UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA CRUZ

RECOVERING THE IRRECOVERABLE: FEMALE FIGURATIVE DISTILLERS IN THREE SHAKESPEAREAN PLAYS

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

LITERATURE

by

Ashley Herum

December 2022

The Dissertation of Ashley Herum is approved:

_____
Professor Sean Keilen, chair

_____
Professor Emerita Karen Bassi

_____
Professor Martin J. Devecka

_____
Professor Patty Gallagher

_____
Peter Biehl
Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

RECOVERING THE IRRECOVERABLE: FEMALE FIGURATIVE DISTILLERS IN THREE SHAKESPEAREAN PLAYS

Table of Contents

Abstract v

Acknowledgements vii

Introduction 1

The Trope of the *Hortus Conclusus*, with Variations 4

Relationship with Time 12

Alchemical Rebirth 16

(Quasi-)Goddess Figures 22

Distillation as Poetic Creation 25

Organization of the Chapters 28

I. The Angelical Perfume in Juliet's Bosom 32

Juliet as Artless Figurative Perfumer 32

Juliet's Creative Agency 37

The Difference between Paris' and Romeo's Scents: A Matter of Wordplay 41

Paris' Scent: The Paris Garden and Herb Paris 41

"Romeo" Transmuted to "Rose": Damask and Canker 45

Nurse's Speech on Juliet's Weaning 56

Angelica: Sweet, Bitter, and Musky 64

Friar on Nurse and Friar "as" Nurse 69

II. "I Am Again for Cydnus": Cleopatra's Perfumed, Renewing Purse 81

Cleopatra as Self-Aware Figurative Perfumer 81

Cleopatra as Isis(-Like) 100

Enobarbus' Bewildering, Enthralling, Perfume-Like Rhetoric 106

Quasi-Causal Connections 109

Pervasive Aural Perfume 112

Savorous Comminglings Both Erotic and Infantile-Maternal 114

An Enfolded Reflection 121

III. The Merciful Weight of Mariana's Tear-Distilled Memory 132

Mariana as Figurative Distiller of (a) Bastard 132

Mariana Incorporates Aspects of Both Mary Magdalène and the Virgin Mary 140

Perverted, Debased Biblical Imagery and Motifs 157

Mariana's Emergent Spiritual and Secular Authority 169

Barnardine: Forgetful Counterweight to Mariana 173

Barnardine as Bernard of Clairvaux 176

The Bohemian Barnardine and the Renewing Power of Music 184

The Weight of Mariana's Tear-Fostered Memory 189

RECOVERING THE IRRECOVERABLE: FEMALE FIGURATIVE DISTILLERS IN THREE SHAKESPEAREAN PLAYS

Ashley Herum

ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the efforts that particular female characters in three of Shakespeare's plays make to revive and to perpetuate sensations related to experiences in the past: sensations that are, strictly speaking, in the mundane world, irrecoverable. Adepts at the sustaining or reviving of memory, these female characters are figured as distillers. As figurative distillers, these three female characters engage with the fragrances and tastes of particular "corpses," exhalations, exudations, and secretions of plants and animals (including humans), whether in "raw," or unprocessed, form or in (figuratively) distilled or otherwise processed form. These characters' fostering of memory is linked within the plays not just to specific tastes and fragrances, nor just to specific plant and bodily emissions, but also to specific locations, in a particular way: another character than themselves describes the locations. These locations, together with the event or the habitual action reported to have taken place—or still continuously to take place—within them, then serve as the foundational source for the reader or audience in terms of contextualizing what the three female characters remember and seek to restore. The locations that provide context for the three female characters' implied memories, moreover, conform to the trope of the *hortus conclusus,* albeit with variations. The *hortus conclusus* may be

understood within each play as the womb of the corresponding female character. These three female characters' variously generative and restorative creative powers are connected to the authority of female (near-)divinities, such as the earth, the goddess Isis, and the Virgin Mary. At various points throughout Shakespeare's oeuvre, including in these three plays, he refers to distillation as a metaphor for the creation of poetry. Distillation in Shakespeare's time was defined in a widely circulated book as an alchemical process. Through these three female figurative distillers' implied bodily memories, they become both the (re-)creator of what they seek to recover and the embodiment of alchemical metaphors of poetic creation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the members of my dissertation committee for their part in my writing of this dissertation. Upon reading Sean Keilen's book *Vulgar Eloquence: On the Renaissance Invention of English Literature* almost a decade ago, I had the premonition that I would study with him and write about Shakespeare. Happily, unlike the tricksy oracles in books, that premonition was what it seemed. As the chair of my dissertation committee, Sean has offered encouragement and words almost impossibly wise. Karen Bassi could not have been more generous in the attention and interest she lavished on drafts of my chapters; I am overbrimming with gratitude to her. I drew continual strength from Martin Devecka's support of, and goodwill toward, my project. Patty Gallagher inspired me with her extraordinary Shakespearean clowning and her directing.

I shall always be grateful for the kind help Mario Télo and Mary-Kay Gamel extended to me in the earliest stage of my project.

The Classics Program at the University of California, Santa Cruz, was a source of mirth and conviviality, even during the COVID-19 pandemic lockdowns. I especially wish to thank Martin Devecka, Maya Gupta, Kristina Chew, and Karen Bassi. Karen Bassi's Ovid reading group has been a particular source of pleasure and sustenance.

The glamour of working in live theatre exerted its gravitational pull on me and led me ever further into the realm of Shakespeare, where I worked as a dramaturg during the writing of this dissertation. That experience radically changed the

direction of my dissertation: it is no coincidence that bodily memory is its focus, bodies being so prominent a part of live theatre. I would like to thank Porter College at the University of California, Santa Cruz, for funding my dramaturgical work for UC Santa Cruz's acting troupe *Shakespeare To Go* for four seasons, from 2017-2020. I profusely thank the troupe's director, Patty Gallagher, as well, for entrusting me with the dramaturg role for those productions. I am grateful to The Humanities Institute at the University of California, Santa Cruz, for funding four of the seven seasons I spent, from 2016-2022, as a dramaturg at Santa Cruz Shakespeare. The funding for two of those years was in the form of the C.L. Barber Fellowship in Dramaturgy, including the inaugural year of that fellowship.

During the 2016-2022 seasons at Santa Cruz Shakespeare, Michael Warren taught me about Shakespearean dramaturgy: what a privilege beyond price! Mike Ryan led the company graciously and artistically. I would like, too, to thank everyone with whom I worked at Santa Cruz Shakespeare.

Thank you to the colleagues who helped to show me the way: Emily Sloan-Pace, founder of Shakespeare on the Edges, and Maria Frangos, Melissa Yinger, Kendra Doherty, and Ariane Hélou. Thank you, too, to my compatriots Amani Liggett and Katie O'Hare, with special thanks to Nate Gentilin and Tara Thomas.

In the world outside of academia, I am particularly grateful to the Bealer family: Brian, Amanda, Chase, and Carson, and to Spring Smith and her family: Alejandro Restrepo and Mateo. Thank you, also, to Stan, Marina and James. And thank you, N. and N.!

INTRODUCTION

Mortal paradise of […] sweet flesh.

-William Shakespeare, from *Romeo and Juliet* (ca. 1595)

My fifter my fpouse is as a garden inclosed...

-Song of Songs 4:12, *Geneva Bible* (1560)

For never-resting time leads summer on
To hideous winter, and confounds him there,
Sap checked with frost and lusty leaves quite gone,
Beauty o'er-snowed and bareness everywhere;
Then were not summer's distillation left,
A liquid prisoner pent in walls of glass,
Beauty's effect with beauty were bereft,
Nor it, nor no remembrance what it was.
But flowers distilled, though they with winter meet,
Leese but their show; their substance still lives sweet.

-William Shakespeare, from Sonnet 5 (1609)

Although newly defeated in war and newly bereft of Antony her lover, Cleopatra blazons Antony, thus re-making him as a figure of endlessly recurring, flourishing virility. She does so in part by invoking the dolphin which, being fish-like, may be construed in her description as a symbol of eternal life, just as is the fish in association with Christ:

> His delights
> Were dolphin-like: they showed his back above
> The element they lived in.
>
> *AC* V.2.87-89[1]

[1] Unless otherwise noted, the edition used throughout this dissertation is William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra,* ed. John Wilders (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2018).

Through a portrayal of Antony's sexual pleasures (his "delights") as expressed by the spiraling leaps with which dolphins breach the water's surface, Cleopatra assimilates Antony to the dolphin.[2] The dolphin lives in two elements: the water that, in the metonymic universe of the play, is the amniotic fluid of Cleopatra's womb, and the air that is the vehicle of Antony's and Cleopatra's olfactory-based intercommunication from the time they first have met—not face to face, but through the heavily perfumed air that Cleopatra strategically diffuses on the wind as she travels by barge along the River of Cydnus.[3]

"I am fire and air," exults Cleopatra, "My other elements / I give to baser life" (V.2.288-289). So she speaks as she stages what she herself characterizes not as her suicide but as her return to "Cydnus / To meet Mark Antony" (V.2.227-228). Apostrophizing Antony, she declares, "Husband, I come!" Thus we see that Cleopatra transforms Antony with her perfumed breath, repeatedly, cyclically, from a nursing infant whom, for example, in the guise of fishes she draws up out of the Nile (II.5.10-15), to god-like, adult emperor-husband (V.2.75-91). She does so in a way that mimics the manner in which a dolphin "show[s] his back above" (*AC* V.2.88) the water: in a series of recurring spirals. And, in her transformation of Antony, the series of recurring spirals is never-ending.

