while gracious language is not helpful and beneficial in the play, mocking, sarcastic language becomes workable and more powerful. Hermione's and Perdita's speech is utterly different to Paulina's whose voice and arguments are heard. Paulina's language becomes controversial because it challenges the Renaissance tradition on female rhetoric which usually sees talkativeness and garrulousness of women as a sign of promiscuity and a threat to male-dominated society. But, as Shakespeare shows us, it is in the end the only response heard by these prejudiced men.

The Triumph of Paulina the Shrew

Like other tyrants in Shakespeare's plays, Leontes must undergo a process of redemption. However unlike Othello and Posthumus, whose incipient jealousy is exacerbated by false friends who are themselves jealous and goad them, Leontes seems to experience madness because of his own fantasy. Shakespeare seemingly creates a different theatrical conflict: how can Leontes heal this self-inflicted wound? One thing is clear he cannot do it alone. One of the ways in which Shakespeare meets this problem is through Paulina who becomes 'counsellor' and 'physician' to the king by using female speech-the very thing that outraged Leontes in the first place-to heal his infectious mind. Her role is vividly contrasted to those female characters in the first part of the play where she acts like a shrew who is condemned by her male counterparts.

In the first scene when we meet her, she is authoritative and straightforward. She intends to see the Queen, but the Gaoler has been ordered to admit no one. Her confrontation with the

jailer shows her most outstanding trait. She and the jailer are a study of contrasts: she is the courageous spokesperson for the Queen and Princess; he is Leontes' frightened subject and Hermione's warden. She justifies her reasons for taking the baby: 'This child was prisoner to the womb, and is/By law and process of great nature, thence/ Free'd and enfranchis'd; not a party to/ The anger of the king, nor guilty of/ If any be- the trespass of the queen' (II.ii.59-63). Paulina simply states the pragmatic philosophy that nature's laws are superior to man's unnatural decrees. She expresses faith in the process of 'great creating nature,' which is evidence of the god's providence. This is the first time that she uses her rhetoric in persuading the jailer to let her take the baby. Paulina is eloquent and her words are powerful. Later her rhetorical powers bring order to this society but presently, she must face Leontes and tell him the truth 'with words as medicinal as true' (II.iii.37). In this scene, Paulina's assumption of the shrewish role begins with her first appearance, which follows Leontes' public accusation of Hermione as an adulteress. Paulina's first lines to the Gaoler, under whose surveillance Hermione is imprisoned, are courtly enough, but when the Gaoler refuses to admit her to Hermione, Paulina reveals the shortness of her patience and the power of her lashing tongue (II.ii.9-12). Paulina's change from a courtly lady to a shrewish woman interestingly reflects the unusual situation of Leontes' court where civil conversation is no longer practical: Hermione's charm and graceful actions as hostess to Polixenes have been seen as dishonest display of rudeness and sexual desire by the king. Paulina; therefore, has to cast herself into the role of 'shrew,' the scolding tongue' of moral conscience in this case rather than of self-indulgent discontent. She clothes herself in the role, verbally, when Emilia informs her of the premature birth of Hermione's baby girl:

I dare be sworn.
 These dangerous, unsafe lunes i'th' King, beshrew them!
 He must be told on't, and he shall; the office
 Becomes a woman best. I'll take't upon me;
 If I prove honey-mouthed, let my tongue blister,
 And never to my red-looking anger be
 The trumpet any more. (II.ii.28-34).

Paulina swears that she will use her trumpet-tongue to tell Leontes of the danger of his delusion; she also implies that she is at home in such a role. It can be seen from the beginning of the play that Paulina is dependent on her tongue to control the situation. In assuring Emilia that she will do her utmost to bring about a successful conclusion to her interview with Leontes, she says: 'Tell her Emilia, I'll use that tongue I have' (II.ii.49-50). Paulina instigates

a plan to prove Hermione's innocence and verify the child's paternity to Leontes. She will present the baby at court, asking for the King's blessing, in hope 'he may soften at the sight o' the child: / The silence often of pure innocence, / Persuades, when speaking fails' (II.ii.40-2). Paulina is confident in her rhetorical strategies and she knows what she has to do in order to win Leontes' heart. She seems to know how to use both speech and silence to achieve her goal. Now she becomes Hermione's priestess whose power lies in her medicinal word.

It can be seen that there is a gender separation in this scene since Leontes tries hard to control the speech of female characters. Therefore, when Paulina abandons her silence and obedience and crosses the line to challenge patriarchal authority with her unruly language calling him 'mad' (II.iii.71) and 'a most unworthy and unnatural lord' (II.ii.112), Leontes' rage is homicidal. Paulina's language and character drastically change at this point. Her persuasive and consoling language is replaced with the ferocious speech attacking Leontes for his 'weak-hinged fancy' and 'tyranny' (II.ii.119-120). Now, Leontes wants not only Hermione consigned to the fire but Paulina and the baby girl as well. On the one hand, Paulina is called a 'mankind witch', a woman abrogating male power and force. On the other, Antigonus is softened by sympathy and pity:

You that have been so tenderly officious
With Lady Margery, your midwife there,
To save this bastard's life (II.iii.158-160)

Susan Snyder observes that 'Paulina is seen as midwife-literally 'with-woman'- and Leontes' scornful addition 'your midwife' associates Antigonus as well with the women's party.¹³ The presence of the baby clearly exacerbates Leontes' frenzy. The baby, in Leontes' eye, is not just a 'bastard' but a 'female bastard' (II.iii.174). What he has done so far is to separate or eliminate female characters from his life on the grounds that they jeopardize his ability to control himself and others. In order to silence everyone asking mercy for Hermione and her daughter, Leontes uses his power and authority to control their speech. While Paulina 'come[s] with word as medicinal/ To purge him of that humor that presses him from sleep' (II.iii.37-38), Leontes, in contrast, screams insults 'whose sting is sharper than the sword's' (II.iii.85). Paulina's rhetoric and the presence of the baby fail to persuade the jealous king to

¹³ Susan Snyder, 'Mamillius and Gender Polarization in *The Winter's Tale*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 51.1 (Spring, 1999), 4.

accept the truth. She has to withdraw and be silent until the oracle reveals the innocence of Hermione.

Paulina uses courtly language in her defense of the queen's honor and reason to prove Hermione's innocence. However, Leontes has never been moved by her speech and evidence. He, in contrast, immediately attacks her with insults based upon her sex. He calls her 'witch,' 'crone,' 'callet' and 'gross hag' (II.iii.66, 74,90,106). Paulina crosses the boundary of female virtues, in Leontes' eye because she challenges his power and refuses to be silent. The tragic consequence of her defense of the queen is evident. Her rhetoric provokes Leontes' fury to the point that he wants to see the baby 'instantly consumed with fire' (II.iii.134).

What is intriguing in Act III scene ii is that Paulina tells a lie about the death of Hermione. Paradoxically, throughout the previous scene, when telling truth, she fails to convince Leontes of the innocence of her mistress. But when she tells a lie, the king, his lords, and the audience wholeheartedly believe her words. When realizing that the 'speaking' of truth and the 'silence of innocence' fail to work on the mind of the king, she makes her mark by lying:

I say she's dead; I'll swear't. If word nor oath
Prevail not, go and see. (III.ii.200-201).

Paulina is the first woman in the play whose spoken words, though untrue, command belief. Before Paulina's oath no proof or belief was attached to a woman's word. Women, according to Leontes, 'will say anything' (I.ii.130). After Paulina's oath, Leontes views female speaking differently: 'Go on, go on,' he says to her 'Thou canst not speak too much; I have deserv'd/ All tongues to talk their bitt'rest' (III.ii.214-216). Female speech for the first time in the play, does finally work even though it is a lie. Paulina's lie seems to establish trust in Leontes. At this point, we can see the development of Paulina and her speech. She starts in the role of Hermione's advocate who is confident in her rhetorical power using her persuasive speech to successfully convince the Gaoler to give her access to Emilia and to persuade Hermione to give her the newborn princess. She totally understands the Gaoler's position; therefore, she explains that it is 'lawful' (II.i.11) for her to see Emilia. Moreover, when the Gaoler is afraid that he might be guilty of letting baby out of jail, Paulina again uses 'law' to ease his worries. (II.ii.60). However, when she tries to convince Emilia to tell Hermione about her intention of being Hermione's advocate, her language changes. She uses *ethos* to

establish her credibility as a fluent advocate who has ‘best obedience to the Queen. (II.ii.35). She successfully convinces Hermione to believe that she is an honest and trustful servant whose rhetorical skill is irresistible.

However, Paulina’s use of *ethos* is also evident when she vigorously attempts to persuade Leontes to believe in Hermione’s innocence. She looks at Leontes as her patient who is in need of medication for insomnia and she aims ‘to bring him sleep’ (II.iii.34). Here, Paulina becomes Leontes’ ‘physician’ (II.iii.54) whose words are ‘as medicinal as true’ (II.iii.37). This time she uses *logos* to convince Hermione’s innocence by presenting the baby hoping that he might see the resemblance. And she moves to *pathos* to appeal to Leontes’ emotion when calling Leontes ‘ignoble’ and ‘scandalous to the world’ (II.iii.120-121) trying sincerely to make him feel guilty and shame of his cruelty. Like Hermione later in the trial scene, Paulina also fails to convince Leontes.

What Hermione and Paulina have learnt from the confrontation with the jealous king is that catastrophe and calamity are inevitable if they still participate in the verbal rivalry between male and female. However, after Leontes has accepted Hermione’s innocence and chastity and received Paulina’s tutelage, Paulina starts attacking Leontes with bitter words making the king feel shame and guilt. Leontes’ response is accepting and submissive: ‘Thou didst speak but well/ When most the truth: which I receive much better than to be pitied of thee’ (III.ii.233-235). However, when warned by the lord ‘Say no more, / you have made fault in th’ boldness of your speech’ (III.ii.215-216), Paulina changes her strategy. She adopts play-acting proposing to drop her forthright speech: ‘I’ll say nothing’ (III.ii.230), and identifies herself as a woman subordinate to Leontes-’Now, good my liege, / Sir, royal, sir forgive a foolish woman’ (III.ii.224-5). Paulina knows that Leontes needs to control the speech of others, so she turns his weakness to her advantage. In contrast to her earlier courtly, sincere language in Act II and Hermione’s where both of them fail to persuade Leontes to believe in their statements, in this development, Paulina’s mocking and fictitious language seems to win the heart of Leontes. The appropriate courtly language has less persuasive power compared to the cynical language of Paulina in the trial scene.

Paulina’s roles are similar to those of Emilia in *Othello*. Emilia is a precursor to Paulina. But their fates are different. It can be noted that Emilia is a shrew at the beginning at the play because Iago complains that ‘Sir would she gives you so much of her lips/As of her tongue

oft bestows on me,/ You would have enough' (II.i 100-102). Moreover, her speech about her willingness to cheat on her husband in order to attain wealth and power is shocking while Desdemona finds this idea to be unbelievable. When her husband tells her to 'charm [her] tongue' (V.ii.183), Emilia responds; 'I will not charm my tongue. I am bound to speak.' (V.ii.184). Paulina, in contrast, becomes 'shrewish' when her civil conversation fails. Emilia's speech about her sexual liberation and adultery emphasize the idea that talkativeness equal a potential for sexual promiscuity. Her speech throughout the play is the language of a shrew while Paulina's language has developed from the civil conversation of a court lady to the fierce language of a shrew. Moreover, Emilia's last speech at the end of the play 'So speaking as I think, alas I die' (V.ii.251) indicates that she is punished with death for public speaking which is quite different from Paulina's speech in *The Winter's Tale* where her speech cures not kills.

It can be said that Paulina's words do cure Leontes of his illness eventually but presently he is not ready to listen. When Apollo's oracles are read, Paulina and the innocent victims of Leontes' tyranny are vindicated. Paulina has anticipated the truth of the oracle, as revealed through her actions. As the courtiers and Hermione praise Apollo, Leontes replies, 'There is no truth at all i' the Oracle: / The sessions shall proceed: this is mere falsehood' (III.ii. 139-140). After this response, it is announced that Mamillius has died; the Queen drops dead and Paulina proclaims that 'the news is mortal to the Queen' (III.ii.145). In these two powerful lines, Paulina has changed her position from subject of Leontes to his ruler.

Leontes has a sudden change of heart, recalling his unjust judgments against Polixenes, Hermione and Camillo. But he still must suffer for his actions. Paulina stays with him, reminding him of his sins. His sixteen years of 'saint-like sorrow' are necessary for the recovery of his spiritual integrity and she becomes a kind of image of his penance. Leontes' prolonged penance begins with Paulina's series of rhetorical questions and *litotes*¹⁴ describing his wrong:

What studied torments, tyrant, has for me?
 What wheels? Racks? Fires? What flaying? Boiling?
 In leads or oils? What old or newer torture
 Must I receive, whose every world deserves

¹⁴ Silva Rhetoricae: Deliberate understatement, especially when expressing a thought by denying its opposite.
<http://rhetoric.byu.edu>

To taste of thy most worst?
 ...
 That thou betray'st Polixenes, twas nothing;
 ... nor was't much
 Thou would'st have poison'd good Camillo's honour,
 To have him kill a king...
 The casting forth to crows thy baby daughter,
 To be or none or little;
 ...
 Nor is [thy tyranny] directly laid to thee the death
 Of a young prince (III.ii.175-200).

Paulina starts her attack with a series of rhetorical questions. They make Leontes think about what he had previously done to his wife and his children. The rhetorical questions that Paulina uses are sarcastic and mocking. These rhetorical questions emphasize Leontes' cruelty and tyranny. Paulina's aims here are not to heal or redeem Leontes from guilt and sinfulness but to pierce his conscience and shame him with his foolishness. The language is so fierce that a lord begs her to stop her speech: 'Say no more' (III.ii.216). Shakespeare is doing here is thought-provoking since he not only challenges the Renaissance tradition on female rhetoric, which demands female silence or gracious speech, but also endorses a female verbal attack. Paulina's talkativeness is the example of the positive side of female rhetoric. The healing and restorative power of female rhetoric in *The Winter's Tale* is introduced in order to undermine a notion about early modern women as chaste, silent and obedient, which firmly puts them outside the discursive realm of power.

As Cornelia Ilie argues, rhetorical questions:

are extensively used for opinion manipulation by defending speaker's position and/ or by attacking the opponent's position...[this figure] can be used as ironical, sarcastic or humorous acts.¹⁵

This is exactly how they are being used in this scene. Paulina's rhetorical questions are powerful since they do not allow Leontes to argue further. *Litotes* also gives the affirmation of Leontes' guilt in negative ways which will make Leontes feel more guilty and hurt. For example, her sharp tongue that berates Leontes for the next sixteen years is 'vengeance' enough 'dropp'd down' from Apollo. To us, her rhetorical questions are sarcastic. To Leontes, they are the medicinal words necessary for his first stage of healing.

¹⁵ Cornelia Ilie, *What Else Can I Tell You? A Pragmatic Study of English Rhetorical Questions as Discursive and Argumentative Acts* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1994), p. 224.

Although the notion that rhetoric can be healing, rather than merely persuasive, may seem surprising, as John T. McNeill has argued a therapeutic concept has in fact been long discussed in classical rhetoric.¹⁶ Indeed, for these thinkers, it can be said that rhetoric and the art of healing are inseparably connected. James and Tita Baumlín also reveal vital connections between rhetoric and therapeutic art.¹⁷ Aaron Beck, also observes the connection between these medicine and rhetoric, explaining that psychologists can use rhetoric when offering ‘alternative rules for the patient’s consideration,’¹⁸

Therapeutic rhetoric focuses on how to benefit from the feeling of guilt and failure and how to make those experiences bearable or even beneficial. David Payne explains that ‘failure and rhetoric are necessarily and fundamentally related’. Therapeutic rhetoric, according to Payne can help us to re-conceive pain and suffering or negative experiences as ‘opportunities for self-growth and change.’¹⁹ James and Tita Baumlín also note that ‘one uses rhetoric for many purposes to express, to create, to praise, to blame, to analyze, to explore, to doubt, to destroy, to curse . . . to cure and heal.’²⁰ Healing by using rhetoric is emphasized in Shakespeare’s romances because it can lead to the restorative and redemptive atmosphere at the end of the play.

Paulina has made it very clear from the beginning of the play that she is Leontes’ ‘physician’ (II.iii.54), and that her ‘word’ is ‘medicinal’ (II.iii.37). Her role as his spiritual mentor emphasizes her reproofing manner and wisdom in discerning Apollo’s will. Already she is Leontes’ physician, but during the time of his quiescence, she becomes more conscious of her role as a restorer. Leontes’ reliance on her is necessary for his and his family’s recovery, and her repeated acts of faith make possible the restoration occurring at the end of the play.

Following her reprimand of Leontes, Paulina reiterates the certainty of the Queen’s death and again points up the King’s cardinal sins:

... I’ll serve you
As I would do the gods. But, O thou tyrant!

¹⁶ See John T. McNeill, *A History of Cure of Souls* (New York: Harper and Row, 1951), pp. 27-30

¹⁷ James and Tita Baumlín, ‘Psyche/Logos: Mapping the Terrains of Mind and Rhetoric’, *College English*, 51 (1989), 245-61.

¹⁸ Aaron Beck, *Cognitive Therapy and the Emotional Disorders* (New York: Penguin Book, 1991), p. 256.

¹⁹ David Payne, *Coping with Failure: Therapeutic Use of Rhetoric* (South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press 1989), p. 44, 147 and 154.

²⁰ James and Baumlín, p. 259.

Do not repent these things, for they are heavier
Than all thy woe can stir: therefore betake thee
To nothing but despair. A thousand knees
Ten thousand years together, naked fasting,
Upon a barren mountain, and still water
In storm perpetual, could not move the gods
To look that way thou wert. (III.ii.203-14).