---

[2] "delight, n.". OED Online. September 2022. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/49382?rskey=1Wgaua&result=1&isAdvanced=false (accessed November 16, 2022).

[3] Holly Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume: Scent and Sense in Early Modern England.* Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008, 20; 198, n. 77, notes that Antony fell in love with Cleopatra "not at first sight, but at first smell" (20).

Cleopatra shares this power of creating an enduring transformation with two other female characters from Shakespeare: Juliet in *Romeo and Juliet* and Mariana in *Measure for Measure.*

This dissertation explores the efforts that particular female characters in three of Shakespeare's plays make to revive and to perpetuate sensations related to experiences in the past: sensations that are, strictly speaking, in the mundane world, irrecoverable. Adepts at the sustaining or reviving of memory, these female characters are figured as artists. Juliet (with the tutelage of Nurse and Friar) in *Romeo and Juliet,* Cleopatra in *Antony and Cleopatra,* and Mariana in *Measure for Measure* engage in the revision and preservation in memory of Romeo, Antony, and Angelo, respectively. As figurative artists, these three female characters engage with the fragrances and tastes of particular "corpses," exhalations, exudations, and secretions of plants and animals (including humans), whether in "raw," or unprocessed, form or in (figuratively) distilled or otherwise processed form. Among these excretions, seepages, expirations, and remains are: carrion; parts of the herbs angelica and wormwood; dung; myrrh; tears and breast milk; blood and wine; herbal, floral and human breath, including the "breath" emitted by the vagina or by its representation in clothing of the English Renaissance: the purse or pocket.

These characters' fostering of memory is linked within the plays not just to specific tastes and fragrances (as, for instance, that of the Damascene rose or of

angelica) nor just to specific plant and bodily emissions (as, for example, breast milk and tears), but also to specific locations, in a particular way: another character than themselves describes the locations (Nurse in *Romeo and Juliet*; Enobarbus in *Antony and Cleopatra,* and Friar Ludowick [the disguised Duke] in *Measure for Measure).* These locations, together with the event or the habitual action reported to have taken place—or still continuously to take place—within them, then serve as the foundational source for the reader or audience in terms of contextualizing what the three female characters remember and seek to restore. Yet Nurse's, Enobarbus', and the Duke-as-Friar's descriptions are merely proxies for the three female characters' own (implied) memories. As such, they provide us only oblique glances, whiffs, and tastes of those characters' memories, as staged, so to speak, within those locations. The location in each instance is a garden that provides information about the particular character's erotic and nurturing or creative propensities.

The Trope of the Hortus Conclusus*, with Variations*

Broadly speaking, the gardens in which each character is portrayed are instances of the trope of the *hortus conclusus*, or "enclosed garden," albeit with variations. In the late Middle Ages, the virginal condition of Mary, the Mother of God in the Christian tradition, had been represented in iconography through images of her

seated in a flower garden enclosed by a wall.[4] A walled garden, moreover, had become the conventional setting for paintings that portrayed the Annunciation.[5] This imagery, and the term for it, *hortus conclusus,* or "a garden enclosed," derived from the Song of Songs, a remarkably erotic book of the *Bible*, in which the lover says of his beloved:

> My fifter my fpouse is as a garden inclosed…
> Song of Songs 4:12[6]

By Shakespeare's time, the imagery of the Song of Songs had long been adopted by secular poets; its immediate source in any given work might not be the Song of Songs itself, but another work derived from it. The enclosed garden had become a private place for worldly lovers to meet. In these three plays, I argue that the three female characters, Juliet, Cleopatra, and Mariana, respectively, are earthly lovers (or, as in the case of Mariana, a would-be lover), who also have characteristics of divine female figures. The garden settings in which they appear is one component of their (quasi-)divine identities.

---

[4] Mark Jones, "Some Versions of the *Hortus Conclusus* in Elizabethan Landscape and Literature," *Literature Compass* 6:2 (2009): 355.
[5] Brian E. Daley, "Late Medieval Iconography of Mary," in *Medieval Gardens,* 253-278*,* ed. Elisabeth B. MacDougall (Dumbarton Oaks, 1986), 274.
[6] Unless otherwise noted, the edition of the *Bible* cited is *The Geneva Bible, A Fascimile of the 1560 Edition,* ed. William Whittingham (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969). Note that this translation of the *Bible* refers to the Song of Songs as "An Excellent Song, which was Salomons (sic)." In this dissertation, I use the terminology "Song of Songs," as this provides for consistency of terminology with my discussion of Bernard of Clairvaux's *Sermons on the Song of Songs* (*Sermones super Canticum Canticorum*) in Chapter 3.

In all of the plays, too, there is an additional garden, or garden-like space, besides the foundational one, in which the characters figure: these additional spaces more closely conform to the definition of a *hortus conclusus* (Capulet's orchard; the Nile and the zone of fertile land bounded by the reach of the river's own flood waters; and Angelo's garden). I shall interweave discussion of them with that of the "foundational" gardens that establish the ground of the characters' memories.

Nurse describes Juliet's weaning as having taken place in what is implicitly a kitchen garden, as the presence of a dovehouse indicates.[7] Part of the garden's boundary apparently is formed by the wall of the dovehouse, the shaking of which in an earthquake suggests—one might say, "foretells," or "discloses"—the precarity of Juliet's virginity at the time when Nurse delivers her speech (I.3.24-28). Romeo indeed summarily bypasses the wall surrounding Capulet's orchard, which Juliet's bedroom overlooks: "With love's light wings did I o'er-perch these walls" (II.2.66)," Romeo crows.[8] When, upon his banishment, he laments, "There is no world without Verona's walls" (III.3.17), it is as though he refers to the world without Capulet's orchard and, by extension, without Juliet's body. In discussing medieval depictions of "romance," or "love gardens," Teresa McLean distinguishes between portrayals in medieval literature of Garden of Eden like spaces, replete with trees, and those reminiscent of the enclosed garden

[7] Paula Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden* (New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2005), 14.
[8] See also Jones, "Some Versions of the *Hortus Conclusus*," 375.

of the Song of Songs: by late medieval times the exquisitely depicted garden of the Song of Songs, rather than the Garden of Eden, had become the primary biblical model for literary and other artistic representations of gardens dedicated to erotic pursuits.[9] Capulet's orchard, however, can be construed as a combination of the two biblical gardens, being surrounded by a wall that contains enough fruit trees as to warrant the name "orchard." That Juliet proposes renaming Romeo further associates Capulet's orchard with the Garden of Eden, where Adam bestowed names upon the beasts and the birds (*Genesis* 2:19-20).

The "moated grange (*MM* III.1.247-248)," in which the Duke, disguised as Friar Ludowick, reports Mariana to dwell is not a flower garden in the sense of being a pleasure garden for lovers. Rather, it is a kitchen garden for a monastery, enclosed by water. A monastery's kitchen garden, however, would have contained fragrant flowers used for medicine and as cooking ingredients.[10] Mariana's assignation with Angelo, as if a perverse re-enactment of the Annunciation, also takes place within an enclosed garden: Angelo's own garden, within his garden house. Much attention is drawn in the play to the fact that his garden is well barricaded. Not only is it appointed with a surrounding brick wall, but the side containing the door, which is kept locked, is further defended from the outside by a vineyard, the gate of which is also kept locked:

> He hath a garden circummured with brick,
> Whose western side is with a vineyard backed,
> And to that vineyard is a planched gate

[9] McLean, Teresa, *Medieval English Gardens* (London: Collins, 1981), 120-121.
[10] McLean, Teresa, *Medieval English Gardens*, 140.

> That makes his opening with a bigger key;
> The other doth command a little door,
> Which from the vineyard to the garden leads.
>
> *MM*, IV.1.26-31[11]

The fact that it is locked is not out of keeping with the *hortus conclusus* of the Song of Songs in which appear the lines:

> My wellbeloued put in his hand by the hole of the dore, & mine heart was affectioned toward him.
>
> I rofe vp to opẽ to my wellbeloued, and mine hãds did droppe down myrrhe, & my fingers pure myrrhe vpon the handels of the barre.
>
> Song of Songs 5:4-5

Conspicuously lacking, however, from the description of Angelo's garden is any celebration of a beloved. Thus, despite details that connect Angelo's garden to the *hortus conclusus* of the Song of Songs (its surrounding wall; its vineyard; its being locked), Angelo's garden reads like a prison ward as much as like a pleasant enclosure. Yet, we might recall that there is some ambiguity in the play as to the nature of the accommodations within the prison: Barnardine who, like Claudio, has been condemned to death, perpetually evades this sentence. At his own discretion, Barnardine determines to retire to his "ward" (*MM* IV.3.54) within the prison, rather than to submit to execution. Furthermore, according to the Provost of the prison, Barnardine could leave the prison, if he so chose. Rather like Vienna's prison with its "secret holds" (*MM* IV.3.78), the monastery

[11] Unless otherwise noted, references to the text of *Measure to Measure* are to: William Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure,* ed. Brian Gibbons (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

of St. Luke's presumably contains cells, albeit for monks rather than for prisoners. Yet it also houses the "moated grange" (*MM* III.1.247-248), where Mariana is enclosed. Angelo's garden distortedly reflects both places in the city: the prison and the monastery of St. Luke's.

In the Vienna of the play Angelo's garden house is an anachronism. Such a structure was popular in Renaissance England, in great houses of rich or influential men (such as Angelo is in Vienna). They were also referred to as "banqueting houses," as their express purpose was to serve as dining rooms for the so-called "banquet," or dessert, course.[12] Banqueting houses were also notoriously put to secondary use, however, as trysting places.[13] That Angelo or Mariana or both amount to a sweet food for the other's delectation is one underlying suggestion of the particular place in which they meet. There are resonances, too, of the Song of Songs, in which the lover and beloved liken one another's bodies to various foods and spices as well as to milk and wine.

Although there is no garden, as such, in *Antony and Cleopatra,* Cleopatra is a garden unto herself in all but name. She is linked with more than one river and its banks: the Tiber, by analogy with the Nile; implicitly, the Thames; but most notably the Nile and the Cydnus. Enobarbus delivers a lyrical speech of extraordinary sensory richness in which he describes Cleopatra's progress by

---

[12] Paula Henderson, "The Architecture of the Tudor Garden," *Garden History* 27: 1, Tudor Gardens (1999), 54-7; Miriam Jacobson, *Barbarous Antiquity: Representing the Past in the Poetry of Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 56.
[13] Henderson, "The Architecture of the Tudor Garden," 69. At least, they were notorious for this in the over-heated minds of the likes of Philip Stubbs, the Puritan pamphleteer, whom Henderson cites as railing against their use for such purposes.

barge down the Cydnus River (*AC* II.2196-236). In his portrayal, Cleopatra's bodily presence is not readily locatable in any direct fashion, as Jonathan Gil Harris famously observes;[14] however, Enobarbus intimates Cleopatra's narcotic, flower-like scent through his reference both to one of her female crew-members' "flower-soft hands" (*AC* II.2.220) and to the perfume which both permeates the barge's sails and is emitted in such powerful waves that it "hits the sense" (*AC* II.2.222) of the riverbank.[15] Enobarbus also suggests, again indirectly, that Cleopatra's genitalia emit a powerfully attractive scent through which she enthralls Antony. The flower-like qualities exhibited by Cleopatra's barge assemblage in its progress along the River of Cydnus form an elaborate metaphor for Cleopatra's own elusive and simultaneously sensorily overwhelming self-presentation. Cleopatra's diffuse, uncontained presence, furthermore, echoes aspects both of the river-water (its hidden depths; its ungraspable liquid self; its instability) and of the winds that waft her perfume (their invisibility; their ungovernability; their proclivity to shift in direction and strength). The setting—upon water, amid winds, filled with sensual charms—forms a variation on the trope of the *hortus conclusus.* In *Antony and Cleopatra* the Nile River and its adjacent arable fields form another variation on the *hortus conclusus*. Through the annual flooding of its banks, the Nile deposits fertile silt on the fields which

[14] Jonathan Gil Harris, "'Narcissus in Thy Face': Roman Desire and The Difference It Fakes in *Antony and Cleopatra.*" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45: 4 (1994): 408-425.
[15] Here I use the term "narcotic" as it is used in modern perfumery: not to mean "sleep-inducing," which is its standard meaning when applied to pharmaceutical preparations, but, rather, "overpoweringly heady and seductive."

border it all along its length. Cleopatra is figured as both the cyclically overspilling Nile and its cyclically swamped margin. Antony even addresses Cleopatra as "Egypt" (e.g., III.11.51), as though he called her by the name of a garden that comprised a whole riverine country. In Agrippa's remark to his fellow Romans Enobarbus and Maecenas on Cleopatra's interaction with Antony's predecessor, Julius Caesar, he refers to her as an arable field:

> Royal wench!
> She made great Caesar lay his sword to bed.
> He ploughed her, and she cropped.
>
> *AC* II.2.236-238

A field of crops is not the same thing as an enclosed pleasure garden. Egypt—the country, but also the figurative garden, or the queen Cleopatra—could be considered "enclosed," or "intact," however, in that it annually renews itself, during its springtide self-fertilization, with the waters of the river that runs through its length. This point is relevant to my later discussion in this Introduction and in Chapter 3 of Cleopatra as Isis, who cyclically enacts a search for her dismembered son / lover. [16]

[16] Plutarch, *Moralia,* trans. Philemon Holland (London: Printed by Arnold Hatfield, 1603). Accessed through Early English Books Online, 1303, discusses how the Nile's annual flooding and enriching of the fields links the river to Isis, whose annual search for Osiris also is cyclical and recurring.

Relationship with Time

Being centered on sensory and emotive sensations experienced in the past and sustained and revived through their implied memories, Juliet's, Cleopatra's, and Mariana's relationship with time is different from, and overrides, that of their male (sometime-)consorts, whose own stance towards time is marked by a concern with future renown for martial or political prowess. Even if, as in Romeo's case, his concern for political honor, as evinced when he kills Tybalt, appears on the surface as petty, adolescent, factional squabbling, it nevertheless centers on upholding his dynasty's claim to ascendance and, by extension, honor, over Juliet's—his own wife's—father's dynasty.[17] At the hands of the three female characters, respectively, all three of the male characters undergo a transformation which counteracts their own original stance toward time. According to Mariana, Angelo is "moulded" (*MM* V.1.432) by her, as though, like the sacrificial Christ, he were (transubstantiated) bread.[18] Although Angelo shows no sign that he is aware of Mariana's moulding of him, nevertheless, finally, under duress, having been publicly exposed in a staged spectacle in the street, he does claim to have acquired a "penitent heart" (*MM* V.1.478).

---

[17] Admittedly, dynastic squabbling generally does appear as petty, adolescent jockeying for power at others' expense, as does its manifestation on a yet larger political scale.

[18] "mould | mold, v.1". OED Online. September 2022. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/122813?rskey=bNiaQI&result=7 (accessed November 17, 2022). Both the senses found in 1a. and 6c are relevant. The *OED* cites Mariana's use of "moulded" (*MM* V.1.432) in its definition for "mould," v.1, 6c: "[t]o create, produce, or shape (a character…)," but "to shape (bread) into loaves," as found in the sense v.1.1a is also operative.

I argue in Chapter 2 that Juliet figuratively transforms Romeo into a Damascene rose, a perfume ingredient, as part of her implied project of turning him into a lasting perfume. A dream of Romeo's alerts him to the changes which he himself is undergoing, but, like an oracle, it does so in a cryptic manner which leads to his misinterpretation of it.

> I dreamt my lady came and found me dead—
> Strange dream that gives a dead man leave to think—
> And breathed such life with kisses in my lips
> That I revived and was an emperor.
>
> *RJ,* V.1.6-9[19]

Tanya Pollard proposes that Romeo indeed becomes an emperor, but not within the duration of his own, self-contained "life."[20] Instead, his revivification as "an emperor" (*RJ* V.1.9) must "wait," so to say, until his permutation as Antony in *Antony and Cleopatra.*

In her blazon of Antony, Cleopatra indeed portrays him as an emperor.

> I dreamt there was an emperor Antony.
> […]
> His face was as the heavens, and therein stuck
> A sun and moon which kept their course and lighted
> The little O, the earth…
>
> *AC* V.2.75; 78-80

[19] Unless otherwise noted, the edition referenced throughout this dissertation is William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet,* ed. René Weis (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2012).
[20] Tanya Pollard, *Drugs and Theater in Early Modern England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 77; within the confines of the text of *Romeo and Juliet*, Romeo is, however, transformed into a golden statue, a figure for alchemical transmutation from a base, or corruptible substance to an incorruptible one. Yet this change is owing to the efforts of his father-in-law and father, even if neither man would have attempted such a project if Juliet had not persisted in finding in Romeo's savor an equivalent to Nurse's when she served as Juliet's wet nurse.