Dramatic irony is significant in this speech: Paulina does serve Leontes 'as [she] would do the gods.' She guides him toward faith in Apollo's words and their journey together stretches out for sixteen years as he listens to her caustic reminders about his sins. Considering Paulina's role as truth-teller, we also believe that Hermione is dead, and Leontes, in comparison, is living a death-in-life existence as the impotent king of Sicily. But Paulina has a plan whereby he can rid himself of his sin and guilt. Her rhetoric in this passage is overstated. The image of Leontes 'naked fasting, / Upon a barren mountain' during a wintry storm is a metaphorical representation of his fallow sixteen year existence as the debilitated king of Sicily. Though Paulina speaks figuratively, Leontes does experience despair and 'saint-like sorrow' for a long time.

The last scene of the play is dominated by Paulina's actions. Perdita's identity is discovered and she and Florizel, Camillo and Polixenes are happily reconciled with Leontes. Reunions take place among the alienated or separated family members and Paulina invites everyone to her house for the unveiling of the Queen's statue. Paulina directs the reunion of Hermione and Leontes, coaxing Hermione, the representation of art, to move and Leontes, art's spectator, to perceive. Paulina's repeated references to the 'curtain' frame Hermione's resurrection as a theatrical process, while her famous line - 'It is required / You do awake your faith' (V.iii.94-95) invites the audience's wonder. Echoing the theatrical directions Camillo gave the young prince and princess in Act IV scene iv, Paulina stages the reconnection of husband and wife, framing their reunion with a music cue then directing the action with short, powerful commands that both King and Queen silently obey:

Music, awake her; strike!
'Tis time. Descend. Be stone no more. Approach.
Strike all that look upon with marvel. Come,
I'll fill your grave up. Stir, nay, come away,
Bequeath to death your numbness, for from him

Dear life redeems you. – You perceive she stirs. [*Hermione comes down.*]
Start not. Her actions shall be as holy as
You hear my spell is lawful. Do not shun her
Until you see her die again, for then
You kill her double. Nay, present your hand.
When she was young you wooed her. Now in age
Is she become the suitor? [*Leontes touches her.*] (V.iii.98-109)

Paulina's words as she coaxes Hermione down - 'I'll fill your grave up,' followed shortly by 'Dear life redeems you' – affirm Kiernan Ryan's reading; Hermione's stone tomb becomes obsolete the moment she is redeemed by live action.²¹ In this scene it can be seen that Paulina guides these physical actions, speaking almost entirely in commanding verbs and telling her queen to 'Descend,' 'Come,' and 'Stir'. Turning towards Leontes once Hermione begins to move, she instructs him as one would instruct an audience; he must 'perceive,' 'hear,' and 'present [his] hand.' Their reanimation is necessarily simultaneous: Paulina directs the queen and king in one uninterrupted string of commands, inviting Hermione to move towards Leontes in the same breath that she restores his ability to behold her.

Up to this moment, Paulina has proven through her words and deeds that she is 'the great comfort' of Leontes' life. Her constancy has upheld Leontes and perpetuated his changes from tyrant to penitent sinner and remorseful father. But her last role as a magician or physician reiterates the power of her active faith. Paulina's therapeutic powers are a prototypical manifestation of the god's power in human affairs. Her faith has linked her with the restorative energy that characterizes divine power. When she asks that music be played, Paulina wants her audience to become aware of the harmony of this reunion about to manifest itself in Hermione's resurrection. Paulina's magic has restored Hermione to life and, in turn, has provided Leontes with an opportunity to correct his moral and spiritual perspective. He has walked for a brief moment, 'by faith and not by sight.' As a result he has been rewarded with a resurrected wife whose 'holy actions' he learns to acknowledge. In assuming the role of protector, gallerist, director, and cleric, Paulina contributes to Shakespeare's elevation of the lost feminine in this scene. Throughout the play, Paulina functions as a representative of moral and female authority, one initially resisted but restored to prominence in the final

²¹ Kiernan Ryan, *Shakespeare: The Last Plays* (New York: Longman, 1999), p. 5.

scenes. Paulina dominates Act V scene i and ii, reducing Leontes, who spent the first half of the play criticizing her as a loudmouth gossip, to relative silence.

The final scene of the play shows that Paulina has completed her work when she reveals the statue of Hermione sixteen years after her death. Her biting language seems to disappear in the final scene. However, the linguistic rebuke has been transformed to a 'visual rebuke' when Leontes comments:

As now she might have done,
So much to my good comfort as it is
Now piercing to my soul. O, thus she stood,
Even with such life of majesty-warm life,
As now I coldly stands-when first I wooed her.
I am ashamed. Does not the stone rebuke me
For being more stone than it? O royal piece!
There's magic in thy majesty, which has
My evil conjured to remembrance... (V.iii.32-41)

Huston Diehl persuasively argues that there is a close relation between her relentless rebuke or 'vehement speeches' and 'her astounding theatrical spectacle' in the final scene. Diehl notes that the 'statue does not comfort or bless Leontes; it shames him, unsettles his senses and pierces his soul'²² It reminds him of his cruelty and foolishness. I agree with this insight. Paulina's language might be fierce and biting in stirring Leontes' guilt and sinfulness but the statue as a theatrical spectacle also plays the role of 'visual rebuke.' But I argue further in the last part of this chapter that the redemption does not come from Paulina's vehement language or the statue but from Hermione's gesture and silence.

Nonetheless, despite all of this, the ending of the play seems to be problematic not only with the final silence of Hermione but also that of Paulina when Leontes rewards her by marrying her to Camillo, without her consent. The silence of female characters of the play is very problematic and powerful since it controls the atmosphere of the play's ending. It is to this troubling topic that I now finally turn.

²² Huston Diehl, "Does not this stone rebuke me?" The Pauline Rebuke and Paulina's lawful magic in *The Winter's Tale* in *Shakespeare and the Cultures of Performance*, eds. by Paul Yachnin and Patricia Badir (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), p.79.

III

The Female Rhetoric of Silence

In the final scene of the play, what happens to Paulina is truly awkward and surprising. Paulina who censures Leontes on Hermione's behalf, now withdraws. She is no longer a counselor to both king and queen and announces that she will spend her time grieving for her lost husband:

I, an old turtle,
Will wing me to some withered bough, and there
My mate, that's never to be found again,
Lament till I am lost (V.iii.131-134).

Now Paulina, who is a lonely widow is dedicated to mourning her dead husband. However, Leontes seems to have a plan for her. He uses his prerogative to give her a husband.

O peace, Paulina.

Thou shouldst a husband take by my consent,
As I by thine a wife....Come, Camillo,
And take her by the hand (V.iii.135-142).

It is often thought that the couples are rather hurriedly married off to each other as a convenient way of extending the comic harmony. Leontes interrupts her plan in lamenting her lost husband by imposing upon her a husband. Indeed, there is nothing in the text to prepare us for the joining of Paulina and Camillo. Why does Leontes need to find a husband for Paulina at the end of the play? Perhaps Leontes gives Paulina a husband as a reward for her loyalty but without asking her consent. The same problem again happens in the final scene of the play. How is it that Paulina, a gifted rhetorician, like Marina in *Pericles*, and Isabella in *Measure for Measure* becomes mute when she is offered in marriage to the Duke. If we believe that feminist criticism tries to change women's position in society by challenging male rules and power, then Paulina's role as a feminist character depends on how one is to interpret the meaning of silence. Christina Luckyj successfully argues that silence is not the only sign of chastity, obedience and modesty which are regarded as feminine values but also a gesture of resistance, disobedience and seductiveness.

Jessica Murphy in 'Feminine Virtue's Network of Influence in Early Modern England,' persuasively argues that 'early modern women were not taught to be unquestioningly obedient, but rather that they had a responsibility and its power that the

authors [of conduct literature] concentrate on in their prescriptions.’²³ She argues further that a virtuous woman can change people during her life through her goodness. According to Murphy the feminine virtue is so prominent in the marriage manuals which are always performative. What makes a woman good is the repeated performance of her obedience. Although it can be internalized and a woman can presumably be always thinking obedient thoughts, she must always perform her duty-publicly and domestically for her virtue to be clear and acknowledged. However, Paulina’s silence in this scene is can be seen both as a final performance of feminine virtue and as the wonder for the audience. Throughout the play, Paulina is seen as a rhetorician, a counselor and when she has become silent at the end of the play, the audience seems to wonder what has happened to talkative Paulina. Paulina, who has spent her last 16 years reforming the repentant king, seems to understand her position as a widow. It is possible that Paulina’s silence can be read as a sign of obedience or a sign of discontent. Moreover, the ambiguity of silence simultaneously gives Paulina a chance to assert her feminine virtue which requires performing submission and obedience and show her resistance to Leontes’ order.

After Leontes has been healed from his spiritual infection by the therapeutic power of Paulina’s rhetoric and restored as a father to an heir of the kingdom by the reunion with Perdita, he needs one more thing to complete his selfhood which is the redemptive power of his wife. The resurrection of Hermione is necessary to create the atmosphere of the romance because Leontes needs to be redeemed and forgiven by his wife. However, the final speech Hermione speaks in the play is not addressed to Leontes; in contrast, she speaks to her daughter instead this is because silence leaves women open to manipulation. As Elizabeth Harvey writes of the silent hysteric, ‘Her ‘voice’ and special propensity for language is transformed into a kind of somatic dumb show, making her particularly dependent upon the men who must translate her bodily signs into language.’²⁴ Given its multiple signifiers, the language of silence is subjected to a complex translation.

It is true that Hermione’s silence towards her husband can be interpreted both as a sign of resistance and indicator of submissiveness, even though her body language in the final scene can direct the interpretation of her silence in a positive way, it does not indicate redemption

²³ Jessica Murphy, ‘Feminine Virtue’s Network of Influence in Early Modern England’, *Studies in Philology*, 109.3 (Spring, 2012), 260.

²⁴ Elizabeth Harvey, *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts* (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 66.

or forgiveness. Though Polixenes notes that Hermione does ‘embrace him’ (V.iii.112), and Camillo also says that ‘she hangs about his neck!’ (V.iii.113), here, Hermione refuses to address Leontes directly. When Camillo demands that: ‘if she pertain to life, let her speak too!’ (V.iii.114), Paulina responds: ‘it appears she lives, / Though yet she speak not’ (V.iii.117-118). Leontes really needs to hear Hermione’s voice again, the voice that he used to disdain to hear:

What to speak
I am content to hear; for ‘tis as easy
To make her speak as move (V.iii.90-93).

In contrast, Hermione is interested in having a conversation with her daughter rather than speaking to her husband. Her final speech is addressed to her daughter which can be seen as her resistance towards patriarchal authority. Despite her comparatively short speech in the final scene, Hermione makes a very considerable suggestion of her negative attitude towards her husband. She does not say anything to Leontes because she might have learnt the lesson from past experience that her suffering and calamity in part derived from her rhetorical superiority; therefore, she chooses to address her daughter instead. She does not move when men want her to move and she refuses to speak even when they command her to speak. She does move and speak when Paulina says so. Indeed, it is Paulina who actively presents, even *gives*, Hermione to Leontes as she claims possession of the prized image, which she keeps apart, a secret whose value is revealed only by being circulated.²⁵ Moreover, Paulina’s action of drawing back the curtain that seductively hides the sculpture intensifies the incredulity of the moment, augmenting its meaning and value for both the audience and Leontes. As Paulina advertises to Leontes her ability to animate the statue, she insists that her work, her labor to produce the real Hermione, is lawful business. Here, Paulina appears to be less of a marriage counselor or powerful witch, and more a persuasive merchant attempting to sell Hermione to Leontes, the interested buyer. As Paulina’s language performs the revivification, her speech gradually imbuing the statue with life, she shrewdly names her price: ‘It is required / You do awake your faith’ (V.iii.118-9). The price of reconciliation, named by Paulina, can only be for Leontes to reawaken his need for Hermione, his fidelity toward her, and his deepest acceptance of her abiding loyalty. Given Leontes’s deeply rooted mistrust of

²⁵ Consider especially Paulina’s insistence of her ownership over the statue: — ‘Indeed, my lord, / If I had thought the sight of my poor image / Would thus have wrought you – for the stone is mine - / I’d not have showed it’ (V.iii.67-71).

women, to abandon that mistrust and —embrace a stronger belief in female honor may be the costliest price he has ever paid.²⁶

As the statue quickens, it is Paulina again who must direct the action, instructing both the statue Hermione and Leontes on how to interact. As Hermione comes down from her display stand, Paulina directs him: ‘Nay, present your hand. / When she was young, you wooed her; now in age / Is she become the suitor?’ (V.iii.133-5). Yet again, Shakespeare plays with recurring images. Whereas in Act I Leontes doubtfully preoccupied with Hermione’s hands, thinking about her ‘paddling palms and pinching fingers’ (1.2.146), now he must present his hand to her, a sign not only of trust and acceptance, but the re-establishing of their marriage. Charles Frey explains the significance of Leontes’s touching of Hermione’s hand, suggesting that ‘it is the crowning proof of his own rebirth for he, too, is touched alive like the new-waking Adam.’²⁷ Indeed, as in the first act, ‘language and passion wrench reality...into a new form,’²⁸ shaping Hermione anew from the hard stone into a living being. No longer is she the cold commodity he purchased, but life and flesh, albeit silent.

Hermione’s silence hauntingly echoes her own initial silence in Act I, and indeed the silence of the voyeurs at the statue’s ghostly appearance. Friedman reads Hermione’s silence as evidence of her returned status as the ‘good wife, who patiently accepts and forgives all the hardship purposefully inflicted upon her without a word of recrimination for Leontes’²⁹

Hermione’s reluctance to speak as signifying ‘a tension between husband and wife’³⁰ is an uneasiness that stands in contrast to the queen’s verbalized affection for the also newly returned Perdita. Adding perhaps more melodrama to the tragicomedy than necessary, Matchett believes that Hermione’s silence ‘becomes the final language, the language of love and forgiveness which all can understand, the wordless communion in which the exchange is most complete.’³¹ This interpretation assumes, however, that Hermione does forgive and that her *silence*, rather than her quickening presence itself or her active physical gestures, serves

²⁶ Micheal D Friedman, ‘The World Must Be People’, *Shakespeare’s Comedies of Forgiveness* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2002), p. 221.

²⁷ Charles Frey, ‘Shakespeare’s Imperiled and Chastening Daughters of Romance’, *South Atlantic Bulletin*, 43.4 (Nov., 1978), 125-140.

²⁸ Neely, p. 336.

²⁹ Freidman, p. 226.

³⁰ Sarah Dewar-Watson, ‘The Alcestis and the Statue Scene in *The Winter’s Tale*’, *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 60.1 (2009), 77.

³¹ William Matchett, ‘Some Dramatic Techniques in *The Winter’s Tale*’, *Shakespeare Survey*, 22 (1969), 93-107.

as the indicator of such forgiveness; silence itself is viewed as the culmination of the redemptive process, a process that, much like Leontes's unmitigated jealousy, we cannot understand. Indeed, with the final scene Shakespeare 'stages a miracle – not just her coming back to life, if she does, but her forgiving Leontes.'³² Presented as a miracle, the inspiration behind such is never fully rendered, but tucked away behind Paulina's curtain once more. If we are to understand, as Hermione later states, that Paulina has preserved her in secret for sixteen years, then it is reasonable to assume that Hermione is in on the presentation of herself as a statue.

Thus, Hermione commodifies herself as an object to be presented to Leontes for the sake of her marriage, for the purpose of reunification. Using the appearance of a commodity, she allows him to re-establish his position of authority and ownership over the statue, but upon her quickening, it is Hermione who actively participates in giving a new method of self-expression. Keenly understanding the symbolic economy of which she is a part, Hermione is able to utilize the male conception of woman in order to negotiate a reconciliation with Leontes in true ideal female fashion: without the *appearance* of agency, without the appearance of recrimination. Indeed, for Hermione, speech has been the ultimate vehicle for expressing agency, an instrumentality that triggered her own annihilation. Moreover, as Enterline proposes, 'the language she 'understand [s] not' limits the field of her possible responses; and any answer she makes must still be read by him, a reading she cannot control.'³³ Therefore, instead of speaking, Hermione exercises Paulina's instructions, becoming the 'suitor' by actively embracing Leontes, expressing her own agency and establishing a new way of forgiveness. This embrace, however, is not presented as a stage direction, but rather as the breathless wonder of Polixenes. William Matchett interprets Bohemia's line as his 'marveling that Hermione, of all people, is forgiving Leontes, of all people, after the unforgivable way he had treated her.'³⁴ By having Polixenes verbalize this moment between husband and wife emphasizes his unique position as the close-outsider, intimate with the couple, yet not disruptive of their union. Moreover, as the onlookers marvel at Hermione's embrace of Leontes, Camillo gasps, 'she hangs about his neck' (V.ii.112),³⁵ but this hanging now registers as appropriate for it is Leontes's neck upon which Hermione

³² William Matchett, *Shakespeare and Forgiveness* (Santa Barbara: Fithian Press, 2002), p. 33.

³³ Enterline, p. 22.

³⁴ Matchett, p. 34.

³⁵ Indeed, even this phrasing suggests agency while giving the impression of objectification. While Hermione actively hangs, this use of the verb doesn't take an object, as Hermione herself appears to be the object, an item owned and worn by Leontes.

dangles. This purposeful physical intimacy by Hermione thereby re-affirms her fidelity to Leontes, who in turn remains silent.³⁶

As if still acting under Paulina's tutelage, Hermione turns to address Perdita.³⁷ Slow to speak, her first words exalt the gods, a subtle reference to Hermione's insistence on being judged by Apollo rather than Leontes's cruel reign. Once she addresses her long-lost daughter, Hermione asks the questions that everyone desires to know about her own self: how she has been preserved and returned here. Her words are commanded, however, by Paulina, who encourages everyone to leave 'precious winners all' (V.iii.165), emphasizing their newly gained possessions and newly acquired statuses. She assures everyone, including the audience that all the details will be sorted out later and need not be explicated here and now.

At this thought, however, Leontes finally speaks. Though Leontes seems to have 'lost his old habits of abstraction and categorization'³⁸ while marveling at the statue's magnificence, his appreciation for the uniqueness of the sculpture stands in stark contrast to his minimal expression of regret, or indeed of anything, to Hermione herself. While Leontes claims that he is 'content' to look on and hear whatever the statue may perform, once Hermione awakens, Leontes barely interacts with her, re-focusing his attention on Paulina's unbridled status.³⁹ Leontes, who has suffered Paulina's bitter tongue for the past sixteen years, finally speaks not to praise or beg forgiveness from his wife, but to silence Paulina through the 'verbal subordination of marriage'⁴⁰ to Camillo. Leontes seizes this moment to reassert himself as the Authority figure, gagging the only voice that actively reproached him for his crimes. Similar to the Comedies of Forgiveness, the disparity between Leontes's culpability and his punishment is enormous, yet this gap is seemingly closed by the sharpness of Paulina's tongue. With her constant reminders, Paulina personified Leontes's conscience, exacerbating his mental suffering.

³⁶ Neely reads a lot into this moment and Leontes's lack of stage directions, actions, or speech, stating that 'Leontes must respond to Hermione, acknowledge her, and this, at first, he cannot do. Although he has been able to face her image, her ghost, her statue, he turns away from her when she appeals physically to him for acceptance; his shame is not yet vanquished, his seeing of her not yet clear' (337).

³⁷ Perdita, like her mother, is reluctant to speak up in mixed company, but like her father does not speak at all to Hermione, only to the statue, addressing it as 'Lady, / Dear queen' (V.iii.52-3). This wordless presence at the fleshly Hermione stands in contrast to the apparent intimacy they share in statue form. Indeed, as Dewar-Watson observes, 'Perdita also takes on a statuesque character 'Standing like stone with thee' (V.iii.48), which suggest a peculiar bond with her mother -warm in its intimacy, yet cold and static in its lack of animation' (76).

³⁸ Neely, p. 332.

³⁹ Indeed, Enterline views Paulina as 'a domestic version of the Bacchic horde' (29), whose tongue is uncontrollable by men.

⁴⁰ Friedman, p. 227.

Hermione's only speech to Perdita indicates that she no longer trusts men's words. Here in the final act she asks for divine 'grace' to be poured on her daughter's head.⁴¹ The speech of blessing and the silence of forgiveness is the most appropriate rhetoric for Hermione in order to establish the female courtly ideal where female rhetoric is no longer a threat to the patriarchy. Hermione's silence and gesture becomes signs of forgiveness creating the redemptive atmosphere of the play. The redemptive power at the end of the play is noted by Paulina:

Music, awake her; strike!
Tis time; descend; be stone no more; approach;
Strike all that look upon with marvel. Come!
I will fill your grave up: stir, nay, come away!
Bequeath to death your numbness; for from him
Dear life redeems you. You perceive she stirs (V.iii.98-103).

According to the OED, the word 'redeem' means 'to regain' or 'to recover' and it also means 'to rescue, save or deliver'.⁴² Hermione does not only come alive to redeem her husband but 'dear life' in this context will also redeem her. In this scene, Hermione plays both the redeemed and the redeemer. Both Leontes and Hermione regain their status as husband and wife and recover from painful experience. In Julia Reinhardt has used *The Winter's Tale* to explore the different viewpoints of Auden and Arendt on forgiveness.⁴³ For Auden forgiveness involves 'manifestation in action while Arendt proposes that forgiveness must be uttered. I do not agree with Lupton's proposal when she argues that Hermione 'withhold[s] or delay[s] forgiveness' (642). I am not convinced by her support of Arendt's idea of forgiveness which is an action that always involves speech. Hermione's only speech to Perdita indicates that she no longer trusts men's words. Here in the final act she asks for divine 'grace' to be poured on her daughter's head. The speech of blessing and the silence of forgiveness is the most appropriate rhetoric for Hermione in order to establish the female courtly ideal where female rhetoric is no longer a threat to the patriarchy. Hermione's silence

⁴¹ Bruce W. Young points out that more than twelve times the word 'grace' has been used by different characters. Bruce W. Young, 'Ritual as an Instrument of Grace: Parental Blessings in *Richard III*, *All's Well that Ends Well* and *The Winter's Tale*', in *True Rites and Maimed Rites: Ritual and Anti-Ritual in Shakespeare and His Age*, ed. by Linda Woodbridge and Edward Berry (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992), pp. 169-200.

⁴² 'redeem v.' *OED Online*. Oxford University Press 30 April 2013 <<http://dictionary.oed.com/>>.

⁴³ See Julia Reinhardt Lupton, 'Judging Forgiveness: Hannah Arendt, W.H. Auden, and *The Winter's Tale*', *New Literary History*, 45:4 (2014), 641-63.

and gesture: 'she embraces him' and 'she hangs about his neck,' (V.iii.139-140) becomes signs of forgiveness creating the redemptive atmosphere of the play. Hermione exercises Paulina's instructions, becoming the 'suitor' by actively embracing Leontes, expressing her own agency and establishing a new way of forgiveness. This embrace, however, is not presented as a stage direction, but rather as the breathless wonder of Polixenes. By having Polixenes verbalize this moment between husband and wife emphasizes his unique position as the close-outsider, intimate with the couple, yet not disruptive of their union. When Camillo reports that Hermione 'hangs about his neck,' it also recalls Leontes' heated jealousy when he snaps: 'Why, he that wears her like her medal, hanging / about his neck – Bohemia' (I.ii.374-5). Hermione is obviously rescued and saved by her daughter while Leontes is saved by his reunion with his wife. This reconciliation and reunion between family members cannot be fulfilled if he is not cured from his spiritual infection by Paulina. Her therapeutic power of female rhetoric will cure Leontes from disease before he is restored at the end of the play.

However, Paulina's silence at the end of the plays is also problematic. She seems to be speechless when Leontes rewards her with a husband. Valerie Traub, points out that 'rather than being a victory for the wronged heroine, the final scene works as wish fulfillment for Leontes, who not only regains his virtuous wife and loses his burden of guilt, but also resumes his kingly command of all social relations including control over Paulina.'⁴⁴ Paulina's silence seems to signify her submissiveness to Leontes's authority. After regaining his wife and marrying his daughter to Florizel, Leontes exercises his power again by marrying Paulina to Camillo. Diane Dixon posits:

Shakespeare, still caught in the pairing off convention at the end of his romantic comedies, cannot be content to leave Paulina alone in her PMZ (postmenopausal zeal) power. The relative chaos she releases with her 'unbridled tongue' may be contained to some extent as she is married to Camillo.⁴⁵

Paulina now returns to the position of a wife who is under control of her new husband. However, since silence is subject to interpretation. I would argue that Paulina's silence might signify her wonder. When she draws a curtain to show the statue of Hermione, she notices Leontes' reaction and says: 'I like your silence; it the more shows off/ Your wonder'

⁴⁴ Valerie Traub, 'Jewels, Statues, and Corpses: Containment of Female Erotic Power in Shakespeare's Plays', in *Shakespeare and Gender: A History*, ed. by Baker and Kamps (London: Versw Roman"/>

⁴⁵ Diane M. Dixon, "'Away With That Audacious Lady': Paulina's Rhetoric in *The Winter's Tale*.' *Journal of the Wooden O Symposium*, 4 (2004), 43.

(V.iii.22-23). Both Leontes and Paulina do not expect what they receive from each other. It is very difficult to interpret Paulina's silence as a sign of submission or resistance because female silence is in Brathewait's phrase 'a moving Rhetoricke,' a signifier which fluctuates uncontrollably from chastity to promiscuity, obedience to defiance. The various meaning of female silence means that people especially men could interpret them for their own ends. With multiple signifiers, the language of silence is often beyond translation.

Chapter IV

Redemption and Forgiveness in *The Tempest*

In *Pericles*, *Cymbeline* and *The Winter's Tale*, the relationships between father and daughter are almost identical - a lost daughter is found, and the marriage of the daughter ends the play with happiness. Marina and Perdita are lost and found by their fathers; Thaisa, Imogen and Hermione die and are reborn. The motif of the return of female characters is a basic structural element in *The Winter's Tale* and is important to two of the other three romances: *Cymbeline* and *Pericles*. The reunion between fathers and daughters and the marriage of the daughters in these plays are necessary since they not only lead to a happy ending, but also underscore the theme of redemption and regeneration in each play. The redemption derives directly from the recovery of the daughters and wives (in the case of *Pericles* and *The Winter's Tale*) whose feminine redemptive power is evident.

Again, in *The Tempest*, the theme of regeneration and redemption, so prominent in the previous romances, reappears. Like the previous romances, the daughter in this play plays a vital role as a redemptive figure. Although the separation of father and daughter never happens, and in the end, the daughter returns to her native Italy, not to her father, as Prospero puts it: 'I have lost my daughter...in this last tempest' (V.i.147, 153),¹ the atmosphere of redemption can be felt through the figure of the daughter in the play. It is notable that while the daughters in the previous three romances are the most fully developed redeemers in the whole Shakespeare canon, Miranda in *The Tempest* plays a similar role. Miranda's redemptive power is shown in Prospero's comment:

O, a cherubim
Thou wast that did preserve me. Thou didst smile.
Infused with a fortitude from heaven,
When I have deck'd the sea with drops full salt,
Under my burthen groan'd; which raised in me
An undergoing stomach, to bear up
Against what should ensue.(I.ii.152-8).

The idea of rebirth is also apparent in *The Tempest*- this remains an ongoing concern for Shakespeare. Prospero is restored in the same way as Pericles, Cymbeline and Leontes but

¹ Prospero's language here is obviously different from that of Pericles, Cymbeline and Leontes in the scene of recognition.

there are differences too. For instance, while the previous three romances explore the feminine redemptive power in rescuing the patriarchal figures, *The Tempest*, examines this important recurrent motif and explores the balance between femininity and masculinity. The only female character who is able to utter her speech in the play is Miranda, and her speech as a daughter is relatively different from those in the previous three romances. This difference is important, I argue, because in *The Tempest*, Shakespeare, in observing the struggle between masculine and feminine power, seems to emphasize how the female character tries to assert her agency and autonomy by challenging the privilege and the legitimacy of patriarchal authority, and remarkably, it is this kind of challenge that ultimately helps to redeem and restore Prospero to his proper place at the end of the play.

In this chapter, I argue that Shakespeare is using the father-daughter dynamic in a way that is different from the three previous romances. The redemptive power of femininity is still the main concern in this play. However, the power of femininity is emphasized throughout the play by Prospero's treatment of his daughter Miranda, who is the only human female character. Even though Miranda is on stage very little and hardly participates in the play, when she does, her speech is not only instructive and assertive but is also restorative. By her assertion of agency and autonomy with her restorative power, Miranda becomes one of the most interesting female characters in Shakespeare's plays.

As I noted in the introduction, *The Tempest* is usually described as a romance; however, this generic classification has shaped its reading in an unhelpful way. The critics usually look at the relationship between Prospero and Miranda in the same way as father-daughter relationships in the previous three romances, and the assumption of Miranda's redemptive power has become pervasive in Shakespearean scholarship.² I am not the first to make the case for the redemptive power of Miranda, or to align *The Tempest* with other romances. However, my focus differs because I pay particular attention to the significance of female

² Critics are likely to associate Miranda with the previous three daughters in romances and also see her as a redemptive figure that has redeemed her father and restored his dukedom at the end of the play. See Lagretta Tallent Lenker, *Fathers and Daughters in Shakespeare and Shaw*, (West Port: Greenwood Place, 2001); Cyrus Hoy, 'Fathers and Daughters in Shakespeare's Romances', in *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, ed. by Carol McGinnis Kay and Henry E. Jacobs (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978), pp. 77-90; Francis Fergusson, *Shakespeare: The Pattern in His Carpe*, (New York: Delacorte Place, 1970), pp. 287-312 and Ann Thomson, 'Miranda, Where's your Sister: Reading Shakespeare's *The Tempest*', in *Feminist Criticism: Theory and Practice*, ed. by Susan Sellers, Linda Hutcheon and Paul Perron (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), p. 48.

speech in the play, arguing that the redemptive power of Miranda can be found in her rhetoric. Her speeches signify not only female agency, rebellion and autonomy, but also restoration and redemption.

I will start my chapter with *The Tempest* by exploring the relationship between father and daughter in the play and by identifying the similarities and differences between the relationship of Prospero and Miranda and those of the previous three romances. I would propose that Miranda is central to Prospero in the restoration of his dukedom, and that she plays the role of redemptive daughter through her use of language. What Shakespeare focuses on is the way she handles the patriarchal power with which he tries to have control and influence over her. It is very clear that Miranda's speech in the play reflects her attempt to assert her agency and autonomy, especially when she disobeys her father and declares her love for Ferdinand. This moment is important since it not only indicates Miranda's autonomy, but also represents her struggle against patriarchal authority. By refusing to be passive and controlled by her father in the wooing scene, she bravely presents herself as a wooer whose sexual desire is more powerful than the restrictions of patriarchal ideology. I would argue that in the play, Miranda successfully overcomes the tendency of masculine power to control female sexuality, emotion and speech. In this play, Miranda becomes not only a redeemer of the father who creates a redemptive atmosphere, but also an agent in helping Prospero to restore his dukedom. Her ability in asserting her agency allows her to show compassion and mercy which is very important in redeeming and restoring Prospero at the end of the play. Prospero's abandonment of vengeance and his embracement of compassion and mercy can be seen as a sign of forgiveness at the end of the play.

I

“Are you not my father?”

Before exploring Miranda's ability to assert her agency, declare her independence and redeem her father, it is very important to closely examine Prospero both as a father and a political figure. The close analysis of Prospero's decision and behavior will help us to understand the process of redemption at the end of the play. His past experience as the Duke of Milan taught him a lesson about the power politics in his state, and he is obsessed with the controlling power. *The Tempest*, like *Pericles*, is a romance that employs the motif of a journey through extreme peril on the sea to miraculous regeneration on land. The play begins

with a shipwreck at sea, an apparent disaster which is harmlessly metamorphosed into serenity and reunion in the end. Also, the story of Prospero and Miranda, like the adventure of Pericles and Marina, is a romance narrative of how their 'sea sorrow' (I.ii.170) was transformed 'By providence divine' (I.ii.159) into their present joy in perfect unity, the wishful fantasy of King Lear, who is waiting for his daughter for redemption. Lear's longing for Cordelia's feminine virtue to 'redeem all sorrows / That ever I[Lear] have ever felt' (V.iii..267-68) is fully realized in *Pericles*, where Marina restores Pericles to a full sense of happiness and where Pericles identifies himself with feminine qualities.

In contrast to *Pericles*, *The Tempest*, seemingly centered on a dominant male figure, a manipulative, powerful magician, depicts a notably masculine world which tries to exclude not only female characters (except Miranda), but also benign, generative, creative feminine power. Several critics have investigated the absence of a human adult female figure in the play.³ In Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, Prospero's power to control is very pervasive and dominant. Any critical approach which tries to understand the politics of the play must be drawn to the issue of control because Prospero is shown to exercise this power so absolutely, particularly in relation to his daughter, servant and slave. For example, when Miranda curiously asks him more questions, he puts her to sleep. However, his daughter, servant and slave have their own ways of dealing with Prospero. Since my main concern is how Miranda challenges her father's manipulative authority and how she can get away with it, it is pivotal to fully understand the construction of authority in the play.

The question of who rules and who has the power to control is in fact a key theme in the play that is introduced in the first scene of the play. 'Boatswain' is the first word of the play, spoken by the master of a ship about to go down in a storm. He orders the Boatswain to 'speak to th' mariners,' and then is silent for the rest of the play (I.i.3). This prompts King Alonso and Duke Antonio, the two figures of civil authority aboard the ship, to ask the question: 'Where is the master?' (I.i.9, 12) This question is very important because it turns *The Tempest* 'into an anatomy of rule and authority. Scene by scene the question is implicitly

³ See Ann Thompson, 'Miranda, Where's Your Sister?: Reading Shakespeare's *The Tempest*', in *Feminist Criticism: Theory and Practice*, ed. by Susan Sellers (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), pp. 45-55; Mary Beth Rose, 'Where are the Mothers in Shakespeare? Options for Gender Representation in the English Renaissance', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 42.3, 291-314 and Janet Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to The Tempest* (London: Routledge, 1991).

or explicitly posed and dramatized on different levels such as those of service, the family and the state.’⁴

The Boatswain, however, responds to his sovereign ambiguously as well as defiantly: ‘Do you not hear him?’ You mar our labour: keep your cabins, you do assist the storm’ (I. i.13-14). The Boatswain implies that he is the one speaking to them; it is he who is ‘master’ of the situation, not the boat’s captain who is the legitimate authority on board, because at this moment, he is the most competent to save them. In the midst of disaster, the King and the Duke look for a figure of conventional authority but find instead one whom they conceive to be merely the instrument of power. In the presence of the force of the elements, those who command under normal circumstances are reduced to subjects - they must obey the Boatswain to save themselves, or so they believe. Alonso, the King of Naples, has no power over nature and no skill as a mariner, but he attempts to assert his legitimate authority: ‘Good boatswain, have care, / Where’s the master? Play the men’ (I. i.9-10). The irony of the moment is further reinforced as we are invited to reconsider Alonso’s challenge to the Boatswain’s rule as a repetition of his usurpation of Prospero, the real ruler of Milan. As a well-known classical metaphor of a city, the ship immediately suggests the political motif. If the ship is a city, the captain is its ruler. Only a good sailor can rule this city properly. Order and ability are at stake from the outset of the play. The scene prepares us for the power relationship on the island which the play is about to unfold.

Natural necessity deprives men of their right to rule unless, as the Boatswain sarcastically suggests, they can: ‘command these element to silence, / And work the peace of the presence’ (I.i.21-22), but the ‘roarers’ care nothing for the ‘name of King’ (I.i.16-17). As Mary Ann McGrail argues, ‘The Boatswain dismisses these figures of conventional authority and continues to command since he values his life.’⁵ It can be said that the first scene not only lays out the central concerns of the play - legitimate and illegitimate political rule and the limitations of power - but also foreshadows the empowerment of subjects, including women and especially that of Miranda, who tries to assert her agency and establish her autonomy from the beginning of the play to the end. It can be said that the first scene of play is exploring political power relations between men. This is the central concern of the play and it

⁴ Kurt Tetzeli Von Rosador, ‘The Power of Magic: From *Endimion* to *The Tempest*’, *Shakespeare Survey*, 43 (1991), 11.