Before Cleopatra refers to Antony as an emperor, however, a handful of his followers or attendants in the play have addressed him as "emperor": notably, his faithful servant Eros who does so as he attempts to dissuade Antony from forcing him to kill him (Antony) in his distress over what he believes to be Cleopatra's suicide. Shortly before Eros calls Antony "my emperor" (*AC* IV.14.91), he alludes to Antony's impregnability in battle against arrows, even those discharged by master archers (*AC* IV.14.70-72), as well as to his supposed status as someone who is the object of world-wide "worship" (*AC* IV.14.86-87).[21]

> The gods withhold me!
> Shall I do that which all the Parthian darts,
> Though enemy, lost aim and could not?
> […]
> Turn from me then that noble countenance
> Wherein the worship of the world lies.
> […]
> My dear master,
> My captain and my emperor, let me say,
> Before I make this bloody stroke, farewell.
>
> *AC* IV.14. 70-72; 86-87; 90-92

Eros' use of the title "emperor" forms part of his portrayal of Antony as someone exceptionally, indeed preternaturally, distinguished. Yet, on account of Eros' own name, "Eros," his words of praise undercut Antony's status as an heroic male. Eros reminds Antony that he has withstood Parthians' arrows; however, it is patent that, with respect to Cleopatra, Antony has not been successful at fending off even a single arrow of the god Eros, son of the goddess Venus, to

[21] *AC* IV.14, n. 87; the Parthians were legendary in Classical antiquity as superb archers.

whom Enobarbus likens Cleopatra in his foundational speech about her first meeting with Antony.[22] Our awareness of Antony as the victim of the god Eros, oftentimes portrayed in iconography and literature as a mere child, tinges our reception of Cleopatra's speech in which she expands upon her claim that she has "dreamt there was an emperor Antony" (*AC* V.2.75).[23] In her blazon of Antony, which is more hyperbolic even than Eros' words in praise of Antony, she exalts him as an emperor of god-like proportions, attributes, and capabilities (*AC* V.2.75-91). Drawing upon her memory of her dream of him "as an emperor," she remakes Antony, bestowing upon him a grandeur he did not possess in life—at least, not in anyone's but her own cognizance.

In her discussion of this speech, Janet Adelman notes that it is not "Rome" but Cleopatra who is "the memorializing site of Antony's heroic masculinity."[24] Her memorializing of him, moreover, Adelman proposes, "comes in the most literal way from what Cleopatra has earlier called 'the memory of my womb' (*AC* III.13.168), her own sexualized desire for what is absent."[25] I would add that we know how to contextualize Cleopatra's memory of Antony thanks both to Enobarbus' foundational speech as well as to the play's various portrayals of

[22] That Eros calls Antony "my captain" recalls us, too, to the play's opening lines in which Philo disparages Antony as sexually enslaved to Cleopatra. "His captain's heart," sneers Philo, "[…] is become the bellows and the fan / To cool a gypsy's lust" (*AC* I.1.6; 9-10).
[23] Shakespeare appears to have been familiar with Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* (through Jacques Amyot's French translation), in which the god Eros appears in the form of a child to the shepherd Philetas in a dream-vision. Philetas' dream, in fact, takes place within a walled garden.
[24] Janet Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to Tempest* (New York; London: Routledge, 1992), 182-183.
[25] Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers*, 186. In Adelman, the line number is III.13.163.

rivers, especially the Nile*:* that is, thanks to the representations in the play of *horti conclusi,* those spaces that conventionally are figured as wombs. Cleopatra's memory of Antony induces her to (re-)create him; in so doing she effectively memorializes him for others' benefit.

Alchemical Rebirth

Cleopatra's phrase, "the memory of my womb," is embedded in lines that hint at an alchemical process: putrefaction, or death by drowning. this is the stage of an alchemical experiment in which the material in the alembic (distilling vessel) becomes decomposed and, according to alchemical belief, ready to be reborn.[26] In response to Antony's query, "Cold-hearted toward me?" (III.13.163), Cleopatra demurs:

> Ah, dear, if I be so,
> From my cold heart let heaven engender hail
> And poison it in the source, and the first stone
> Drop in my neck; as it determines, so
> Dissolve my life! The next Caesarion smite,
> Till by degrees the memory of my womb,
> Together with my brave Egyptians all,
> By the discandying of this pelleted storm
> Lie graveless, till the flies and gnats of Nile
> Have buried them for prey!
>
> III.13.163-172

[26] Lyndy Abraham, *A Dictionary of Alchemical Imagery* (Cambridge University Press, 1998), 160-161; Peggy Muñoz Simonds, "My Charms Crack Not": The Alchemical Structure of *The Tempest," Comparative Drama* 31: 4 (1997-98), 546-547.

Upon initial consideration, it would appear that what Cleopatra envisages as a hypothetical punishment for herself, should she prove to be "cold-hearted toward [Antony]," is a botched putrefaction: botched, that is in alchemical terms, which would dictate that rather than "[l]ie graveless" (*AC* III.13.171), the putrefying substance be contained within a "grave," which—again—in alchemical terms would be understood to mean an "alembic."[27] Within the "grave," or alembic, moreover, the putrefied substance should not serve as food for "flies and gnats of Nile" (*AC* III.13.171), but rather should itself be fed in an alchemical process termed "cibation."[28] The putrefied substance within the alembic was the incipient, much-touted "philosopher's stone," reputed, upon its perfection, to bestow immortality and perfect health upon any entity that touched it.[29] Lyndy Abraham states, "The cibation of the Stone is often compared [in primary sources] to the feeding of an infant […] with milk and meat." As Jennifer Park remarks, Cleopatra was viewed in the English Renaissance as an adept at alchemy and one of the few alchemists knowledgeable about the arcana relating to the philosopher's stone.[30] Park observes that Cleopatra's lines about the "memory of [her] womb" share imagery with a passage from the early alchemical text from which Cleopatra's reputation as a skilled alchemist in no small part originated: *The Dialogue of Cleopatra and the Philosophers*. Park draws particular attention

[27] Abraham, *Alchemical Imagery,* 90-91; 160-161.
[28] Ibid., 40.
[29] Jennifer Park, "Discandying Cleopatra: Preserving Cleopatra's Infinite Variety in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra.*" *Studies in Philology* 113:3 (2016): 623-624.
[30] Park, "Discandying Cleopatra, 624, quoting Stanton Linden, *The Alchemy Reader: From Hermes Trismegistus to Isaac Newton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 44.

to the fact that in the *The Dialogue* Cleopatra characterizes the philosopher's stone as a child.[31] The Cleopatra of Shakespeare's play also appears to do so with her reference to a hail stone (*AC* III.13.164). It should be noted, too, that, like the grave, the womb is another figure in the alchemical tradition for the alembic in which the alchemical experiment takes place.[32] It would seem that Cleopatra conjures up for her hypothetical alchemical child not a secure berth in an alembic-as-womb, but a "graveless" (*AC* III.13.171) liminality, somewhere on the Nile's banks. A region that is neither wholly dry land, nor wholly water, but a fluctuating admixture of the two, the margin of the Nile is a place where a child might drown. Yet, by comparison with a later passage in the play, one must conclude that Cleopatra herself does not view a corpse's lying on a bank of the Nile as a feast for flies as necessarily a "graveless" condition:

> Rather a ditch in Egypt
> Be gentle grave unto me! Rather on Nilus' mud
> Lay me stark-naked, and let the water-flies
> Blow me into abhorring!
>
> *AC* V.2.56-59

It may be that Cleopatra's specification that she lie in "a ditch in Egypt" (*AC* V.2-56) —assuming that this ditch were situated "on Nilus' mud" (*AC* V.2-57)— distinguishes this latter imagined scene from the earlier one, in which Cleopatra depicts the corpses of her "next Caesarion" (*AC* III.13.167) and "[her] brave Egyptians all" (*AC* III.13.169) as "graveless." The "ditch in Egypt" (*AC* V.2.56)

[31] Park, "Discandying Cleopatra," 624.
[32] Abraham, *A Dictionary of Alchemical Imagery,* 219.

in which she hopes to lie may be viewed as a grave-as-alembic: that is, as a grave that, like a womb, shelters and nourishes burgeoning life. Indeed, it may be that, in Cleopatra's implied estimation, the Nile's banks alone, without the benefit of a "ditch" (*AC* V.2.56), would suffice as an alembic, given that the Nile and its margins are portrayed in the play as a variant of the *hortus conclusus*. For according to this trope, the *hortus conclusus* itself is to be understood as Cleopatra's womb, which, as noted earlier, is annually renewed (re-made as "*conclusus*") through the Nile's yearly flooding. Regardless, whether through contrast or similitude with her proposed punishment of herself, should she be cold-hearted toward Antony, Cleopatra's imagery and diction foreshadow her and Antony's eventual deaths within her monument, or "grave." While ensconced within her monument, she does draw Antony upward to, as it were, her breast, where she does suckle him in the guise of asps, which do inject her with the alchemical "poison" (*AC* III.13.165), or "venom" that not just kills her but also primes her for renewed life with Antony.[33] That the hypothetical "discandying" (*AC* III.13.170) or dissolving which Cleopatra envisages is brought on by self-"engender[ed]" (*AC* III.13.164) hail reminds us that Cleopatra is the (re-)creator of Antony.