⁵ See Mary Ann McGrail, *Tyranny in Shakespeare*, (London: Lexington Book, 2002), p.118.

is Prospero's preoccupation too. It is also picked up in the various sub-plots. However what is remarkable about this play is that Shakespeare extends the same concern/battle to female subjects too.

The Tempest represents Shakespeare's most provocative and thorough examination of the relationship between father and daughter in terms of political analogy. Miranda's limitation as the sole representative of the feminine is very obvious. In *The Tempest*, the sexuality of the father is dominant. There are mother figures in this play, but they never appear on stage and the father's daughter is not only a temptation to be overcome, but also a force for sexual liberation.⁶ It is clear that the possibility of incest darkens the sexuality and threatens the father-daughter relationship of the play.⁷ The daughter brings the father out of the 'oedipal family of his past so that he became the father anew accepting his fatherhood as his identity.'⁸ This very same situation also happens in *Pericles* where the father-daughter incest is between Antiochus and his daughter. However, Prospero's sexual desire is contained within a political narrative and continuously repressed throughout the play, especially in Act IV when he interrupts the masque and becomes 'vex' and remembers Caliban's 'foul conspiracy/ against [his] life' (IV.i.139-140), like the previous three romances where the motif of father-daughter incest is certainly discernable as the nubile daughters save their fathers and turn to marry elsewhere. However, *The Tempest* seems to undermine this motif by giving Miranda feminine power and autonomy to challenge parental authority, especially in the matter of marriage, even though from the beginning of the play, it can be seen that Prospero has both parental and rhetorical power in controlling his only daughter Miranda. Actually, we can see the challenge of parental power at the very beginning of Act I, scene ii,

⁶ See David Bevington, *Shakespeare*, (London: Blackwell, 2002), pp. 190-191; Mary Beth Rose, 'Where are the Mothers in Shakespeare? Option for Gender Representation in English Renaissance', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 42.3 (1999), 291-314. In this essay, Rose observes that the best mother in the Renaissance play is an absent or a dead mother since they are a potential threat in their over indulgence of love leading to the destruction of their children. The desirable adult society should be construed as motherless. Also see Coppélia Kahn, 'The Absent Mother in *King Lear*', in *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy J. Vickers (Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1986), pp. 33-49 and Stephen Orgel, 'Prospero's Wife', in *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy J. Vickers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), pp. 50-64.

⁷ See Cyrus Hoy, 'Fathers and Daughters in Shakespeare's Romances', in *Shakespeare's Romances Reconsidered*, ed. by Carol McGinnis Kay and Henry E. Jacobs (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978), pp. 77-90.

⁸ Coppélia Kahn, *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981) p. 211.

in which Miranda says to Prospero: 'If by your Art, my dearest father, you have / Put the wild waters in this roar, allay them'(I. ii.1-2). The daughter gives her father a command. The reversal of power here echoes what had previously happened in the opening scene. It can be seen that the first words Miranda utters in the play signify her disagreement with her father's conduct. However, before examining the nature of Prospero's power to control his daughter, one needs to understand his motivation in having control over everything, especially his daughter, Miranda.

In Act I scene ii, Prospero's long narration of the events that led to his expulsion from the dukedom of Milan answers the question of why he has been preoccupied with the idea of being able to have control. Although it might be possible to say that Prospero studies the 'liberal arts' (I.ii.73) because he saw them as a way of satisfying an already existing desire for power and control, one cannot help but think that his devotion to the liberal arts led him not to wisdom in practical affairs but rather to intemperance with regard to knowledge and a thirst for 'secret studies' or magic such that he neglected his duties as Duke of Milan. While this devotion to the occult did indeed disastrously lead him to give over his dukedom to his brother, it is also clear that Prospero refuses to take full responsibility for his brother's evil actions:

I, thus neglecting worldly ends, all dedicated,
To closeness and bettering of my mind
With that which, but by being so retir'd
O'er prized all popular rate, in my false brother
Awak'd an evil nature, and my trust
Like a good parent, did beget of him
A falsehood in its contrary, as great
As my trust was, which had indeed no limit
A confidence sans bound...(I.ii.89-97).

Prospero does not accept blame for his own overthrow. He blames his 'false brother'[s] 'evil nature'. Though he does not deny the honor of pursuing the 'liberal Arts' (I.i.73), Prospero now knows the perils incurred 'by being so retir'd.' A ruler must exercise rule in order to maintain his power. This might be Prospero's original anxiety about the significance of having the power to control. The comparison of himself with his brother as a 'good parent' reflects the necessity of having control of his daughter since he could not allow history to repeat itself. The choice of metaphor is telling: Prospero feels a paternal sense of betrayal. The parental terms Prospero uses in the above passage also emphasize his parental right over his daughter. Here we can see the interconnectedness of the personal and political. Prospero

as a leader of a state and the head of his household tries to exercise his authority both in his state and his household in order to have everything under his control.

One might argue that we see Prospero's political values and style of leadership through the relationship within his household. He believes that he is a usurped true ruler, but he is exposed as tyrannous in his household. Act I scene ii also provides the reader with a troubling portrait of Prospero's relationship with his servants Ariel and Caliban. Early in the scene, Prospero had revealingly referred to those under him in Milan as 'my creatures', a designation which seems to imply a fundamental distinction or difference between the ruled and the ruler. In sharper fashion, his interaction with Ariel and Caliban indicates the distinction between master and slave. Although Prospero at first refers to Ariel as: 'My brave spirit!' (I.ii.206), his language becomes rather harsh when Ariel asks for his 'liberty' (I.i.245). Indeed, the brave spirit praised lines earlier is now suddenly a 'malignant thing' that 'liest' (I.i.257). Prospero seems to lose his patience after being reminded of his promises by Ariel. He repeatedly chastises Ariel about his past history and reminds him of his kindness in rescuing him from suffering and pain. Prospero's speech here indicates how he exercises his power by using his rhetoric as an instrument to control the past and memories of it. Moreover, it can be seen that Prospero seems to control the narratives of the whole play. He is the one who recounts the story of Sycorax even though he confesses that he has never seen her before.

Prospero realizes that being able to control people's memory is very significant because it will help him to have full control over their present. When he speaks to Ariel, Prospero justifies himself by commanding him to retell the past story. Prospero needs to tell Ariel to recite his history at least 'once in a month' (I.ii.262) to ensure that Ariel remembers his benevolence. By understanding the importance of past memory and by being able to manipulate the way his daughter and his servant think, Prospero is confident that the recovery of his dukedom and his political 'project' will succeed.⁹ For Prospero, the control of memory can be seen as a way to establish political stability both in his household and in the state. He focuses on how to regain his dukedom through his daughter, but he forgets that political

⁹ Dympna Callaghan observes that it is Prospero not Ariel who gives the background of the story. See Dympna Callaghan, *Shakespeare Without Women* (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 105. Also see Judith Anderson, *Words That Matter: Linguistic Perception in Renaissance English* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), p. 163.

stability can be achieved when individual virtue is established. This is very important because Prospero's attempt to control everyone's memory is a sign of his weakness and dictatorship. However, Shakespeare seems to redefine the concept of political stability by exploring the possibility of mercy and compassion as the foundations of political order.

It can be said that Prospero's attempt to interfere with the memories of his subordinates in Act I scene ii can be seen as the manifestation of his power to control. Although Prospero is familiar with all the pertinent events, his magical knowledge does not make the process of communication any easier. As Gunter Walch points out, Prospero uses no magic when explaining to Miranda the events of their past:

We witness the magus equipping his daughter with a new identity by building up a surrogate memory in her...[H]er father has to impart the information to her in the hard and 'tedious' and 'clumsy' way. And this tell us that Prospero, although revealed to be a magician, cannot rely on his magic powers in this particular situation ... Although the 'Four or five women' remembered sound suspiciously like the images in a 'place' used in the Art of Memory, we are shown that Prospero is not using occult memory art ... Obviously Prospero would have no problem remembering. But the text seems to show him labouring over reconstructing the past. There is no shortcut even for the magus in imparting the contents of his mind to Miranda's memory.¹⁰

I would argue that it is his linguistic skill, not his magic that has been used to create the memories of his daughter. When Prospero's attempt to lead Miranda to remember fails, he simply gives her the knowledge that her memory does not contain. As Prospero recalls his brother's treachery, one might recall another scene in which a wronged ruler demands that his child 'remember': the ghost's appearance to Hamlet. Unlike the ghost, however, Prospero gives some sense of what the process of remembering entails.¹¹ He offers an invitation for Miranda to explore what she does remember. When Miranda admits that she remembers dimly: 'four or five women... that tended me' (I.ii.47), Prospero tells her how she might remember more:

What see thou else
In the dark backward and abysm of time?

¹⁰ See Gunter Walch, 'What's Past is Prologue': Metatheatrical Memory and Transculturation in *The Tempest*, *Travel and Drama in Shakespeare's Time*, ed. by Jean-Pierre Maquerlot and Michele Willems (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) pp. 229-230.

¹¹ I am indebted to Lina Perkin Wilder who points out that the parallels between old Hamlet and Prospero are numerous and telling. Both Prospero and old Hamlet are dethroned by their brothers and both attempt to convey not only the fact of this usurpation, but also its emotional impact on their ignorant children. See Lina Perkins Wilder, *Shakespeare's Memory Theatre*, Dissertation Unpublished (Yale University, 2005), p. 212.

If thou rememb' rest aught ere thou cam'st here
How thou cam'st here thou mayst (I.ii.49-52).

Miranda may be able to piece together the events of the past if she can gain access to her memory, but Miranda cannot remember. Unable to draw anything like his own fixed memory of this loss of power from his daughter's mind, Prospero turns to narration which he demands she listens to. During his narrative, Prospero reprimands Miranda three times for not paying attention to what he is saying: 'Dost thou attend me?' (I.ii.74), 'Thou attend'st not' (I.ii.85), 'Dost thou hear?' (I.ii.105). Why is Prospero so concerned about Miranda's attention to his narrative? Before starting to tell Miranda's history, Prospero reassures himself that Miranda has no memory of her own and he then proceeds to imprint his own stories. However, Miranda's reply to this last demand makes it clear that inattention is not the problem: 'Your tale, sir, would cure deafness' (I.ii.106). The difficulty is not in holding Miranda's attention but getting her to 'mark' the contents of her father's narrative and thus to internalize what he says as if it were her own memory.

Miranda responds to Prospero's narration with a fervor explicitly presented as a substitute for the memory that she does not have:

'O my heart bleeds
To think o' th' teen that I have turned you to,
Which is from my remembrance.
.....
Alack, for pity.
I, not remembering how I cried out then,
Will cry it o'er again. It is a hint
That wrings my eyes to't' (I.ii.63-65, 132-135).

For Prospero, his call for her attention and his insistence that the story be completed suggests that he wants her to do more than just react to the story as he tells it. In order to find her place in 'the present business/...without the which this story/ Were most impertinent' (I.ii.136-38), Miranda must become familiar with the past about which that 'business' rests. Unable to remember Prospero's usurpation and their exile from her own experience, she must 'attend,' 'hear,' 'mark' and remember Prospero's narration.

The control of memory is also evident in his relationship with Ariel. Prospero's present relationships are defined through a carefully constructed narrative of past events. The bonds of service between Prospero and Ariel, to take another example, are based not simply on Prospero having freed Ariel from captivity in which he was placed by Sycorax, but on the

memory of that captivity. Prospero refers Ariel not only to the event itself, but also to the narrative that leads up to it:

[H]ast thou forgot
The foul witch Sycorax, who with age and envy
Was grown in a hoop? Hast thou forgot her?
Ariel: No, sir
Prospero: Thou hast! Where was she born? Speak; tell me
Ariel: Sir, in Algiers
Prospero: O, was she so? I must
Once in a month recount what thou hast been,
Which thou forget'st' (I.ii.257-63).

Even though the memory of Sycorax is Ariel's rather than Prospero's, Prospero enforces the discipline of remembering Sycorax, her imprisonment of Ariel, Prospero's freeing of Ariel and the obligation under which this deed places Ariel. In part, this litany is for the theatre audience's benefit; we now know who Caliban is and where he comes from, but Prospero's recounting of the story of Sycorax also serves to re-establish his relationship with Ariel. Prospero prompts Ariel to recall events that will 'put [him] in mind' of his captivity, his having been freed and his present state of servitude; these facts are made to come almost from Ariel's own mouth.

Lina Wilder points out that the reason that Prospero invokes this particular part of Ariel's past, moreover, is that:

Ariel has attempted to introduce another memory narrative. Since [he says after describing the tempest that he created at Prospero's request] 'thou dost give me pain, / Let me remember thee what thou hast promised, / Which is not yet performed me' (I.ii.242-44).¹²

It can be seen that Prospero's power is effective because he understands the different natures of the creatures he controls. He appeals to the desires and fears of each. For each of them, he provides an explanation of why they must serve and obey him. For Caliban, it is his attempted rape of Miranda; for Ariel it is an appeal to gratitude and fear. As Caliban is quick to point out, in neither case can he claim that his power is legitimate, only that it is backed by the compulsion of his Art: 'I must obey: his Art is of such pow'r/ It would control my dam's

¹² Wilder, p. 223.

god, Setebos (I.ii.374-375). Caliban is more than willing to recall his attempt to rape Miranda, but his recollection does not produce the effect that Prospero thinks it should:

Caliban: 'This Island's mine by Sycorax, my mother,
Which thou tak'st from me.

.....
Prospero: Thou most lying slave,
Whom stripes may move, not kindness; I have used thee
(Filt as thou art) with humane care and lodged thee
In mine own cell, till thou didst seek to violate
The honour of my child.

Caliban: O ho, O ho! Would't have been done;
Thou didst prevent me, I had people else
This isle with Calibans' (I.ii.332-33, 345-52).

Unlike Ariel, Caliban remembers the events of which Prospero reminds him almost without prompting and, unlike Ariel's memory of Sycorax, Caliban's memory of his attempted rape of Miranda neither causes him shame nor creates a sense of obligation.

In the case of Ariel, Prospero works on the spirit's love of liberty (which he presumably enjoyed before Sycorax came), his gratitude, and his fear of punishment. Prospero sometimes refers to Ariel as: 'my slave' and threatens him: 'If thou more murmur'st, / I will rend an oak and peg thee in his knotty entrails till thou hast howl'd away twelve winters' (270, 294 - 96). Nevertheless, it is possible to conclude that Prospero is engaging in his characteristic behavior when he refers to Ariel as: 'my slave.' Of course, the 'freckled whelp' Caliban fares even worse in Prospero's estimation. His initial mention of the savage indicates his low estimation of Caliban's hopelessly base humanity:

Then was this island
(Save for the son that she did litter here,
A Freckled whelp, hag-born) not honor'd with
A human shape (281-84).

Like Ariel, Caliban is also described by Prospero as: 'my slave' (308), but then Prospero distinguishes the two by insisting that Caliban, like Antonio, is evil on a fundamental level, that of his nature: 'Thou poisonous slave, got by the devil himself / Upon thy wicked dam, come forth' (319-20). Though his treatment and judgment of Caliban appears extreme, it is important to realize that, for Prospero, such judgment is clearly rational and based on experience, specifically the experience of Caliban's attempted rape of his daughter. It can be said that Prospero does not only physically control Caliban, but he also controls his sexuality.

It can be seen that in the first part of the play, Prospero exercises his power by exercising control over every character in the play.

That Caliban should rebel against Prospero's memory as well as against his present actions is no surprise. The lack of obedience of the more dutiful memories of Ariel and especially of Miranda, however, is more problematic. It can be said that another person's narrative is no substitute for personal recollection. Prospero wants those around him to internalize not only his version of the past, but his sense that the past is the foundation of present business. He needs to control his daughter and his servants from the inside out, in contrast to the narrative of *Cymbeline*. In *Cymbeline*'s final scene, characters tell their stories to one another not in order to manipulate one another's sense of the past but to understand their own story. *Cymbeline*'s confused actions produce a need to hear other people's stories that Ariel and Caliban simply do not have and that Miranda, having often been 'left...to a bootless inquisition' (I.ii.35) about her past, has apparently learned not to express. Prospero's need to make other people remember draws attention to the difficulties of communicating the internal experience, which is personal memory.

However, it is noteworthy that Miranda has a moment in which her memory differs from Prospero's sense of the past. When Prospero asks whether she remembers anything of her childhood, instead of remembering her father's political status in Milan, she wonders whether she correctly remembers having had 'four or five women about [her].' It seems that Miranda pursues this recollection after her conversation with Prospero; bemused by Ferdinand's praise of her beauty, she says: 'I do not know/ One of my sex, no woman's face remember-/Save, from my glass, my own' (III.i.48-50). Made aware in the earlier scene of the limits of her recollection (she cannot remember the women's faces), Miranda constructs a memory, not from Prospero's narration of their common past, but from her own experience or literally from herself. Miranda relays this memory to Ferdinand rather than relaying any of what her father tells her in Act I. This is just the starting point of Miranda trying to assert her autonomy and to act against her father's authority and power to control. The challenge of her father's authority and dictatorship illustrates that she is merciful, compassionate and she must act as her father's 'tutor' to steer him from revenge to forgiveness.

II

‘My foot my tutor?’

It can be said that the opening section of the play has all the markings of death and sorrow, but the second scene introduces the story of restoration. The introduction to Miranda is telling because her words are most remarkable

If by your art, my dearest father, you have
Put the wild water in this roar, ally them.
The sky, it seems would pour down stinking pitch
But that the sea mounting to th ‘welkin’s cheek
Dash the fire out . O, I have suffered
With those that I saw suffer! a brave vessel
(Who had no doubt some noble creature in her)
Dashed all to pieces.(I.ii.1-8).

In contrast to the confusion of the first scene, the opening lines of the second scene immediately establish an order of familial relation and of power. Miranda’s opening speech indicates authority, power and compassion. It can be seen that she questions first whether her father is responsible for the calamity, and she is certain that she is correct in suspecting Prospero’s involvement. She then seems to order him to ‘ally them.’ Her language is instructive and with a commanding tone. Once the spectacle is concluded and Miranda’s first apprehension allayed, she establishes herself from the beginning of the play as an authority who can interrogate her father. Her words seem to have magical properties. Magic is, on the one hand, an aesthetic fantasy, set apart from reality, but on the other hand, is an image of public control and coercion, or an "effective policeman."¹³ Her language is powerful enough to command Prospero to stop his magic and to show compassion for the drowning people. While her father uses magic to create chaos and disorder, Miranda, in contrast, uses commanding words to allay them. Moreover, her magical language is relevant to her image as ‘a cherubim’ (I.ii.152), who saved him from despair by giving him the will to live: her innocent smile "rais’d in me [Prospero]/ An undergoing stomach, to bear up / Against what should ensue” (I.ii.156-58). Miranda has for twelve years been ‘a third of mine [Prospero’s] own life, / Or that for which I live’ (IV.i.3-4) Miranda’s words here are remarkable. We have never seen a more compassionate character in all of Shakespeare. She knows her father’s capability and questions him as to whether he is responsible for the calamity. She suffers for

¹³ Harry Berger, Jr. “Miraculous Harp: A Reading of Shakespeare’s *Tempest*.” *Shakespeare Studies*, 5 (1969), 253-83.

people she has never met. She also gives them more credit than they deserve when she mentions that the boat must have some noble creature on board. Her ability to see, despite her innocence and lack of experience is impressive.

However, it is interesting to see that Prospero removes his 'magic garment' and put his magic at a distance: 'Lie there, my Art' (I.ii.24-25), in order to explain what has happened. He will do this once again in the final scene, when he resumes his ducal robes (V.i.85-94). On both occasions, he tells a story of the injustice he had received. Why does he lay aside his art to do this? To tell a story of how he lost his dukedom does not require art. It is as though the tale of the injustice required no other dimension, no dramatic context. Prospero prefaces his story by saying, 'I have done nothing but in care of thee/ Of thee my dear one, thee my daughter,/who art ignorant of what thou art' (I.ii.16-18). This is the most explicit statement of his motive that Prospero gives in the play. When he addresses the audience beyond the play in the Epilogue, he says his aim is 'to please.' It means that the shipwreck which has disturbed Miranda so greatly has been entirely for her benefit. Prospero insists twice that Miranda learn of her story just after the tempest. It can be said that the story he is about to tell his daughter will help justify his calculation to take revenge on his arch-enemies. Prospero thinks that Miranda is ignorant. He reiterates this at several key times in the play. We might assume from Prospero's words here that he is the caring father who performs these great deeds to aid Miranda's understanding of herself. However, I think we can show otherwise. Prospero may indeed think himself to be selfless in his actions. In truth, he has wrecked the ship not to help Miranda's self-knowledge but to serve his form of justice on his brother and the King of Naples.

Furthermore, his assumption that Miranda is ignorant reveals Prospero's mistake, as well as the depth of Prospero's anger at the injustice served to him. Miranda is fully aware of what she is and does not need knowledge of Prospero's history. Prospero makes the same mistake as Polixenes in *The Winter's Tale*, thinking that worth and identity are due to position. Miranda has already shown us that she is perceptive and knows not only herself but also her father. Prospero, thus far, has revealed both his power and his inability to recognize his own actions for what they are. That is not to say that Prospero is an evil man or a bad father. Rather, he is a man who is learning what to make of his past and his suffering. As the play unfolds, Prospero's goodness is revealed. Though he begins the play a good man, he is, nevertheless, filled with anger at the injustice and with thoughts of revenge. His change of

heart occurs through a process begun by Miranda. Miranda, like Perdita, does not know what she has lost and therefore feels no pain. Prospero wishes to introduce her to that pain, hoping that it will both allow her better to understand human nature and its capabilities as well as serve Prospero's personal ends.

His concern about the timing of his tale implies that his staged tragedy has in some way prepared his daughter for the story of her true identity. The 'very virtue of compassion' in her has just been touched. She has 'suffere'd with those' she saw suffer (I.ii.5-6). Compassion is a virtue made possible for Miranda only by a belief in the existence of creatures like herself. It takes her out of herself, and this self-forgetting prepares her to hear her father's misfortune and her own true history, to acquire self-knowledge. Prospero also comments that she has a 'piteous heart' (1.ii.14). This kind of compassion will help steer her father from revenge/murder to forgiveness.

The powerful language of Miranda can be seen again when she visited Caliban with her father. She severely chastises Caliban for being ungrateful.

Abhorrèd slave,
Which any print of goodness wilt not take,
Being capable of all ill! I pitied thee,
Took pains to make thee speak, taught thee each hour
One thing or other. When thou didst not, savage,
Know thine own meaning, but wouldst gabble like
A thing most brutish, I endowed thy purposes
With words that made them known. (I.ii.350-57)¹⁴

Though these lines have been attributed to Prospero by some editors, I would argue that these lines elucidate an important part of Miranda's verbal ability. She is a language teacher teaching a savage Caliban to learn human language. She is patient and kind, but Caliban is a member of a 'vile race... had that in't which good natures could not abide to be with' (I.ii.355-362). Miranda feels pity for him. Her pity and careful teaching are wasted on Caliban, through whom she comes to learn that compassion has its bounds, for Caliban, according to Prospero is 'a devil, a born devil on whose nature/Nurture can never stick' (IV.i.188-189). However, Prospero's statement might not be trusted because it contains

¹⁴ In this introduction to the play, Stephen Orgel, the editor of *The Oxford Shakespeare*, notes that from Dryden to Kittredge, this speech was always reassigned to Prospero. 'Indeed, the passive Miranda was felt by commentators from Dryden and Theobald to the Cambridge editors and Kittredge to require an emended text: 'Abhorred slave...' was regularly until well into this century given to Prospero in editions of *The Tempest*. (17)

prejudice and bias. In contrast, Miranda's speech shows that although she despises him, Miranda does not torture or punish him like her father. Despite its harshness, the speech is an indication of her mercy and compassion when she tries to teach him language. Miranda is a tutor teaching Caliban language and through the use of her language, she teaches her father to give up revenge and accept forgiveness by means of compassion.

Miranda's compassionate language is telling again when she meets Ferdinand for the first time. When they first meet, in the state of confusion, Ferdinand gives way to wonder as he beholds Miranda, 'most sure the goddess/ On whom this air attend!' (I.ii.424-5). His mistake directly follows Miranda's similar misunderstanding, 'I might call him/A thing divine; for nothing natural / I ever saw so noble' (I.ii.420-22). Miranda goes on in this vein, speaking of Ferdinand as a 'brave form' a 'temple where nothing ill can dwell' (I.ii.460). The word 'brave's is important because it is the most commonly used word in Miranda's vocabulary. In this instance, to Miranda, the word 'brave' means noble. By recognizing Ferdinand's form as brave, Miranda is also saying something about Ferdinand's nature based entirely her first sight of him. She might look naïve but that would be underestimating her ability to see. If we need to call someone naïve, it would be Prospero. He has already interpreted Miranda's words with less finesse than she intended. Furthermore, upon hearing Miranda's acclamation of Ferdinand's nobility, Prospero remarks, 'It goes on, I see, / As my soul prompts it' (I.ii.431-2). Prospero's plan is to marry the two, hoping in the bargain to gain Naples as well as Milan. He thinks that this action is his own, prompted by his own desires. By centering the action upon himself, Prospero is in grave danger of missing entirely what Miranda can teach him. To put Miranda's brave wisdom in the words of Eve Horwitz: 'In this play, a masculine world of courtly antithesis and rational control is contrasted with a feminine world of natural mutability and paradox.'¹⁵ Prospero is in danger of trying to subvert this feminine principle with masculine power. At this point in the play, we see Miranda only in action, revealing her character as virtuous. Thus far, she has revealed herself as compassionate and generous. As the play unfolds, so, too, does her virtue.

Since Miranda's un-courtly education has not taught her the sexual politics of coyness, Prospero tests the mettle of her prospective husband

¹⁵ Eve Horwitz, " 'The Truth of Your Own Seeming': Women and Language in *The Winter's Tale*." *Unisa English Studies: Journal of the Department of English* 26.2 (1988) p, 7.

... this swift business
I must uneasy make, lest too light winning
Make the prize light. (I.ii.453-55)

To this end, he charges Ferdinand with usurpation angering him to rebellion and puts him in servitude. Prospero tests Ferdinand by treating him as though he were Caliban so that Miranda may better understand what elevates him above the servant-monster:

I'll manacle thy neck and feet together
Sea-water shalt thou drink; thy food shall be
The fresh-brook mussels, wither'd roots, and husks
Wherein the acorn cradled... (I.ii.465-7).

Ferdinand is compelled to assume the place of Caliban, carrying wood, a slave, at the beginning of act III, while Caliban wanders off to plan the regicide. Prospero emphasizes to her the comparison she should make:

To th' most of men this is a Caliban
And they to him are angels (I.ii.483-4)

The juxtaposition of Caliban's rebellion and Ferdinand's quick submission brings a comparison of their characters. Each finds himself under the rule of Prospero and wishes to escape it. They are both set the menial task of carrying wood. Each feels treated unjustly- Caliban is deprived of an island and Ferdinand of his status as King of Naples. Caliban turns to cursing, but Ferdinand finds an object of admiration and praise. What preserves Ferdinand from becoming a Caliban? He reasons '...some kinds of baseness/ Are nobly undergone (III.i.1-2) He fashions his slavery to Prospero into service to Miranda, speaking of Miranda as 'the mistress which I serve' who 'quickens what's dead' (III.i.6). He ennobles his slavery. While Ariel is willing to obey by promises of freedom, and Caliban is subjugated by promises of physical pain, Ferdinand surprisingly resigns himself to his fate without promises of freedom or reward.

Miranda is confident that her choice is the best choice because she has seen the good and embraced it. Upon her insistence, Prospero frees Ferdinand who immediately pledges his love for Miranda. Prospero, aside, claims that everything goes as he has planned. While this may be true, his reasoning is skewed. He does not wish them to love for themselves but for him. Prospero wishes to gain from their love.

Upon his imprisonment, begun with Prospero's powerful spell which freezes Ferdinand, making him unable to use his drawn sword, Miranda comes to his defense. She even risks the wrath of her father, which, as we have seen, is quite awesome. Miranda defines her character in this scene with her father; it is her defiance of her father that reveals her strength. When Prospero tells Miranda that Ferdinand is like a Caliban by comparison to other men, Miranda replies with, 'My affections / Are then most humble. I have no ambition to see a goodlier man.' Miranda is willing to suffer the punishment reserved for Caliban in order to grant rest to her lover, a wonderful example of Miranda's expanding virtue. While her predisposition is towards empathy, as seen in the first act of the play, now Miranda is able to channel that generic love into a single person.

Miranda's language in the wooing scene is the most interesting case. Her speech to Ferdinand shows both compassion and mercy toward him. She prefers to carry the log for him:

If you sit down
I'll bear the log the while: pray give me that;
I'll carry it to the pile (III.i.28-30).

In showing compassion toward Ferdinand, she simultaneously becomes a figure of sturdy independence from her father and the obedient daughter. As Prospero watches this exchange, one almost formal and ritualistic and a foreshadowing of the famous chess scene, he begins to soften towards their love. He says, '[f]air encounter / Of two most rare affections! Heavens rain grace / On that which breeds between 'em!' (III.i.74-76) Prospero, responding to the apparent beauty of their growing love, is beginning to see the worth in their union not because it serves his ends but because it is good in itself. The possibility of a good union, a good human action, seems somewhat foreign to a man who has suffered so much at the hands of others. However, he is beginning to see what Miranda is capable of teaching him. Once Miranda's and Ferdinand's promises are sealed with the offer of hands, Prospero tells us, for he is speaking to the audience, '[s]o glad of this as they I cannot be, / Who are surprised withal; but my rejoicing / At nothing could be more' (III.i.92-94).

At one level Miranda appears to act entirely on her own behalf, steadily pursuing Ferdinand against what she knows of her father's wishes. When the young prince questions her: 'What is your name?' she replies, 'Miranda. O my father, /I have broken your hest to say so' (III.i.36-37). Miranda organizes her own nuptials: 'Do you love me?' she demands of Ferdinand, whose response is Miranda's desire:

O heaven, O earth, bear witness to this sound,
And crown what I profess with kind event
If I speak true! If hollowly, invert
What best is boded me to mischief! I,
Beyond all limit of what else i' th' world
Do love, prize, honor you (III.i.68-73).

This declaration moves her to 'weep' with happiness, and she then proposes the marriage: 'My husband, then?', but she goes a step further and offers to 'die [Ferdinand's] maid' if he refuses her and, in the meantime, to be his 'servant.' Miranda is taking a great chance of rejection, humiliation, or even danger. As usual, we are attracted to the clarity of the heroine's desires, manifested in the daring clarity of her language.

At the end of the first half of the play, we have seen Prospero in action, attempting to gain the upper hand on his enemy. We have seen his enemies revealing their wicked nature. We have also seen another alternative to Prospero's anger: Miranda's compassion and mercy. The second half of the play will concern with the transformation of Prospero. Prospero, who has entered 'unseen,' has been watching the proposal, but he is careful not to interrupt the conversation; he arranges its circumstances, but he leaves the outcome to the lovers. Not only is he unperturbed by Miranda's disobedience, he expresses the utmost pleasure in this 'Fair encounter / Of two most rare affections.' He prays that the 'grace' of the 'heavens' will bless 'that which breeds between 'em,' (ll. 74-76), an allusion not only to their love but to the offspring that he hopes it will bring, the traditional fruits of a happy ending.

At the end of the play, though she speaks only seven lines in the final scene, her language clearly mirrors her autonomy and summarizes her character. When playing at chess¹⁶, Miranda accuses Ferdinand of cheating, but Ferdinand immediately protests: 'No my dearest love,/ I would not for the world' (V.i.171-173). Upon hearing this, Miranda proceeds to deflate with the remark that for such a stake as a score of kingdoms he certainly would do so:

Yes for a score of kingdoms you should wrangle,
And I would call it fair play. (V.i.174-175).

In his edition of *The Tempest*, Stephen Orgel glosses the word 'And' as 'If,' making

¹⁶ See Bryan Loughrey and Neil Taylor, 'Ferdinand and Miranda at Chess', *Shakespeare Survey*, 35 (1982), 113-118.

Ferdinand's wrangling conditional upon Miranda's approval.¹⁷ In other words, Miranda is making her approval a condition for Ferdinand's cheating. Her speech here not only reveals how much she loves Ferdinand, but also implies that she does have agency. She would call cheating 'fair play' not because she is ignorant and submissive but because she has already approved it.

However, it is worth noting that the dynastic marriage between Ferdinand and Miranda is similar to those in the previous romances. The reunion of family members and the dynastic marriage seem to secure and extend the father figure's political power at the end of each play. Pericles leaves Tyre for Marina and Lysimachus to govern and he will become king of Pentapolis, his father-in-law's kingdom. While Leontes successfully establishes his political alliance with Bohemia through Perdita's marriage, Prospero gains his dukedom back and sends his daughter to be the Queen of Naples.

The Tempest might end with a scene of recognition and marriage. The marriage of Miranda to Ferdinand has finally restored Prospero's dukedom and secured his bloodline; it redeems him as a father. The female redemptive power of the three heroines in the previous plays has been transformed into the power of resistance. But resistance and disobedience is in need in the process of redemption. Though she might not be fully successful in declaring her independence from patriarchal control, she, at least, has challenged it and finally found a way to exercise her agency and independence. Her assertiveness and independence also have magical properties of redemption because they help her win Ferdinand as her husband and steer her father towards compassion and forgiveness. His obsession with magic disappears, and he no longer needs to control everything. The chaos and disorder at the beginning of the play has been allayed, and Prospero is finally restored and redeemed by Miranda.

III

'Mercy itself, and free all fault'

In *The Tempest*, a man of power, Prospero, arranges political and familial regeneration with feminine compassion. He has successfully achieved this by including and valuing women and by absorbing 'woman's compassion within himself. As Prospero adopts female compassion and moves his plot toward reconciliation, his magical display is changed from the function of

¹⁷ See Stephen Orgel, *The Tempest* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 197.

threat to that of celebration and blessing, mostly apparent in the mother's nurturing. Prospero's masculine potent art to create a violent tempest is transmuted into the fanciful marriage masque, a vision of fruitfulness, where female deities present beneficent images of harmonious, bountiful nature (IV.i.121-22).

Prospero's redemption and restoration are actually enacted in the final act, where Prospero abandons his magical powers, gives up his vengeance, and forgives all his enemies. By the end of Act IV, Prospero achieves his goal of recovering his losses, and his enemies are virtually vanquished. Once his enemies are all in his power, he begins to show his mercy: 'At this hour lie at my mercy all mine enemies' (IV.i.262-63). Prospero becomes Duke Vincentio who incorporates Christian mercy in his political judgment, the mode that the comic heroines conventionally employ to rejuvenate the given patriarchal order. Resembling Duke Vincentio, who finally abandons his disguise, an instrument of his political manipulation, Prospero relinquishes magic, the source of his power, and frees Ariel. Like Duke Vincentio, Prospero forgives what he would personally love to avenge or punish for the greater project of political reconciliation. He marries off his daughter to his enemy's son to affirm the regenerative power of the family and to extend his political power, just as Vincentio's arranged marriages, including his own to Isabella, secure the legitimate establishment of the patriarchy.

In Prospero's finest moment, a moment when he could have destroyed his enemies, he has a change of heart and says, 'the rarer action is / In virtue than in vengeance' (V.i.27-28). The last time Prospero used the word 'rare,' signifying worth and purity, he was speaking of the two young lovers. He spoke of the 'fair encounter of two most rare affections,' the memory of which has changed his heart from vengeance to virtue. It is the thought of the virtue of these two young people, people of a new and vibrant generation that causes Prospero to choose their way as opposed to his planned way. In an act of generosity, Prospero tells Ariel to release his prisoners and, in private, makes his most important and complete change.