Here, I wish to recapitulate and augment my interpretation of the image from Cleopatra's blazon of Antony with which this Introduction opens: the dolphin's leap. In its circuit, that leap encompasses both the element of water,

[33] Abrams, *A Dictionary of Alchemical Imagery,* 208.

which is the site of alchemical putrefaction, and the element of air. Although associated throughout *Antony and Cleopatra* with the elements of earth and water, nevertheless in the course of her self-orchestrated death Cleopatra also assumes for herself an existence co-extensive with the elements of fire and air. [34]

> I am fire and air. My other elements
> I give to baser life.
>
> V.2.288-289

In alchemical terms, fire is believed to reside in imperceptible form within the incipient philosopher's stone, or alchemical child, until physical fire, as applied to the alembic, brings about the emergence of the completed alchemical child.[35] Air, in alchemy, can be considered as synonymous with volatility, the quality exhibited by perfume (or liquor) ingredients that are susceptible of being distilled.[36] As noted above, through its dispersal of Cleopatra's perfume, air is the vehicle of Cleopatra and Antony's first intercommunication. The pioneering natural perfumer Mandy Aftel shares the insight that, "The experience of volatility in perfume is […] a metaphor for the experience of time."[37] The image of the dolphin within Cleopatra's blazon of Antony encapsulates her and

---

[34] Mary Thomas Crane, "Roman World, Egyptian Earth: Cognitive Difference and Empire in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Comparative Drama* 43:1 (2009): 9, remarks, "[A]lthough [Cleopatra] can at one point imagine her death as a transformation into immaterial 'fire and air,' she can also imagine it as a return to the ooze of the Nile."
[35] Abrahams, *A Dictionary of Alchemical Imagery,* 76.
[36] Abrahams, *A Dictionary of Alchemical Imagery,* 4. On volatility, see Mandy Aftel, *Essence and Alchemy: A Natural History of Perfume* (Layton, Utah: Gibbs Smith, 2008), 56.
[37] Aftel, *Essence and Alchemy,* 81. Starting in the twentieth century, Aftel has been instrumental in the revival of the practice of natural perfumery.

Antony's recurrent trajectory within time. The simultaneity of the dolphin's access to elements that signify, variously, death and rebirth, furthermore, is reminiscent of Friar's soliloquy in Romeo and Juliet on the nature of the earth:

> The earth that's nature's mother is her tomb,
> What is her burying grave, that is her womb.[38]
> *RJ* II.3.5-6

In Friar's formulation, the earth as "nature's mother" (*RJ* II.3.5) is a furrow where a corpse might rest and, equally, where it might be transformed back into a living body. Mariana's re-making of Angelo through the influence of the distilling, purifying agency of her tears also has a recurrent aspect. For Mariana is linked in *Measure for Measure* with the Virgin Mary at the Annunciation, whom, by convention by Shakespeare's day, as noted above, receives news of her pregnancy from the archangel Gabriel while she is within an enclosed garden. In her guise as the Virgin Mary, who gives birth to Christ-as-Mercy, Mariana's generative action is linked to the cyclical liturgical calendars of both the Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England.

[38] Abrahams, *A Dictionary of Alchemical Imagery,* 90-91, in similar vein, notes that for Romeo and Juliet in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet,* Tybalt's tomb is both their grave and marriage bed, where their union may be thought to produce the alchemical child.

(Quasi-)Goddess Figures

These three female characters' variously generative and restorative artistic powers are connected to the authority of female (near-)divinities, such as the earth (considered to be a female entity in the Greco-Roman tradition from which Shakespeare draws in his characterization of her), the goddess Isis, and the Virgin Mary, together with her complement, Mary Magdalène. In *Romeo and Juliet,* Friar indirectly equates Nurse with the earth when, while gathering medicinal herbs, he meditates aloud about the earth as the nurse of the "children of divers kind" (*RJ* II.3.7), among which he includes "plants, herbs, [and] stones" (*RJ* II.3.12) that, upon emerging from her "womb" (*RJ* II.6), feed "on her natural bosom" (*RJ* II.3.8) :

> The earth that's nature's mother is her tomb,
> What is her burying grave, that is her womb;
> And from her womb children of divers kind
> We sucking on her natural bosom find.
>
> *RJ* II.3.5-8

Antony and Cleopatra is replete with allusions to Cleopatra as Isis(-like) in her guise as mother.[39] Holding snakes, like the goddess Isis herself, Cleopatra asks:

> Dost thou not see my baby at my breast
> That sucks the nurse asleep?
>
> *AC* V.2.308-309[40]

[39] For citations, see Chapter 3 of this dissertation, especially the section entitled "Cleopatra as Isis(-Like)."
[40] Janet Adelman, *The Common Liar,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), 64.

Mariana, in her reputedly incessant weeping within her enclosed kitchen garden, or "moated grange" (*MM* III.1.247-248), bears resemblance to the Virgin Mary as portrayed in a *hortus conclusus*. Not only is the Virgin Mary renowned as the disconsolate mother who sheds tears for her own son after his crucifixion, but she is also the mother celebrated in iconography for the humble act of feeding her son, in his infancy, with yet another liquid generated from within her own body: her breast milk. Mariana's weeping, with its echoes of the Virgin Mary's sorrowing over Christ's execution on the Cross, connects Mariana "as" the Virgin Mary with the condemned prisoner Barnardine, said to have been "nursed up" (*MM* IV.2.130) in Vienna's prison, through glancing allusions to two interlinked Roman Catholic historical figures: Bernard of Clairvaux and the Jesuit martyr Robert Southwell, both of whom were devotees of the Virgin Mary. According to legend, Bernard experienced a miraculous vision in which a statue of the Virgin Mary fed him with her breast milk: not, however, it should be noted, while he nestled in her arms. Instead, as he knelt praying in a church, the statue, having temporarily come to life, aimed and squirted milk into his mouth from a distance.[41] This provides an admittedly humorous precedent for Mariana's feeding of Barnardine from a distance. Mariana swears an oath to the Duke to the effect that, if she should turn out to have been lying to him about having become Angelo's legal wife, owing to the trick that the Duke himself (when disguised as

[41] Melanie Holcomb, "The Hungry Monk: Bernard of Clairvaux in a Trans-corporeal Landscape." Postmedieval: *A Journal of Medieval Cultural Studies* 11-1 (2020): 81-82.

Friar Ludowick) had arranged for her to play on Angelo, she will call down upon herself the fate of being "for ever […] confixed here / A marble monument" (V.1.233-234). The potential punishment she envisions for herself in her oath—to be transformed into a statue—suggests her affinity with the manifestation of the Virgin Mary in statue form from which Bernard received breast milk. Scholars have argued, moreover, that Southwell, who was executed for treason during Elizabeth I's reign, wrote in a Bernardine (not to be confused with "Barnardine") style. Indeed, while Southwell was imprisoned, and tortured, in the Tower he had with him a *Bible* and writings of Bernard.[42] In Shakespeare's time, both Bernard and Southwell were highly esteemed as writers, even by Protestants.[43] Southwell's *Marie Magdalen's Funeral Tears,* an early example of so-called "tear literature"—was generally popular when it was published in England in 1591.[44] Thomas Lodge, in a somewhat later example of this genre, "Prosopopoeia Containing the Teares of the Holy, Blessed, and Sanctified Marie, the Mother of God," published in 1596, represents the Virgin Mary as referring to her tears over Christ's wounded corpse as breast milk-like:

> [A]s I weep on his face, let him sucke up my tears.[45]

---

[42] Diane Marie Shaw, "Such Fire Is Love: The Bernardine Poetry of Robert Southwell, S.J." *Christianity and Literature* 62: 3 (2013): 333-334.
[43]Shaw, "Such Fire Is Love," 333; 335.
[44] Shaw, "Such Fire Is Love," 350, n. 5, citing Franz Posset, "The Elder Luther on Bernard." *Benedictine Review* 42:1 (1991): 37, reports that Martin Luther (1483-1546) loved the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux.
[45] Thomas Lodge, *Prosopopeia: The Teares of the Holy, Blessed, and Sanctified Marie, the Mother of God* (London: Printed [by T. Scarlet] for Edward White, and to be sold at the little North doore of Paules, 1596). Accessed through Early English Book Online.

Lodge presents the Virgin Mary's tears, like a mother's milk, as life-preserving. As I argue in Chapter 3, Mariana's tears in *Measure for Measure*, similarly, are life-renewing: through her weeping, her tears preserve her beloved Angelo in memory. Moreover, as distillations of her longing for Angelo, her tears are transformed into mercy through which she prevails upon the Duke of Vienna to spare Angelo's life.

Distillation as Poetic Creation

Shakespeare on several occasions refers to the distillation of the Damascene rose as a metaphor for the creation of poetry.[46] In his *Liber de Arte Distilllandi de Compositis* of 1512, the Strasbourgian Hieronymus Brunschwygk's defines "distillation" as:

> Dystyllyng is none other thynge, but onely a puryfyeng of the grosse from the subtyll, and the subtyll from the grosse/ eche separately from the other / & to the entent that the coruptyble shall be made incorruptbyle / and to make the materiyall immateryall."[47]

[46] Katherine Duncan-Jones, "Deep-Dyed Canker Blooms: Botanical Reference in Shakespeare's Sonnet 54," *The Review of English Studies* 46:184 (1995): 523.
[47] Cited in part in R.J. Forbes, *A Short History of the Art of Distillation: From the Beginning up to the Death of Celius Blumenthal* (Leiden: Brill, 1948), 110; cited in its entirety in Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume*, 52.