After Ariel has gone, Prospero makes his most beautiful speech of the play. Calling upon the elves and spirits of nature, those who have been his servants and done his bidding, he tells them:

Ye elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes and groves,
And ye that on the sands with printless foot
Do chase the ebbing Neptune, and do fly him
When he comes back; you demi-puppets that

By moonshine do the green sour ringlets make,
 Whereof the ewe not bites; and you whose pastime
 Is to make midnight mushrooms, that rejoice
 To hear the solemn curfew, by whose aid-
 Weak masters though ye be- I have bedimmed
 The noontide sun, called forth the mutinous winds,
 And' twixt the green sea and the azured vault
 Set roaring war; to the dread rattling thunder
 Have I given fire, and rifted Jove's stout oak
 With his own bolt; the strong-based promontory
 Have I made shake, and by the spurs plucked up
 The pine and cedar. Graves at my command
 Have waked their sleepers, oped and let'em forth
 By my so potent art, but this rough magic
 I here abjure; and when I have required
 Some heavenly music -which even now I do-
 To work my end upon their senses that
 This airy charm is for, I'll break my staff,
 Bury it certain fathoms in the earth,
 And deeper than did ever plummet sound
 I'll drown my book. (V.i.33-57)

This speech of the renunciation of his magic echoes Medea's invocation in Ovid's *Metamorphosis*.¹⁸ In both case, magic has the power to alter natural phenomenon. Unlike Medea who is invoking her magical power in order to make Jason's father younger, Prospero relinquishes his magical power. He finally realizes that magical power is the forces that he must reject. He sees the dark side of magic when he calls it 'rough' (V.i.50). He forsakes his claim to justice, his first renunciation, preferring to use smooth magic to do his work, which is mercy. If 'rough magic' has been what he has used until now, then smooth magic must be Miranda's compassion and mercy. Furthermore, it would seem that Prospero has finally learned that Caliban may have been correct in his assessment of him; he has placed his knowledge and his life in his books. He was thrown from power in Milan because he was concerned only with his books and was not concerned with the well-being of his citizens. Now, after many years, much suffering, and some wisdom taught to him by his young daughter, Prospero finally makes his learning his own. He is exhibiting the humility he lacked. No longer is he dependent upon his outward signs of power because power is no longer his goal. He is now capable of taking what he has learned and is ready to show compassion: 'Holy Gonzalo, honorable man, /Mine eyes, ev'n sociable to the show of thine, / Fall fellowly drops.' (V.i.62-64). He has seen honor in men again. He is like Miranda, recognizing good in human beings, remarking at their wondrous, brave beauty: 'How beauteous mankind is! Oh brave new world/ That has such people in't' (V.i.183-184). The

¹⁸ Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. by A.D. Melville (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) p, 150.

‘brave new world’ for her is the world where people have compassion and mercy and turn away from vengeance to forgiveness. And in her new world, Miranda includes her father as one of the ‘beauteous’ people.

It might be said that Prospero’s appropriation of forgiveness and mercy stems from his reason, his renunciation of passion. The one passion that Prospero seems to have is *anger*. Yet, as we have seen, Prospero yields to this passion because he firmly decides that anger is necessary in the given circumstances for his political project. For example, in order to accelerate the dynastic marriage between Ferdinand and Miranda, he must act the role of an angry father. His anger is once again displayed enough to surprise Ferdinand and Miranda when he remembers Caliban’s conspiracy. Even if we assume that his distemper caused by Caliban is genuine; he is not the one whose extreme anger gives way to self-destruction but a temperate man who can calm his awakened passion. His anger is quickly replaced by a speech about the transition of all things, including passion. Prospero himself claims that he is a human being who can ‘relish all as sharply / Passions as’ other humans (V.i.23-24), a man filled with passionate rage against his disloyal brother. But at the same time, he clarifies his difference from other humans. He is a man of ‘nobler reason’ who can control or renounce his passions, ‘my fury’ (V.i.26).

In the final scene, the forgiveness of Antonio seems to be problematic:

For you, most wicked sir, whom to call brother
Would even infect my mouth, I do forgive
Thy rankest fault,--all of them; and require
My dukedom of thee, which perforce, I know,
Thou must restore. (V.i. 130-4)

What is interesting is that unlike Alonso, Antonio has never uttered a word to ask for his brother’s forgiveness. He has never said ‘pardon me my wrongs’ (V.i.118). Frank Kermode sees him as ‘one of Prospero’s failures’ because Prospero cannot make him feel guilty about his sinful deeds. For him, Antonio has become ‘another thing of darkness’ that ‘Prospero must acknowledge.’¹⁹ Stephen Orgel also notes in his edition of the play that, ‘It is important to observe that Antonio does not repent here--he is, indeed, not *allowed* to repent.’²⁰ David

¹⁹ Frank Kermode, *The Tempest* (London and New York: The Arden Shakespeare, 1988), p. lxii.

²⁰ Orgel, p. 53.

Bevington agrees that ‘Antonio never repents.’²¹ Antonio’s silence is utterly different from, and more complex than, that of Hermione in the scene of recognition in *The Winter’s Tale*. Hermione greets her husband with silence but at least she walks to ‘embrace him.’ (V.iii.121). The body gesture may alternatively signify forgiveness. In *The Tempest*, however, Antonio has not even moved after Prospero’s speech.

Philip McGuire observed that most productions over the past 30 years have considered his silence as a sign of his denial of repentance.²² He also proposes that Antonio's silence might indicate that he is so overwhelmed with guilt that he could not utter the words. It means the actor on the stage is free to interpret the lines and to perform his own interpretation of the scene when Prospero forgives him and requires the return of the dukedom. However, for Prospero, he has already achieved his spiritual triumph by forgiving his brother despite the silence of Antonio.

It is through his rational choice of virtue—renunciation or forgiveness—that Prospero restores his life and society to the level of perfect patriarchy. His giving away Miranda to his enemy's son is a means of preserving his authority and securing the legitimate transmission of power to the next generation; his forgiveness of his usurping brother Antonio is a means of resolving his old rivalries and validating his new identity as duke. Prospero becomes a triumphant patriarch whose art serves a restorative cause. Prospero’s forgiveness might be an expression of his transformation from a hostile patriarch to a merciful man. Prospero is simply playing a woman’s part in his political project. As Gonzalo summarizes, Prospero follows the romance pattern from loss to restoration, from potential tragedy to comic reconciliation: ‘Was Milan thrust from Milan, that his issue / Should become kings of Naples?’ (V.ii.205-6).

Beneath his rational political act of renunciation (and forgiveness) is his uncomfortable anxiety; behind his perfect attempt to be a patriarch, both powerful and benign, lies an acute sense of emptiness. While exhibiting his power in the several performances of magical art, Prospero is a proud superman who controls all humans. But in one disturbing moment

²¹ David Bevington, *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, 4th edn (New York: Harper Collins, 1992), p. 1528.

²² Philip McGuire, ‘*The Tempest*: ‘Something Rich and Strange,’’, in *Shakespeare: The Jacobean Plays* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994), pp. 175-197.

during the powerful performance of the celebratory masque, he reveals his feelings of emptiness, hollowness, and weakness. As nymphs and reapers 'heavily vanish' by his sudden remembrance of Caliban's revolt, he becomes conscious of the vanity of his own art, which leads to his disquiet at the illusoriness and emptiness of life and to his painful acknowledgment of his own old age, weakness, and death:

We are such stuff
As dreams are made on; and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep. Sir, I am vexed;
Bear with my weakness, my old brain is troubled. (IV.i.156-59)

In the scene of the masque, Prospero reaches the peak of his own power. But at the same time, he also descends to the lowest point. After celebrating his daughter's marriage to Ferdinand and manipulating Caliban's rebellion, he confronts the moment of potential fracture; in his daughter's marriage, he sees the cycle of our dream-like life which begins anew in marriage, ending with death in despair, and Caliban's revolt seems to awaken him to his own weakness and darkness innate in the apparent smooth manipulation of Caliban. The disturbing moment during the masque quickly disappears; the successful display of power to defeat Caliban's conspiracy is continued. Although his noble reason controls his emotions, Prospero in the final act unmask the acute sense of loss and loneliness he experiences in marrying off his daughter. He confesses to Alonso: 'I / Have lost my daughter. . . . In this last tempest' (V.i.147-48, 153). In his restorative attempt to establish the 'brave new world' (V.i.183) imagined by Miranda, he becomes a displaced and dispossessed father, echoing Alonso who is in suicidal despair because of the supposed death of his son and who thinks that 'Irreparable is the loss, and patience / Says it is past her cure' (V.i.140-41). Concluding the marriage ritual, Prospero expresses the pain and loss of the isolated father:

To see the nuptial
Of these our dear-belov'd solemnized,
And thence retire me to my Milan, where
Every third thought shall be my grave. (V.i.309-12)

He recognizes, in his daughter's marriage, not the hopeful beginning of new life, but his place of death in the great cycle of life. In addition to loneliness, Prospero also feels guilt. When he abjures his magic, he seems to feel ashamed of his power and feels guilty for having employed it cunningly to revenge and subjugate his enemies. In the final moment of political victory, Prospero humbly embraces his own darkness behind his role as a benign patriarch.

He acknowledges his kinship with Caliban: 'The thing of darkness I / Acknowledge mine' (V.i.275-76).

Prospero's willingness to accept his new place is made more evident in his epilogue to the play. Herein Prospero turns to the audience, as he has throughout the play, and begs their acceptance of his tale. He asks that he, and all on the island, be released by mercy from the audience, Prospero says:

And my ending is despair
Unless I be relieved by prayer,
Which pierces so that it assaults
Mercy itself and frees all faults.
As you from crimes would pardoned be,
Let your indulgence set me free. (Epilogue, 15-17)

Like a virtuous man/king, Prospero entices his friends to virtue, asking their prayers for his deliverance. Instead of leading others to wickedness, as so many in these plays have done, Prospero asks others to be virtuous and good. If they do so, he suggests, *The Tempest* has been efficacious, resulting in public virtue.

In the epilogue, after having manipulated other humans at his disposal, he seemingly needs a kind of expiation. He counteracts his former feelings of pride and places himself in a dependent, submissive position.

Now my charms are all o'erthrown,
And what strength I have's mine own,
Which is most faint. (Epilogue 1-3)

Now Prospero sees himself not as powerful but as a man of despair who can 'be reliv'd' only by 'prayer' (Epilogue 16), a guilty man who begs mercy and pardon for his faults or crimes, or an imprisoned man who wants to be free. Using religious terminology, Prospero tries to persuade the audience not to judge him. Prospero's final appeal to the audience's mercy is apparently self-conscious skepticism. Beneath his self-righteous claim that he rationally chooses mercy over vengeance, Prospero has another deep motive for forgiving the men of sin. By forgiving others, he wants to ensure pardon for his own sins.

Coda to Chapter IV: Female Speech in *King Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*

It has long been customary to end the study of Shakespeare's romances with *The Tempest*.¹ Perhaps this is because *The Tempest* has the reputation of being Shakespeare's last play, the final chapter in which he ends his revels and the romantic equation of Shakespeare with Prospero saying farewell to his art. However, *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, both collaborations with John Fletcher, are really Shakespeare's last plays. The first of these plays is often considered as a history play, a fact which often excludes it from studies of this kind. The other is arguably of the same genre as the four late plays but is often excluded because of the issue of authorship. Yet both of these plays are relevant to a study of Shakespeare's discourse concerning female speeches and the conflict between masculinity and femininity. However, when looking at the plays through the lens of gender politics, it is relatively clear that these two plays debate the same issues as those seen in the first four romances.

One recent criticism is about the features of its genre.² If we consider Shakespeare's romances as plays exploring the theme of restoration and reunion of father and daughter or husband and wife, *Henry VIII* could be separated from the previous four romances. Divorce not reunion is the main issue of this play. The relationship of father and daughter is never developed throughout the course of the play. Yet, like *The Tempest*, *Henry VIII* explores the conflict between masculinity and femininity and how a female character – in this instance an abandoned wife -unsuccessfully asserts her agency and autonomy under patriarchal authority. Even though her rhetorical attempt is not successful, Katherine arguably becomes a remarkable moral figure at the center of the play. While Miranda in *The Tempest* has to act against paternal authority, Katherine in *Henry VIII* is in a more perilous position under the monarchical power, and is blamed for Henry's lack of a son. It can be seen that several of her speeches directly address King Henry. The female speeches in this play are significant since they not only dramatize how a female character challenges patriarchal authority through the use of language, but also underscore the assumption about the generic classification of the play since the nature of female speech in *Henry VIII* is similar to that in the previous four

¹ Alison Thorne, *Shakespeare's Romances* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Harold Bloom, *Shakespeare's Romances* (Philadelphia: Chelsea House, 2000) and David Bevington, *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* (London: Longman, 2013).

² The main contributions to this debate are: Howard Felperin, 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*: History as Myth', *Studies in English Literature*, 6 (1966), 225-46; Ronald Berman, 'King Henry the Eighth: History as Romance', *English Studies*, 48 (1967), 112-21; Hugh M. Richmond, 'Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*: Romance Redeemed by History', *Shakespeare Studies*, 4 (1968), 334-49 and John F. Andrews, 'Henry VIII: Shakespeare's Tragicomic Historical Romance', in *The Shakespeare Plays: A Study Guide* (La Jolla: University of California at San Diego Press, 1978), pp. 124-37.

romances. Also, critics have recognized romance features and motifs in *Henry VIII*.³ However, no one has directly addressed the representation and nature of female speech in the play before. It is very important to analyze Katherine's speeches and gestures in order to understand her position in the play. The first section of the coda will be dedicated to the critical analysis of Queen Katherine's speech in the play. I will compare and contrast the rhetorical strategies used in similar moments with other plays, especially Hermione's trial scene. I will argue that Queen Katherine, like Hermione in *The Winter's Tale*, uses all three artistic proofs: *logos*, *pathos* and *ethos* to appeal for mercy but still fails to persuade King Henry VIII to agree to her plea. I will then examine The Jailer's Daughter's speech in *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and argue that even though her speech is rebellious and challenging, she avoids condemnation because she speaks in soliloquies and madness. The soliloquies and madness become strategies she uses to speak her mind. She becomes one of the most rebellious characters in Shakespeare's plays.

Queen Katherine's Language in the Trial Scene

I will start to analyse Katherine's rhetorical strategies in Act II scene iv, which is the trial scene. Even though the play is co-authored by Shakespeare and Fletcher, Act II scene iv, according to Gordon McMullan, is 'generally considered Shakespeare.'⁴ While Wolsey uses his rhetorical power to manipulate King Henry VIII, Queen Katherine, in contrast, tries very hard to assert her voice in the trial, which is fully under patriarchal control. Maurice Hunt observed that:

Wolsey's campaign to strip Katherine of her voice figures strongly in her decision to abort proceedings by exiting the court, an act that weakens defense of her marriage. After she has left, Henry praises her 'rare qualities': her 'sweet gentleness', 'meekness saintlike', and 'wife-like government' (II.iv. 135-36). By commending Katherine's self-control, Henry replaces the unruly wife of the trial with a woman that playgoers have not seen or heard. It is hard to know if Henry is obtuse, or crafty, or if his praise represents a willful male fantasy--of a piece with Wolsey's patronizing treatment of the queen. Whatever the case, Henry joins the other men who deny Katherine her own voice.⁵

³ There are several critics who examine the romance elements in *King Henry VIII* such as Peter L. Rudnytsky, Ronald Berman and Paul Dean.

⁴ William Shakespeare and John Fletcher, *King Henry VIII (All is True)*, ed. Gordon McMullan (London: Arden Shakespeare), p. 298. All citations from this play are from this edition. The contribution to scenic attribution was perfectly summarized by Gordon McMullan in Appendix 3.

⁵ Maurice Hunt, 'Shakespeare's *King Henry VIII* and the Triumph of the Word', *English Studies*, 75.3 (1994), 225-45.

It is true that all of the male characters try to ban Katherine's voice through the course of the play; however, she does not let them do it without a fight. In Katherine's speech in the second act, she pleads to Henry to show that she is the most independent female character in this play. Even though the assertion of her autonomy can be seen as a failure since it does not resolve the conflict between her and Henry, her independence and boldness are still widely recognized.

According to some books on conduct from the period, a woman could ruin her sexual reputation by being talkative. Her loquaciousness could be seen as a sign of lewd conduct and sexual incontinence.⁶ Ann Rosalind Jones also studied the ambiguity of the early modern representations of female courtly speech especially in conduct books. She argues that 'whereas the court encourages the intellectual speech of the lady, other civilizing constructions of female speech emphasized women's weakness and associated chastity with silence.'⁷ Jones also notes that 'the lady is advised to defend herself through a calculated rhetoric of word and gestures.'⁸ Katherine seems to understand that in order to defend herself, both rhetoric and gestures must be employed simultaneously.⁹

We have first seen Katherine in Act I scene II when she enters the stage and kneels before Henry. Kneeling has bodily emblematic significance since it not only indicates the submission of the queen to the kingly power, but also symbolically implies the political strategies of Katherine in dealing with patriarchal authority. Kim Noling observed that Katherine's power comes in part from her command of a strong stage position. Katherine,

⁶ Hilda Smith mentions that in the seventeenth century, even though authors of books on conduct and advice literature concerning woman adopt a more puritan tone and avoid a misogynistic tone in their works, William Gouge's description of *Domesticall Duties* (1622) and Richard Brathwaite's *The English Gentlewoman* (1631), two popular books aimed at the education of woman, still advocated restricted, domestic lives for women including how to avoid risking their honor by not asserting their voice. See Hilda Smith, 'Humanist education and the Renaissance concept of woman', in *Woman and Literature in Britain 1500-1700*, ed. by Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 10-28.

⁷ Ann Rosalind Jones, 'Nets and Bridles: Early Modern Conduct Books and Sixteenth-Century Women's Lyrics', in *The Ideology of Conduct: Essays on Literature and the History of Sexuality*, ed. by Leonard Tennenhouse and Nancy Armstrong (New York: Methuen, 1987), pp. 39-72.

⁸ Jones, p. 43.

⁹ In Stefano Guazzo's *Civile Conversation*, Anniball Magnocavalli gives advice on the topic of how to produce an appropriate 'speech of the court lady: her talke and discourses are so delightful, that you wyll only them beginne to be sory, when she endeth to speake and wishe that sheewoulde bee no more weary to speake, then you are to heare. Yea, sheeframeth her jestures so discretely, that in speakyng, sheeseemeth to holde her peace, and in holding her peace, to speake.' See Stefano Guazzo, *Civile Conversatio of M. Steeven Guazzo*, trans. by George Pettie (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1925), p. 241.

upon her first entrance, physically takes control of a stage that Henry has momentarily dominated: 'Enter *the Queen, Norfolk, and Suffolk; she kneels. King riseth from his state, takes her up, kisses, and placeth her by him.*' By immediately kneeling again, she makes him repeat his theatrical gesture of placing her by him and above Wolsey, '*under the King's feet*' (S.D.I.ii), in order to dramatize the fact that her place at the seat of power, though at the king's grace, is not given perfunctorily; she then maintains that strong position beside him as she overrides Wolsey below her'¹⁰

In the famous trial scene, Act II scene iv, Katherine again enters the stage and 'kneel at his feet' and starts her petition. She starts her petition by using *pathos* saying that she is friendless in a foreign land:

Bestow your pity on me, for
I am a most poor women and a stranger,
Born out of your dominions, having here
No judge indifferent nor no more assurance
Of equal friendship and proceeding. (II.iv.12-15)

She asks for justice and pity followed by a description of her humility, weakness and loneliness. She then addresses King Henry with a series of rhetorical questions:

In what have I offended you? What cause
Hath my behavior given to your displeasure
That thus you should proceed to put me off
And take your good grace from me? Heaven witness,
...
When was the hour I ever contradicted your desire?
Or made it not mine too? Or which of your friends
Have I not strove to love, although I know
He were my enemy? What friend of mine
That had to him derived your anger did I
Continue in my liking- nay, gave notice
He was from thence discharged? (II.iv. 11-32)

Katherine seems to follow the instruction given by Erasmus on how to construct a petition. Erasmus devotes a special section of *De Conscribendis Epistolis* to composing letters of petition, describing the language, arguments, and tropes to be used, while at the same time furnishing pupils with a collection of passages, many from Cicero's letters, illustrating

¹⁰ Noling further notes that Katherine also seizes a strong stage position in the trial scene and her death scene. See Kim Noling, 'Grubbing Up the Stock: Dramatizing Queens in *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 39.3 (Autumn, 1988), 291-306.

various petition styles. The heart of his advice concerns the attitude that the petitioner should show towards the addressee:

First of all [we must exaggerate] the need that besets us, showing what a great weapon neediness is, how useless modesty is to a person in need, and that we are well aware of the shamelessness of making so large a request of a person for whom we have never done anything to deserve it. After that we shall gradually demonstrate in subtle ways that no slight hope is afforded by his singular kindness, which prompts him to give assistance even to unknown and undeserving persons because of the extraordinary goodness of his nature, which is disposed to lighten all men's miseries. This restrained manner commends the petitioner highly, just as presumption serves to estrange the other's feelings. For no one willingly grants a kindness to one who expects it as if it were his due and who makes a demand rather than a request. Erasmus is effectively describing the rhetorical *ethos* of a petitioner, the persona a suppliant must adopt to win his request.¹¹

Erasmus is effectively describing the rhetorical *ethos* of a petitioner, the persona a suppliant must adopt to win his/her request. Creating a petition is a rhetorical performance. To some extent that *ethos* will depend on the circumstance of the petition, but its fundamental attributes (neediness, powerlessness and humility) remain important in the rhetoric of petitioning. In kneeling to the king, Katherine communicates her submission and dependency on royal favour, and in asking questions about her past behavior and obedience to the King, Katherine establishes her creditability through the use of rhetoric. She tries very hard to protect her position as the Queen of England by showing her background as a daughter of a Spanish king. It is very interesting that Katherine's rhetoric, like Hermione's petition in the final scene, fails to persuade her hearer to believe in her innocence even though they closely follow the instructions given by the Renaissance textbook. Since *ethos* fails to help her gain trust and understanding, Katherine moves to use *logos*, or logical appeal, to persuade her audience. She first attacks the King by asking direct questions: 'In what have I offended you? What cause/ Hath my behavior given to your displeasure / That thus you should proceed to put me off/ And take your good grace from me? (II.iv.19-21). She presents herself as a logical woman who needs a reason for her trial. Katherine, then, asks several rhetorical questions for explanation of her prosecution. Since rhetorical questions do not need an answer, Katherine cleverly reminds King Henry that she is very obedience and that his act is tyrannical:

¹¹ Desiderius Erasmus, *Collected Works of Erasmus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974), 25: 24-26

When was the hour
 I ever contradicted your desire,
 Or made it not mine too? Or which of your friends
 Have I not strove to love, although I knew
 He were mine enemy? What friend of mine
 That had to him derived your anger did I
 Continue in my liking? Nay, gave notice
 He was from thence discharged? (II.iv.25-32)

By asking these questions, Katherine not only establishes herself as a virtuous queen who is dedicating and selfless, but also unmasks the King as a tyrant who blindly accuses her despite her innocence. She does not have to argue fiercely with the king on the matter. Her rhetorical strategies have cornered King Henry and simultaneously questioned the integrity of the King. However, like Hermione in *The Winter's Tale*, Katherine fails to achieve her goal. It can be concluded that the application of textbook rhetoric by a women does not work, and the adoption of three artistic proofs of the petitioner by a woman does not work either.

Katherine's Sarcasm

Katherine's language in Act III scene i where the two cardinals visit her chamber is also significant. When Wolsey addresses her in Latin: '*Tanta estergate mentis integritas, Regina serenissima*' (III.i.40), she refuses to be talked to in Latin. She chooses to speak in English: 'O, good my lord, no Latin' (III.i.41). Her use of English helps her to strengthen her position as the Queen of England by refusing to be treated as a foreigner despite her Spanish birth. Moreover, she cleverly uses English because she wants to have witnesses, who are her ladies-in waiting, to hear the Cardinals' speech: 'Pray speak in English. Here are some will thank you,/If you speak truth, for their poor mistress' sake' (III.i.46-47). In contrast to the trial scene, Katherine's language in this scene is very apologetic:

Do what ye will, my lords, and pray forgive me
 If I have used myself unmannerly.
 You know I am a woman, lacking wit
 To make a seemly answer to such persons.
 Pray do my service to his majesty:
 He has my heart yet, and shall have my prayers
 While I shall have my life. Come, reverend fathers,
 Bestow your counsels on me. She now begs
 That little thought when she se footing here
 She should have bought her dignities so dear. (III.i.175-185).

Her speech here is different from those that conveyed the daring insolence of her behavior

towards Wolsey earlier. The sudden shift of language can be explained in several ways. First of all, it can be seen as the work of Fletcher or we can see Katherine's speech here as sarcastic, illustrating her enduring strength and defiance.¹² Sarcasm can be seen as a rhetorical strategy for Katherine to express her rebellious speech without posing any threat to her male counterpart.

This scene is generally attributed to Fletcher. As soon as Katherine passes into Fletcher's hands, she seems to be a different person. Her speech in the trial scene is different from when she talks to the Cardinals in this scene. However, like the female language in the previous four romances, Katherine's language is rhetorically powerful and redemptive. Undeniably, redemptive language is also found in the play, both in the female rhetoric and in male speech which is evident in Act IV scene ii when, in her apartment, Katherine asks her gentleman usher Griffith to tell her about the death of Cardinal Wolsey. Katherine listens to Griffith's speech narrating Wolsey's death, and she seems to forgive him and wishes him peace in death. It is true that Shakespeare wants his audience to see another picture of Wolsey which is different from what they have seen so far. Emotionally touched by Griffith's statement, Katherine declares that after she is dead, she wishes 'no other herald,/No other speaker of [her] living actions' (IV.ii.69-70). With the vision of angels and heavenly salvation while she is asleep, Katherine is redeemed. In this scene, Katherine promises to speak of Wolsey 'with charity' and wishes that 'his faults lie gently on him (IV.ii.31-32)

Gordon McMullan noted 'what we hear from Griffith is rhetoric... he feels the need to fulfill what would have been a childhood habit for educated Jacobean- to offer both sides of any debate with equal fluency and conviction.'¹³ But Griffith's rhetoric also changes Katherine's mind about Wolsey and leads her to honor him. Maurice Hunt states that 'this revaluation stresses the virtue of words spoken with 'religious truth and modesty.' Hearing Griffith, Katherine believes, near the end of her life, that spiritually refined speech can preserve virtue from the ravages of time and slander, from universal 'corruption.'¹⁴ Griffith's language here is redemptive and transforming, paralleling Cranmer's language at the end of the play.

¹² Lynne Magnusson, 'The Rhetoric of Politeness and *Henry VIII*', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 43.4 (Winter, 1992), 391-409.

¹³ Gordon McMullan, *Introduction to his Arden Shakespeare Edition of King Henry VIII* (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2000), p. 105.

¹⁴ In his article Hunt tries to prove that the languages in *Henry VIII* are similar to those of romances. Maurice Hunt, 'Shakespeare's *King Henry VIII* and the Triumph of the Word', *English Studies*, 75.3, (May, 1994), 233.

Even though at the end of the play, Henry declares that his masculinity is finally restored, it does not come from the birth of Elizabeth. The fulfillment of his manliness has been achieved through the rhetoric of Cranmer. Cranmer's oracle concerning the future reign of Elizabeth I, delivered on the occasion of Elizabeth's baptism, moves him to wonder, and the promise of the future seems to heal him and fashion him anew: 'O Lord Archbishop,/ Thou hast made me now a man' (V.iv. 63-64). The oracle promises a wondrous and providential vision of history and nationhood in which the trials of history are at last fulfilled. The entire nation is included in the celebration by the king's establishment of a new festival day:

This day, no man think
H'as business at his house; for all shall stay:
This little one shall make it Holy-day. (V.iv. 74-76).

At first glance, the closing of *Henry VIII* appears to dismiss the anxiety of the play, providing an occasion that transforms the characters' history and their loss with new meaning. Yet when compared with the closing scenes of the other late plays, this ending feels empty. It can be said that three elements are amiss in the final scene.

First the scene carries the tragic events of the play: Katherine's unjust divorce and her subsequent death. These events are not mentioned in the rhetoric of the scene, yet the *pathos* of Katherine's last scene makes it likely that her death is still fresh in the mind during the final act. By contrast, we might recall the manner in which the loss of Hermione is brought to mind and remains fresh when the fifth act opens in *The Winter's Tale*. Shakespeare does not allow either Leontes or the audience to forget Hermione, yet the characters in *Henry VIII* appear to have forgotten Katherine. Velma Richmond suggests a symbolic connection between these two characters, Hermione and Katherine, as both have the role of 'an innocent and falsely accused queen put aside, who bore her husband's unkindness with great dignity and forgiveness,' a type of 'holy woman.'¹⁵ Both make an appeal to heavenly power prior to their demise and while Hermione's appeal to heavenly power is answered in the final scene, Katherine's is not. Indeed, there is a severe thematic dissonance between Katherine's death scene and the closing ceremony of the play. In one scene, the audience witnesses Katherine's saintly death and has momentary access to heavenly music and the providential translation of

¹⁵ Velma Richmond, *Shakespeare, Catholicism and Romance* (New York: CIP Group, 2000) pp. 204- 206.

her own history; in the other scene, the audience witnesses the unreserved celebration of Ann Bullen's progeny and Cranmer's prophetic vision at Elizabeth's baptism.

Second, the anxiety voiced earlier in the play concerning the main problem of the whole play is not resolved in the final scene. One might compare Cranmer's behaviour in the closing scene to Paulina's. While Paulina addresses each of the doubts her audience may have concerning the ritual of the scene, Cranmer mentions none of them. Rather, the anxieties are conspicuous by their absence, and the ceremony passes too easily. For example the parental blessing – a rite which is the occasion for much concern in *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*, passes here without comment:

King: Thank you good lord archbishop

What's her name?

Cranmer: Elizabeth

King: Stand up lords.

With this kiss take my blessing: God protect thee!

In whose hand I give thy life.

Cranmer: Amen (V.iv.7-13).

The complicated nature of this blessing is alarming because it closes a complicated play - and because blessings are complicated in Shakespeare's work, especially in the late plays.

Though McMullan suspects that *Henry VIII* presents English Reformation as 'an incomplete and ongoing process,' a process that is not yet completed or fulfilled even by the blessing of Elizabeth, I suggest that in this sense, an incomplete process is conveyed because Shakespeare does not allow the closing scene to resolve or even comment on the issues of the play or the issues of the Reformation. In this, the ending of *Henry VIII* is different from the ending of the other romances which resolve the issues of father-daughter and husband-wife conflicts. It is likely that the closing of *Henry VIII* is not meant to summon up the restorative and redemptive impulses of the play and is meant to leave the audience deeply unsettled. We must also remember that though the blessing of Elizabeth provides what seems a comedic ending to this history, the Prologue has already warned that this is no comic play: 'those that can pity, here/ May (if they think it well) let fall a tear;/ The subject will deserve it' (Prologue, 5-7). The Prologue suggests then that the play is meant to end in tears, not in a holiday - if the audience 'think[s] it well' to exercise pity for Katherine. Some may not, as either they are not ready as an audience - they may be among those 'that come to see/ Only a show or two,' (9-10) or they do not believe the subject deserves tears. The Prologue speaks to a divided audience.

The closing scene of *Henry VIII* omits what we have come to expect from a successful Shakespearean closing scene in the previous four romances: that is, the visible reaction of wonder from the characters. This same element was absent in Anne Boleyn's coronation scene; there is no exclamation like 'O wonder!' There is the king's response to Cranmer - 'thou speakest wonder,' but the response is more muted (and less evocative) than the responses of other characters in the late plays. Moreover, there is no mention of the sudden and vocal perception of a heavenly music suggested by the performance of the 'choicest music of the kingdom' (IV.i.94). Katherine, on her deathbed, has a fleeting vision of heavenly harmonies but for Henry there is no vision at all. Cranmer relates his prophecy but the brevity of Henry's response and the absence of heavenly music lend one to doubt whether this leads to any ethical or spiritual transformation of his understanding and identity. The audience is probably meant to hear the words that suggest a restorative vision of the play, yet remain unsettled and suspicious of the event. If anything, the close of *Henry VIII* emphasizes the unsettled nature of what is going to happen in the future.

Undeniably, the play also illustrates the relationship between father and daughter, especially how the birth of Elizabeth affects King Henry's identity. In this scene, Cranmer baptizes Elizabeth and makes a long speech about her future greatness. He mentions that this baby holds great promise for England, and when she dies, she will be reborn like a phoenix, and all her attributes will carry on with James I. King Henry responds to Cranmer's prophecy with a short exclamation 'Thou speakst wonders' (V.iv.55) and later tells Cranmer that

O lord Archbishop,
Thou hast made me now a man. Never before
This happy child did I get anything.
This oracle of comfort has so pleased me
That when I am in heaven I shall desire
To see what this child does and praise my maker (V. iv. 63-68).

One might assume that the birth of Elizabeth includes a redemptive power since this baby has made the king 'a man.' While the narrative of the whole play focuses on the divorce which results from Katherine and Henry's failure to produce a male heir, it is interesting to explore how the coming of a daughter makes the king 'a man.' McMullan has noted in the introduction to the play that 'although none of Katherine's male children survived beyond infancy, their daughter Mary was very much alive, and the suggestion that Henry's

masculinity has only now finally been established by his fathering of another baby girl is implausible.¹⁶ It is very apparent that the coming of Elizabeth does not fulfill King Henry's masculinity; in contrast, what has made him become 'a man' is the prophecy of Cranmer. The image of a phoenix, the symbol of the endless cycle of regeneration, foreshadows the coming of an heir whose 'honour and greatness' / Shall be and make new nations' (V. iv. 52-53). Elizabeth's male heir, not herself, becomes the one who restores Henry's masculinity. Like *The Tempest*, the daughter's redemptive power is not the main issue in this play. It is true that this play explores feminine power but not in redeeming the patriarch, but in challenging the patriarchal authority. This kind of power is also evident in Shakespeare's last play, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*.

Jailer's Daughter's Soliloquy and the Language of Madness

Like *Henry VIII*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* explores the struggle for feminine autonomy and self-sufficiency. There are three main female characters in the play: Hippolyta, the Amazon queen whom Theseus has conquered in a single combat; her sister Emilia, who suffers when Theseus orders her to marry the survivor of Palamon and Arcite's duel; and the nameless Jailer's Daughter, who fulfills her duty in the main plot when she releases Palamon from her Father's prison and becomes insane in the subplot of unrequited love. Lorraine Helms observed that the play 'constructs these characters from a masculine perspective which celebrates Hippolyta's defeat in her combat with Theseus, which validates Emilia's brutally forced marriage, and which mocks the sexuality of the Jailer's Daughter.'¹⁷ However, if we look closely at their speeches, it is very obvious that all the female characters in the play challenge the patriarchal perspectives and successfully assert their agency throughout the course of the play.

The two female characters I would like to explore in this section is the Jailer's Daughter whose father very much cares for her. The Jailer's Daughter frees her love Palamon from prison because - like the two kinsmen - she falls in love with her object of desire at first

¹⁶ McMullan, pp. 81-88.

¹⁷ Lorraine Helms, 'Playing the Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism and Shakespearean Performance', in *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*, ed. by Sue-Ellen Case (Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), pp. 196-206.

sight. The Jailer's Daughter is aware of the hopeless situation due to the social gap that divides their lives. She exclaims: 'To marry him is hopeless; To be his whore is witless' (II.iv. 4-5). This awareness arises from the Daughter's sense of her own unworthiness. She appears in nine scenes in the play, two of which were probably written by Shakespeare. The Jailer's Daughter first appears in II.i after the entrance of her father, the Jailer, and a suitor identified as the 'Wooer.' The Jailer says he does not have much wealth to pass on, but it will be the Wooer's as the husband of his daughter. The two appear to be simple men who trust each other. The Jailer loves his daughter.