Translated into English in 1527, Brunschwygk's book popularized the art of distillation in England. Once the province in England of religious orders and the court, the practice of distillation entered widely into the secular world of medicine, including into medicine practiced within the domestic sphere. As Holly Dugan notes, Brunschwygk's definition of "distillation" implies alchemical transmutation.[48] The rose, it so happens, is yet another alchemical symbol. The particular type of rose used in perfumery was the Damascene rose.[49] Damascene roses are typically pink, or "rosy," but may also be white or red. In alchemy, the red rose represents the philosopher's stone: that is the stone the touching of which imparts health and immortality. [50] If one imagines the rose that figures so memorably in *Romeo and Juliet* as red—the one that, "by any other word would smell as sweet" (*RJ* II.2.43), according to Juliet—then it may be thought of as analogous with the child-as-philosopher's stone that Cleopatra calls "the memory of [her] womb" (*AC* III.13.168). The bastard which I argue that Mariana in *Measure for Measure* figuratively distills into pure mercy is also a figure for the child-as-philosopher's stone. These three figures for the artist in part are characterized as practitioners of esoteric alchemy: or, perhaps more accurately, as practitioners of what Margaret Healy terms "aesthetic alchemy."[51]

---

[48] Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume* 52; Forbes, *Art of Distillation,* 110.
[49] Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume,* 44.
[50] Abraham, *A Dictionary of Alchemical Imagery,* 175.
[51] Margaret Healy, *Shakespeare, Alchemy and the Creative Imagination: The Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint* (Cambridge University Press, 2013), 4. I would consider particular savors as "memory images" available for bodily contemplation.

In Healy's discussion of alchemy as providing symbolic language descriptive of a poet's inner artistic practices she proposes that the infant, or "babe" that appears in certain of Shakespeare's sonnets as the object of tender care, represents the poet's own acts of contemplation and his exercising of his memory.[52] Healy remarks, too, that the phrase "flowers distilled" which appears in Sonnet 5 was a conventional phrase for what she terms "memory images": that is, images that stand in for the memory of something else, as an aid to remembering it.[53]

> But flowers distilled, though they with winter meet,
> Leese but their show; their substance still lives sweet.
> Sonnet 5, 13-14

Contemplation of images held in memory, Healy suggests, has the power to "restore" that which has been lost to time.[54] Although my subject finds its focus in three of Shakespeare's plays rather than in his lyric poetry, I nevertheless consider Healy's remarks to be relevant to my interpretations of Juliet, Cleopatra, and Mariana as figures for the artist whose bodily memories are the source of their creative labor, and whose bodily remembering is figured as distillation. Through their bodily memories, they become both the (re-)creator of what they seek to recover and the embodiment of alchemical metaphors of poetic creation.

---

[52] Healy, *Shakespeare Alchemy, and the Creative Imagination,* 4; the word "babe" appears in Sonnets 22, 115, and 143.
[53] Ibid., 68.
[54] Ibid., 4.

Organization of the Chapters

The individual chapters of the dissertation are linked by theme, by certain similarities of structure within the plays, and potentially, too, by the chronology of the plays' approximate dates of composition. This dissertation began as the documentation of my endeavor to follow where Juliet led me in her soliloquy at her window about the sweet savor of a rose. That may sound artless, but it is founded in my interests in natural perfumery and the history of rose cultivation. What, I asked, did Juliet mean by a "sweet" savor, or, even, by "rose"? What other fragrances and tastes were implied in the text, and what was their import? This search led me to deduce that the significance of these savors was bound up with Juliet's implied sensory memory and her impulse to recreate those memories in the form of figurative perfume. As I propose, she uses her own bosom as a figurative vessel in which to distill the fragrant essence of Romeo. I approached *Antony and Cleopatra*, the focus of Chapter 2, in a similar way, exploring in depth what particular words bearing connections to the senses of smell or taste might mean. In the process, I became drawn further and further into the text of some passages, as I discerned more and more olfactory- or gustatory-related words and allusions. In my reading, Cleopatra is "already" able both to generate perfume from within herself and to wield that self-made perfume so as to entrance

Antony, whom she cyclically infantilizes then accords heroic virility. Mariana, the incessantly weeping subject of Chapter 3, like Juliet and Cleopatra, is a distiller: not, however, a distiller of perfume, but of fortified wine, or "bastard," which through her tireless weeping is transmuted into unadulterated mercy. Similarly to Nurse and to Cleopatra, Mariana is, or has attributes of, a (quasi-)divine female: in Mariana's case, the Virgin Mary, whose capacity for extending mercy to others—or, at least, to the unworthy Angelo— she shares.

As intimated above, Pollard proposes that Shakespeare's Cleopatra is a middle-aged version of Juliet. As Pollard argues, Juliet is not in self-conscious control of the spectacle that she herself presents to Romeo, while Cleopatra, by contrast, is in control of the spectacle of her own self as presented to Antony.[55] Drawing upon Pollard's argument, I suggest something similar: like her younger "self" Juliet, Cleopatra aims to preserve her beloved. Unlike Juliet, however, Cleopatra already has at her disposal her self-generated perfumed breath, which she uses to blazon Antony. While Juliet must rely upon Nurse (and, latterly, Friar) for help both in her pursuit of Romeo and in her perfume-making, Cleopatra relies only on herself to ensnare and influence Antony with the perfume she already has perfected.

Chapters 1 and 2 on Juliet and Cleopatra are linked in that, in accordance with Pollard, I discuss Cleopatra as an older, more self-sufficient version of Juliet. In addition, both Chapter 1 and 2 are about Juliet and Cleopatra as perfume

[55] Pollard, *Drugs and Theater,* 56; 75-77.

makers or deployers of perfume. Finally, both Juliet and Cleopatra are protagonists, whereas Mariana is a secondary character, even if a double for the main character Isabella. For these three reasons, I have arranged the chapter on Juliet and the one on Cleopatra consecutively. Yet, there is a distinct chronological trajectory at play, too, among all three chapters. Thus, while Chapter 3 on Mariana comes last, it might, alternately, come in between Chapters 1 and 2. Shakespeare composed *Measure for Measure* in 1603 or 1604, between his writing of *Romeo and Juliet* at some time between 1594 and 1596 and Antony Cleopatra in 1607. This chronology may be reflected by the manner in which the three characters recover their respective beloved: Juliet is able to enact her figurative perfume-making only with the help of Nurse and Friar. Mariana engages in figurative distillation, using her own womb as an alembic. Cleopatra already has her own self-generated perfume at her disposal. She uses it to capture Antony, on whom, through distillation implied by the image of a leaping dolphin in her blazon of him, she bestows continually renewed life. Thus, the three characters' absorptions with effecting transformations manifest as a continuum.

The transformations in which these three female (quasi-)divine characters engage is not of the kind intended to create gold out of dross. [56] Rather these characters aim to create (figurative) eternal life for their own, respective paramour, in order that they themselves may enjoy their own paramour's savors

[56] P.G. Maxwell-Stuart, *Chemical Choir: A History of Alchemy,* (Bloomsbury, 2015) Introduction*:* x; xii

forever. The female characters' efforts, then, are equally as concerned with the recovery of particular bodily sensations of scent and taste as with the bestowal of eternal life. Shakespeare, it seems to me, presents the whole cycle of transformation as important: not just the attainment of incorruptible, figurative perfumes or fortified wines. These purified substances have their basis in bodily memories that are not (yet) enduring.[57] For the three female figures to be able, perpetually, to re-experience particular bodily sensations of unparalleled delight—the experiencing of what Juliet refers to as "mortal paradise of…sweet flesh" (III.2.82)—they must remember those sensations not only through mental contemplation, but through, so to speak, "bodily meditation," as though the body and mind were not distinct. Mariana's sustained weeping provides an example of this. Her practice of weeping allows her, at length, to extract from within her bodily memory the purified essence of the sensations awakened in her by Angelo: not "as if" for the first time, but "again" for the first time, within an ever-renewing present. The many allusions within *Measure for Meaure* to the Song of Songs indicate the rich sensory nature of Mariana's bodily memory and of her once-shared love with Angelo: a shared love that is recoverable only if time is restored, and, within it, her and Angelo's bodies.[58]

---

[57] See also Healy, *Shakespeare Alchemy, and the Creative Imagination*, 66, on how the Neoplatonists of Shakespeare's time or earlier, cited Diotima in Plato's *Symposium* as saying that souls like bodies may become pregnant, and that new memories may only be formed by someone who exists in bodily form.

[58] Healy, *Shakespeare Alchemy, and the Creative Imagination*, 6, proposes that Shakespeare was like John Donne in engaging in a poetics that sought to reconcile bodily and spiritual love.