JAILER: Well, we will talk more of this when the solemnity is past.
 But have you a full promise of her? When that shall be seen,
 I tender my consent.
 WOOER: I have, sir. (II i. 12-15)

A father who cares whether or not his daughter consents to marry her suitor is relatively normal in Shakespeare's plays, but is not invariably so. Early modern historians argue that consent to marriage must be given by the couple themselves; neither their parents nor anyone else could consent on their behalf. Lawrence Stone, however, has observed that in practice, wealthy parents often had the power to persuade their children into distasteful matches, noting the 'authoritarian control by parents over the marriages of their children.'¹⁸ Margaret Sommerville also notes that the combination of physical and economic pressure undoubtedly made it difficult for children to resist their parents' wishes. She comments that 'at the theoretical level, however, moralists and lawyers were absolutely insistent that parents could neither give consent on their children's behalf nor use coercion to compel their sons or daughters to consent. This had been the position of medieval theologians and canon lawyers and was accepted by early-modern theorists, both Protestant and Catholic.'¹⁹ Most Catholic theologians maintained that marriage without parental approval was sinful and irregular but that it was valid.²⁰ It might be said that in the early modern period, parental coercion was incompatible with the free consent required by marriage. Valid marriage required the voluntary consent of the bride and groom. What the Jailer says in the first lines of the scene

¹⁸ Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (New York: Penguin 1990), pp. 184.

¹⁹ Sommerville has observed that the standard dictum that 'marriage ought to be free' has been frequently quoted by theologian and canonist of the period. See Margaret Sommerville, *Sex and Subjection: Attitude to Women in Early Modern Society* (London: Arnold, 1995), pp. 186.

²⁰ Constance Jordan notes that Catholics were themselves divided on the issue of the validity of a child's marriage without his or her parent's consent; theologians argued it was valid while civil lawyers argued that it was not. Humanists, strongly influenced by Roman law, followed the standard civil law. See Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca. Cornell University Press, 1990), pp. 54-55.

shows him to be a decent, good father, and this characterization is unchanged during the rest of the play. The father figure in this play is absolutely different from that of Henry VIII where the relationship between father and daughter has been clouded by the father's desire for a son. In this play, we have a caring father who will do anything to protect his daughter. And unlike Prospero in *The Tempest*, The Jailer has no ulterior motives in protecting his only daughter or in giving her to the unnamed Wooer.

It can be seen that the playwright gives The Jailer's Daughter four soliloquies which contain a representation of female subjectivity in contrast to patriarchal ideology. The soliloquies mean the absence of the audience as listener to The Jailer's Daughter's discourses. It serves as a legitimization of the character's use of rhetoric: The Jailer's Daughter's rhetorical speeches take place in the context of solitude and therefore do not transgress the gender norms which condemn public utterance. Even though The Jailer's daughter's rhetoric in her soliloquies expresses her sexual desire, the nature of soliloquy has saved her from appropriating the masculine territory of public, rhetorical self-expression. The soliloquies appear to be used as a rhetorical strategy in themselves, especially in expressing the sexual and erotic desires of The Jailer's daughter.

Moreover, the private language of madness also protects her speeches from being condemned as immodest and wanton. The madness of the Jailer's Daughter indicates the customary practice of the Renaissance theatre, a practice that allows female characters to use sexually explicit language when they are insane. Her madness allows her to express her thoughts freely and she can voice her deep emotion without fear of being punished by patriarchal authority. Brian Vickers noted about the language used when a character is mad that 'if we establish a hierarchy of psychological normality, those characters who predominantly speak verse can fall down into prose when they lose their reason: Ophelia, Othello, Lear, Lady Macbeth. (Characters from the prose domain never go mad--their dramatic status would not warrant it).'²¹ It means that madness is a psychological problem of the nobility especially in the plays written before *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. It might be assumed that if The Jailer's Daughter were in Shakespeare's earlier plays, it would have been impossible for her because her social class would have prevented it. It can be said that Shakespeare and Fletcher gave The Jailer's

²¹ Brian Vickers, 'Rites of Passage in Shakespeare's Prose', *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft West: Jahrbuch* (1986), 45.

Daughter's complex subjectivity and allowed her to express it through the soliloquies and dramatic narratives which immunize her from the condemnation of public utterance.

In his recent book *Shakespeare and the History of Soliloquy*, James Hirsh tries to define the conventions of soliloquies in early modern drama. He has devoted three chapters to the exploration of Shakespeare's soliloquies and confidently declared that he has never 'encountered any evidence of any sources that any soliloquy of any work written by Shakespeare represented the interior monologue'²² Hirsh also claims that ample evidence in Shakespeare's plays and those of his contemporaries reveal that in the late sixteenth century, the dominant kind of soliloquy was self-addressed speech.²³ This means that soliloquies are not addressed directly to the audience but are, rather, self-addressed speech. It can be said that Shakespeare's soliloquy is a representation of speech rather than the representation of unspoken thought:

The evidence has shown that late Renaissance playwrights restricted themselves to other dramatizations of outward behavior, which included self-addressed speeches. Real human beings do not have direct access to one another's minds, and Renaissance playwrights did not give playgoers access to the hypothetical minds of characters. In this respect, the relationship of a playgoer to characters was similar to her relationships to her fellow human beings. Soliloquies in late Renaissance drama did not provide infallible access to the innermost thoughts of characters.²⁴

Since the nature of Shakespeare's soliloquy underscores self-addressed speech, the Jailer's daughter's soliloquies might indicate that they represent her speech rather than the words passing through her mind. Her soliloquies are, therefore, immune from condemnation as inappropriate speeches and sexual immorality.

If we closely examine all four soliloquies in Act II scene iv, Act II scene vi, Act III scene ii and Act III scene iv, we will find that The Jailer's Daughter is one of the most independent female characters in Shakespeare's plays. From a sequence of soliloquies, we can see her obsession that later leads to madness. In the first soliloquy, she recalls the time when she saw Palamon for the first time and she felt that he was a handsome young man. And she

²² James Hirsh, 'Shakespeare's Soliloquies: The Representation of Speech', in *Shakespeare and the History of Soliloquy* (New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003), pp. 119-140.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 132

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 136

confesses, 'I loved him, / Extremely loved him, infinitely loved him' (II.iv.14-15). Then she decides to give him freedom despite the fact that she wholeheartedly realizes that she is putting her father in a difficult situation.

Later in III.ii, after Palamon was set free, he has gone into the forests. She is very worried about his safety. She cannot sleep or eat anything for two days. She fears she might lose her mind and commit suicide— 'let not my sense unsettle, / Lest I should drown, or stab, or hang myself' (III.ii.29-30). This expressive prelude to madness is followed by another soliloquy which demonstrates her state of mind. Still wandering in the forest, she imagines she is by the sea. She thinks she spies a ship foundering on the rocks and sinking beneath the water, with all its crewmen lost. She wishes she had a seashell, so she might transform it into a ship and voyage to exotic lands. She ends this soliloquy with a plaintive song about searching the world for her lover. Throughout the play, seen as a lusty young woman, the Jailer's Daughter is frank and open in expressing her sexual desires— both when she has her wits about her and after she has lost them. In her open pursuit of Palamon, she provides a sharp contrast to Emilia's hesitancy about love and sex. But in a way, she has no more freedom of choice than Emilia.

Compared with Ophelia's speech in *Hamlet*, it can be seen that The Jailer's Daughter's sexual language is coarser than that of Ophelia. In Act IV, she said that she 'must lose [her] maidenhead by cocklight' (IV.i.112). She expresses her sexual desire openly. Her language about sex is bawdier than that of Ophelia who has never uttered a lewd or vulgar word even when she was mad. Unlike Ophelia, the Jailer's Daughter is not an aristocrat. She grows up in a lower class family. In the play, she was never on stage with an aristocrat or people of higher social position.

The character of The Jailer's Daughter is the playwrights' invention since in previous versions of the story, his friend freed Palamon from jail. (In previous versions Pirithous recognizes Arcite in prison and gains the latter's release through his friendship with Theseus; in this play, we are told that this happened, but Pirithous does not recognize Arcite when he speaks to him, after Arcite's return to the wood near Athens.) The invention leads to a wide range of responses to her character. Some admire her uninhibited attitude toward sexuality. Others feel that her open eroticism represents a threat to a well-ordered, male-dominated society—a force that must be controlled and modified by marriage. However, if we look at

this play through a feminist lens, it is possibly true to say that this is one of the most feminist plays in the early modern period.

Emilia's Modest Proposal

While the Jailer's Daughter has asserted her agency and autonomy through her soliloquies and the dramatic use of the language of madness, Emilia, in contrast, challenges patriarchal tyranny by employing her modesty and reason. It can be seen that the play presents patriarchal tyranny in a form of compulsive marriage. Mary Beth Rose noted that 'marrying Emilia is never an explicit concern [even] of the kinsmen, who quarrel only over the right to love her.'²⁵ Marriage now can be seen as an act of Theseus' political tyranny. Even though at the end of the play she fails in challenging Theseus' absolute power over her marriage, she is the only character who questions his rule.

When Theseus demands that both Palamon and Arcite be executed by giving reasons that they will 'fight about you; hourly bring your honour/ In public question with their swords,' and 'it concerns [her] credit/ And [his] oath equally' (III.iv.221-223), Emilia argues eloquently that:

Oh, my noble brother,
That oath was rashly made and in your anger.
Your reason will not hold it; if such vows
Stand for express will, all the world must perish
Beside, I have another oath 'gainst yours,
Of more authority, I am sure more love,
Not made in passion neither but good heed (III.iv.226-232).

Her speech here is interesting because she not only urges him to take back his oath, but also questions the validity of Theseus' oath and expresses her preference for reason over passion. When Palamon and Arcite are caught dueling, Arcite pleads with Theseus: 'Duke, ask that lady / Why she is fair, and why her eyes command me / . . . to love her' (III.vi.168-70). Hippolyta similarly blames Emilia's face: 'that face of yours / Will bear the curses . . . of after ages / For these lost cousins' (III.vi.186-88). Emilia finally responds, 'in my face, dear sister, I find no anger to 'em, nor no ruin'; instead, she argues, 'the misadventure of their own eyes kill 'em' (III.vi.188-90). Laurie Shannon observed that Emilia also criticizes the 'gender mechanics of courtly love' announcing that she has 'a critical consciousness that does not

²⁵ Mary Beth Rose, *The Expense of the Spirit: Love and Sexuality in Renaissance Drama* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), p. 220.

consent, exposing the Petrarchan system'²⁶

One might look at Emilia's indecisiveness in choosing between two men falling in love with her as a sign of her potential dependence on masculine authority, but if one reads the text closely, one finds that when praying to Diana, she imagines herself as a 'female knight' (V.i.140) who asks for help from Diana. Her request to Diana is not a request to remain a maid but includes the alternative of being won by the suitor who loves her most. It can be seen that Emilia does not allow her fate to lie in the hands of male characters but instead in the will of Diana, a symbol of female chastity. Jeanne Addison Roberts noted that Emilia repeatedly identifies with *women*, defining herself as 'a natural sister of our sex' (I.i.125), invoking 'The powers of all women' (III.vi.194), and thinking of others in terms of their mothers. She has observed that on seeing Arcite, she supposes his handsome face was inherited from his mother, and she asks Theseus' mercy on the two knights because of 'The goodly mothers that have groan'd' for them (III.vi.245). She tries to choose between them for the sake of 'their weeping mothers' (IV.ii.4) and thinks of them as their mothers' joy (IV.ii.63).²⁷

The most intriguing incident that illustrates the female threat against male dominated ideologies is her love for Flavina, her childhood friend, about whom she said that she would never love any man like she loves this friend. The same-sex association can be seen as a harmony of female friendship from which the masculine is barred. This idea is underscored again when she asks Theseus to banish both Palamon and Arcite and make them 'swear' that they will 'never more/ to make [her] their contention' (III.vi.222-223). She has undoubtedly proved that her love for Flavina is stronger, and she has no intention to marry the kinsmen. However the marriage of Emilia to Palamon is inevitable since 'it is central to, and underscores, the established order of patriarchal society.'²⁸ It can be fairly said that the marriage also mirrors the triumph of Theseus' tyranny.

On these grounds, it is clear that *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, when exploring the

²⁶ See Laurie Shannon, 'Emilia's Argument: Friendship and 'Human Title' in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', *ELH*, 64.3 (Fall, 1997), 657-82

²⁷ Jeanne Addison Roberts, 'Crises of Male Self-Definition in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*', in *Shakespeare, Fletcher and The Two Noble Kinsmen*, ed. by Charles H. Frey (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1989), pp. 133-44.

²⁸ Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), p. 85.

assertion of female rhetoric and autonomy, share generic traits which are similar to the four previous romances. Even though it is undoubtedly true that the two last plays share some elements of romance, the characteristics of romance are not the main concerns of these two plays. While we look at Shakespeare's romances as plays of redemption and reconciliation, these two late plays, in contrast, do not mainly focus on the theme of redemption.

At the end of *Henry VIII*, it is the divorce and not the reunion that becomes the influential theme of the play. *The Two Noble Kinsmen* also ends with the death of Arcite and the marriage of Palamon and Emilia, not reconciliation between two friends. The redemption of the patriarch by female power has been replaced by the assertion of autonomy and the expression of self-sufficiency through the challenge to patriarchal ideologies and the establishment of female agency. The female speeches in these two last plays shift the direction of the plays from romances back to tragicomedy. Even though the assertion of their agency and the declaration of their autonomy have not changed their status and position in male-dominated society, they have at least given them a voice in challenging patriarchal ideologies. While the first four romances explore the feminine redemptive power in rescuing the patriarchs and in restoring order back to society, the last two plays closely examine feminine power in a different context. It can be concluded that feminine power is very dominant in these late plays.

Conclusion

From the beginning of Shakespeare's *Pericles*, we can see the corruption and disease that happens in the play and trust in the language of male characters is absent. Language plays the vital part in constructing and shaping the conclusion of the play. While he creates the spiritual infection of Pericles, Shakespeare does not need to provide a remedy for the disease in order to create a happy ending. Marina's metaphoric language is very powerful while the direct language is uncommunicative in the play. Shakespeare gives the therapeutic power to female voices through the use of ambiguous and metaphoric language. The redemptive female rhetoric can also be observed in *Cymbeline* where female agency and forgiving speeches play an important role in the process of redemption and reconciliation. Shakespeare uses silence not only as a sign of rebellion and resistance or submission and obedience, but in *The Winter's Tale*, he also employs silence as a sign of forgiveness and a vital element for redemption. He also challenges the patriarchal ideology on female courtly language by equipping Paulina with sarcasm and ferocious language which is the only voice heard. Her rhetorical triumph and her therapeutic power in healing Leontes bring a new light to the controversial, double-bind assumption about female speech. In *The Winter's Tale*, Shakespeare shows us the controversial nature of rhetoric by showing that rhetoric is not for everyone, especially women. Even though Hermione is well-equipped with rhetorical strategies, she still fails to persuade. In the *Tempest*, we can see the power of Miranda's compassionate and merciful language that steers Prospero from vengeance/murder to forgiveness. The redemptive power of her speech not only redeems her father but also restores his dukedom and extends his political alliance. However, the redemptive power of female language in Shakespeare's romances is limited, even though its functions are vividly illustrated in these four plays where the male characters are in need of redemption. The female redemptive power in romances inevitably involves understanding, repenting, forgiving and restoring, which seem to be the most unique characteristics of female utterance in romances. The critics might be right when saying romances are the plays of redemption and forgiveness.¹ The female language becomes redemptive and has therapeutic power because it amazingly heals, restores order and normalcy back to the plays. While the redemptive language of female characters plays a vital role in the first four plays, this kind of language cannot be found in the last two plays: *King Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble*

¹ Sarah Beckwith, *Shakespeare and the Grammar of Forgiveness* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011)

Kinsmen. But what is the distinctive characteristic of female speech in Shakespeare's late plays?

This thesis gives the answer to that question. Female speech, which is always seen as a site of corruption and evil in the tragedy and as a ground of ridicule and disobedience in comedy becomes the source of therapeutic and redemptive power in romances. The medicinal and therapeutic properties of female speech are very evident in all four plays while in the last two plays this kind of language is absent. This might be because the last two plays are co-authored with John Fletcher, but we can see the same kind of language as can be found in the previous four romances in the last two plays, especially in scenes presumably written by Shakespeare.

In the last two plays, *King Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Shakespeare, however, shifts the emphasis of female rhetorical power from the power of redemption to the power of female assertion. The female language in the last two plays is noticeably different from the previous four romances. The redemptive power of female rhetoric is not the main concern in these two final plays. If we consider Shakespeare's romances as plays exploring the theme of restoration and reunion of father and daughter or husband and wife, *Henry VIII* could be farther away from the previous four romances. Divorce not reunion is the main issue of this play. The relationship of father and daughter is never developed throughout the course of the play, and again, we have Katherine who has sufficient knowledge on rhetoric but fails to persuade even though she strictly follows the rhetorical textbook in defending her position as Queen of England. In the last play, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, Shakespeare creates one of the most interesting female characters of his career, The Jailer's Daughter, whose language is lewd and coarse. However, through the use of soliloquies and madness, she is immune from being condemned or punished.

It is undoubtedly clear that the representations of female speech in Shakespeare's late plays have shaped, controlled and influenced their interpretation and generic classification. Romance has become a term frequently used in regard to the last four plays: *Pericles*, *Cymbeline*, *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*. The generic classification of these plays previously depended on the recurrent motifs that occur in the plays. The father/daughter relationship is another factor that influences critics to group these four plays together. However, if we see romance as a play of redemption of a father figure by the daughter or

wife, all four plays can be grouped together as a genre. In contrast, the rhetoric of redemption might appear in *King Henry VIII*. We can see that Katherine is redeemed at the end of Act IV scene ii when she dreams of angels and heavenly salvation. She is redeemed but she is not a redeemer. Katherine is not able to redeem her husband. In *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, even though The Jailer's Daughter's speech is rebellious and challenging, she avoids condemnation because she speaks in soliloquies and madness. The soliloquies and madness become strategies she uses to speak her mind. She becomes one of the most rebellious characters in Shakespeare's plays.

The thesis concludes that Shakespeare's late plays are the best places to investigate the controversial position of female rhetoric because Shakespeare presents and reflects on the many different ways in which female speech is represented in this period, and, interestingly, he shows us the ways in which women adopted, adapted, circumvented, negotiated or even defied rhetorical strategies in order to achieve their end.