I. THE ANGELICAL PERFUME IN JULIET'S BOSOM

Juliet as Artless Figurative Perfumer

In Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet,* Juliet, in her tomb, awakens from her drugged sleep to Friar Lawrence's news that both Romeo and Paris lie dead "in [her] bosom" (*RJ* V.3.155). At her awakening, Friar urges Juliet:

> …Come, come away;
> Thy husband in thy bosom there lies dead,
> And Paris, too…
>
> *RJ* V.3.154-56

At least two things strike one: that, as Friar says, both of Juliet's suitors lie "in [her] bosom" (*RJ* V.3.155), as if they were collapsed together into one; and that Friar specifies that they two lie "in" her bosom, as if they, collapsed into one, were the dagger that Juliet is shortly to embed in her own bosom (*RJ* V.3.205). Although in this scene they are figuratively merged into one, previously in the play Romeo and Paris have been obliquely weighed against one another as possessing differing savors having contrasting qualities (in Paris' case, overwhelmingly indolic and fetid *versus,* in Romeo's case, appealingly sweet) or a differing combination of strength and tenacity (in Paris' case, both pronouncedly strong and remarkably enduring *versus,* in Romeo's case, strong yet not as lasting). Shakespeare has indirectly portrayed Paris as emitting an

overpowering scent of dung mingled with the scent of animal bodies, some of them wounded or slaughtered. The playwright has also indirectly depicted Romeo to Juliet's perceptions as giving off the sweet scent, and as possessing the sweet taste of a particular kind of rose—the Damascene rose, used extensively in Elizabethan England in perfume-making.[59]

Juliet's response to Romeo, I shall argue, is one of rhetorical transmutation of him into a figurative rose, which she, in turn, incorporates into a figurative perfume, made up, too, of scents which Nurse and Lady Capulet attribute to her rival suitor, Paris. In its savors, this figurative perfume approximates Nurse's sweet breast milk when ingested under the particular sensory and affective conditions prevailing during Juliet's weaning. The specific savors alluded to in the play are not arbitrarily summoned; rather they are, or share olfactory or gustatory characteristics of, raw materials used in contemporary perfumery, as well as in confectionary and poison-making; however, perfumery will be my primary concern. Nurse points proleptically to these savors in her monologue about her weaning of Juliet.

We learn not directly from Juliet, but rather through a mediating speech delivered by Nurse that the occasion of Juliet's weaning was marked for Juliet by particular sensations. Among these sensations were the warmth of the sun (a force known to intensify scents), the sweetness of Nurse's milk, followed by the

[59] For a discussion of the domestication and cultivation in Tudor England of the Damascene rose for its use in perfumery see Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume*, Chapter 2, especially 42-60.

unexpected jolt of an earthquake and the equally unexpected—and, in Nurse's narrative, not wholly extricable from the abrupt shock of the earthquake— jolt of the bitterness of wormwood:

> Faith, I can tell her age unto an hour.
> …
> I'll lay fourteen of my teeth,
> And yet, to my teen be it spoken, I have but four,
> She's not fourteen. How long is it now
> To Lammastide? […]
> Even or odd of all days in the year,
> Come Lammas Eve at night shall she be fourteen.
> Susan and she, God rest all Christian souls,
> Were of an age. Well, Susan is with God;
> She was too good for me. But as I said,
> On Lammas Eve at night shall she be fourteen,
> That shall she, marry! I remember it well.
> 'Tis since the earthquake now eleven years,
> And she was weaned, I never shall forget it,
> Of all the days of the year upon that day.
> For I had then laid wormwood to my dug,
> Sitting in the sun under the dovehouse wall.
> My lord and you were then at Mantua.
> Nay, I do bear a brain. But as I said,
> When it did taste the wormwood on the nipple
> Of my dug and felt it bitter, pretty fool,
> To see it tetchy and fall out with the dug!
> 'Shake,' quoth the dovehouse. 'Twas no need, I trow,
> To bid me trudge.
> And since that time it is eleven years,
> For then she could stand high-lone, nay, by th' rood,
> She could have run and waddled all about,
> For even the day before she broke her brow.
> And then my husband – God be with his soul,
> 'A was a merry man – took up the child:
> 'Yea," quoth he, 'dost thou fall upon thy face?
> 'Thou wilt fall backward when thou has more wit,
> Wilt thou not, Jule?' And by my holidam,
> The pretty wretch left crying and said 'Ay.'
> To see now how a jest shall come about!
> I warrant, an I should live a thousand years,
> I never should forget it. 'Wilt thou not, Jule?' quoth he,

> And, pretty fool, it stinted and said 'Ay.'
> …
> Yes, madam, yet I cannot choose but laugh,
> To think it should leave crying and say "Ay';
> And yet, I warrant, it had upon it brow
> A bump as big as a young cockerel's stone;
> A perilous knock, and it cried bitterly.
> 'Yea,' quoth my husband, 'fall'st upon they face?
> Thou wilt fall backward when thou comest to age,
> Wilt thou not, Jule? It stinted and said 'Ay.'
> …
> Peace, I have done. God mark thee to his grace,
> Thou wast the prettiest babe that e'er I nursed.
> An I might live to see thee married once,
> I have my wish.
>
> *RJ* I.3.12; 13-16; 17-49; 51-58; 60-63

As we also discover in passing from Nurse's recollection of this rite: Juliet's weaning took place under certain conditions, in a particular, outdoor space—seemingly the Capulets' kitchen garden— defined by a dovehouse wall. This is an un-wall-like wall that is capable, according to Nurse's narrative, of human speech:

> "'Shake,' quoth the dovehouse."
>
> *RJ* I.3.34

The word "shake," which Nurse claims the wall itself utters, tells of the various kinds of instability present in the scene Nurse describes: Nurse' own instability in the moment of weaning as a source of sweet nourishment; the earth's instability in the moment of the earthquake; the instability of the dove house wall both as a defining boundary of the outdoor space and of the inside of the dove house, full of dove guano and cacophonous birds. We learn that in the course of this earthquake

Nurse, exhibiting instability herself from Juliet's perspective, withdrew from Juliet once and for all the sustenance and comfort of her breast milk.

I propose that, in her moment of death, Juliet figuratively recreates the sensations of her weaning: in death, she joins together with both Romeo and Paris by way of regaining in lasting form the sweetness of the breast milk she once suckled from Nurse's breast. In my interpretation, Juliet's bosom in the play's final scene is the site of the alchemical merging, or—to use the alchemical term, the "marriage," or "coniunctio"—of Romeo's and Paris's fragrant essences, which Juliet has brought about.[60] The effect of this marriage in the play is the intimation that Juliet and Romeo's story will live on. In the play's last lines, the Prince of Verona decrees:

> Go hence, to have more talk of these sad things.
> […]
> For never was a story of more woe
> Than this of Juliet or her Romeo.
>
> *RJ* V.3.307; 309-310

Juliet's and Romeo's fathers each vow to erect a pure gold statue of the other's child, setting them, as Capulet says, side by side in an enduring image of their mutual love (*RJ* V.3.298-304). In context, the promised statue also represents the perennial fame of the two lovers' story.

[60] Simonds, "'My Charms Crack Not,'" 538-570, in which she outlines the nine stages of alchemical transformation as they relate to Shakespeare's *The Tempest*.

Juliet's Creative Agency

By drawing both upon Nurse's account of her weaning of Juliet as well as upon Juliet's response to Romeo, we may infer that Shakespeare portrays Juliet's bodily memory of Nurse's breastfeeding, then weaning of her as guiding Juliet in her figurative perfume-making. In her endeavor, Romeo figures as the primary "raw material" through which she seeks to restore the sensations she had experienced as a suckling infant and toddler.[61] *In extremis* at play's end, by agitating, or shaking, her bosom with Romeo's blade, Juliet seeks figuratively to put into her own breast what she, as a suckling infant, once drew out of Nurse's breast. Pollard posits a similar comparison between Juliet and Shakespeare's Cleopatra, but in terms of spectacle. Pollard remarks:

> In both [Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* and his *Antony and Cleopatra*], female protagonists are identified with visual spectacles that elate, intoxicate, seduce, and ultimately undo their male admirers, but whereas Juliet is unaware of her effects on spectators, Cleopatra not only recognizes but self-consciously orchestrates her theatrical power.[62]

Pollard observes that Juliet is not in self-conscious command of the spectacle that she herself presents to Romeo, while contending that Cleopatra, whom Pollard characterizes as Shakespeare's iteration of Juliet as a middle-aged female, is in control of the spectacle of her own self as presented to Antony. I suggest a similar comparison of Juliet and Cleopatra: Juliet, without there being any indication in

[61] "Raw material" is a term from modern perfumery denoting the substances, whether plant- or animal-based, which the perfumer manipulates in the process of making a perfume.
[62] Pollard, *Drugs and Theater*, 72.

the text that she is aware that she does so, seeks out in Romeo savors that approximate the sweet breast milk her Nurse fed her before weaning her abruptly with wormwood. By contrast, Cleopatra herself is the one who dispenses milk, after drawing her quasi-son Antony repeatedly—sometimes figuratively and homeopathically, sometimes literally—to her breast with perfumed air that invites Antony's mimicking, perfumed response. In my chapter on *Antony and Cleopatra*, I argue that, Cleopatra draws Antony to her breast repeatedly, cyclically, and, what is more, homeopathically, mesmerizing Antony through actions that mimic her drawing of him to her breast, even as she captures him with her perfume. This is in contrast with Juliet, who, in her pursuit of Romeo, unconsciously seeks to restore the sensations she herself had experienced as a suckling infant and toddler at Nurse's breast.

Through language—in particular, through Shakespeare's wordplay, Juliet "rosifies" (if I may follow Shakespeare's example by coining a word) Romeo and makes an enduring perfume of him-as-rose, when combined with Paris-as-dung- and carrion-scented. Ultimately, when they all three lie entombed together, the result is to turn Romeo (in admixture with Paris) into a scent that is reminiscent of the savor of Nurse's breast milk, as drunk for the last time, in the sun by the dovehouse wall.

As is well-known, when Juliet and Romeo first meet at Lord Capulet's banquet, they (implicitly) compose a sonnet together, extemporaneously (I.5.92-105). In this way Juliet demonstrates a conspicuous skill with the artistic use of

language, a skill one would not necessarily associate with a female at the time the play was written, or in the somewhat indeterminate time in which it is set. And, although Shakespeare may be thought to depict Juliet as aware, at certain points, that she possesses facility with language (for example, when she flirts with Romeo upon their first meeting), nevertheless, just as Shakespeare's portrayal of Juliet does not indicate that she recognizes that she seeks out Romeo's savors in lieu of those of Nurse's breast milk, neither does it suggest that she is aware of the full import and effect of her wordplay: that is, that she figuratively transforms "Romeo" into "rose" then turns that "rose," in turn, into a figurative perfume.

The mode of Juliet's artistic expression is that of figurative perfume making—and perfume-making is a metaphor in the play for the creation of poetry. As scholars have noted, Shakespeare elsewhere in his *oeuvre* uses perfume-making from the distillation of the rose, as a metaphor for the crafting of poetry.[63] Speaking of the rose in Sonnet 54, for instance, Shakespeare's *persona* declares:

> Of their sweet deaths are sweetest odours made;
> And so of you, beauteous and lovely youth;
> When that shall vade, by verse distils your truth.
> Sonnet 54, 12-14[64]

While roses, generally, may be distilled, the Damask rose is unique among roses in that its scent is harvested through stream distillation of the dew which collects at night upon its petals.[65] The references in *Romeo and Juliet* both to dew and to

---

[63] See, e.g., Katherine Duncan-Jones, "Deep-Dyed Canker Blooms: Botanical Reference in Shakespeare's Sonnet 54," *The Review of English Studies* 46:184 (1995): 523.
[64] William Shakespeare, *Shakespeare's Sonnets,* ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones, Shakespeare's Sonnets (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2010).
[65] Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume,* 50.

distillation are suggestive of this process of transforming dew-laden Damask roses, gathered at dawn, into essential oil for use in perfume making. It is suggestive, too, of alchemical transformation; one of the stages in an alchemical experiment is condensation into dew.[66]

Juliet's exertions to transform Rome into a rose are in part an effort, I wish to propose, to transform him into the word, "rose," as if, by transforming "Romeo" to "rose," she would render him susceptible to her figurative alchemical ministrations and mixing. Her own efforts are supported by various characters throughout the play. Through wordplay, Juliet, abetted by other characters, refashions Romeo/"Romeo" as dog rose (*Rosa, or "R." or "rrr," canina*), a canker rose (also *Rosa canina*) and, most significantly, as a Damascene rose (*Rosa damascena*), the type of rose most prized—then, as now—in perfume making.

[66] Simonds, "'My Charms Crack Not,'" 51

The Difference between Paris' and Romeo's Scents: A Matter of Wordplay

Paris' Scent: The Paris Garden and Herb Paris

Shakespeare draws contrasting portrayals of Paris and Romeo by means of the wordplay to which some of his characters give voice. Juliet's mother, Lady Capulet, and surrogate-mother, Nurse, for example, pun on Paris' name while recommending him to Juliet as a suitor. Yet they pun on his name without being aware that they do so—or least, without a full awareness of the ways in which they do so—inadvertently implying that he emits strong odors of dung and decaying flesh. Thus, without meaning to do so, they undermine their own approbations of him.[67] The wordplay with which Lady Capulet and Nurse figure Paris as emitting offensive odors is just one example of characters' in the play punning about other characters—primarily about Paris and Romeo and Nurse—in a manner that links them to particular smells or tastes.

Shakespeare goes to considerable lengths to emphasizes the difference between Paris' scent and Romeo's. Through his characters' wordplay, Shakespeare associates Paris' and Romeo's names both with particular flowers and with particular places in then-contemporary London's theater district which were distinguished by the strong odors they emitted. In this way, olfactory

[67] M.M. Mahood, *Shakespeare's Wordplay* (Methuen, 1957), 41.

sensations of the milieu of the London theaters were interwoven into the first London audiences' experience of the play, rather as olfactory sensations attendant upon Juliet's weaning are woven into Nurse's account of that event and its setting. Through punning on the parts of Lady Capulet and Nurse, Paris' name becomes associated with an arena in London's suburbs, the "Paris Garden," where bull-fights and bear-baitings were staged:

> CAPULET'S WIFE (to Juliet)
> The valiant Paris seeks you for his love
>
> NURSE
> A man, young lady; lady, such a man
> As all the world—why, he's a man of wax.
>
> CAPULET'S WIFE
> Verona's summer has not such a flower.
>
> NURSE
> Nay, he's a flower, in faith, a very flower.
> *RJ* I.3.75-79

"Garden" in the case of "Paris Garden" refers to an arena where animals were tortured for sport, from which an odor of bulls and bears and their dung would have emanated, not to a space in which flowers are grown. Yet Paris also shares his name with a flower, "herb Paris."[68] Susanna Greer Fines notes that, in contemporary lore, herb Paris was associated with lovers, as is reflected in its variant name "truelove."[69] Fines does not remark, however, on herb Paris' scent, which modern herbalists and scientists describe as a "fetid odor," or as resembling

[68]. Susanna Greer Fine, "Verona's Summer Flower: The 'Virtues' of Herb Paris in *Romeo and Juliet*" ANQ 8:4 (1995): 5.
[69] Nor does Lisa Hopkins, "Herb Paris, *Romeo and Juliet,* and Thomas Hasketh." *Notes and Queries* 65:4 (2018): 530-533 who cites Fine, refer to herb Paris' odor.

the stench of "rotting meat."[70] Yet Fines does lay out the tradition, documented from Medieval times, of associating the truelove or herb Paris flower with carnal, as opposed to spiritual, love.[71] One assumes that this association is in part be owing to the odor of decaying flesh which the plant's flower emits.

Although Paris is an insipid, unmemorable character, the scents with which Nurse and Lady Capulet implicitly link him are hardly insipid or easy to forget. Rather, they are both overwhelmingly powerful and enduring. When Lady Capulet and Nurse exclaim that Paris "is a flower" (*RJ* I.3.78-9), they, unbeknownst to themselves (they not being in London, but in the Verona of the play), make a joke—presumably not lost on Shakespeare's contemporary London audiences—about Paris' "un-flower-like" smell. Moreover, as Holly Dugan observes, the animal-derived scents of the Paris Garden—the odor of dung notable among them—were not unlike certain then-popular, animal-based perfume ingredients—having remarkably strong odors—civet and animal-based musk.[72] When worn, such animal-based scents intensify the scent of a person's bodily secretions.[73] For such a perfume to characterize Paris suggests that he is exceptionally virile. While it is tempting to think that associating Paris with such

[70] E.g., Mrs. M. Grieve*, A Modern Herbal,* Volume II. (New York: Dover Publications, 1971), 612.
[71] Fine, "Verona's Summer Flower," 5-7.
[72] Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume,* 62-63, notes that contemporary playwrights besides Shakespeare punned about the smell of the Paris Garden.
[73] Colleen Kennedy, "'Do You Smell A Fault?': Detecting and Deodorizing King Lear's Distinctly Feminine Odor." *Appositions: Studies in Renaissance / Early Modern Literature & Culture* 3 (2010):-paragraph 29. http://appositions.blogspot.com/2010/05/colleen-kennedy-deodorizing-king-lear.html (accessed Aug. 21, 2021).

a fragrance is nothing more than a joke at the expense of the pompous, seemingly vacuous Paris, the penetrating, tenacious nature of animal-based scents suggests otherwise; for the enduring aspects of such scents link Paris with the workings of persistent memory as a matter of bodily and subsequent artistic discernment of the kind I suggest Juliet exercises in what I characterize as her revivification and memorialization of bodily memories, both of suckling at Nurse's breast and of Nurse's weaning of her. Paris' animalic scent, in admixture with Romeo's in Juliet's figurative perfume, lends to that perfume its memorializing power.

Upon the suicides of Juliet and Romeo, their fathers, Capulet and Montague, promise each other to erect a golden statue in honor of the other's child, with, as Juliet's father says, the statue of Romeo lying beside that of Juliet. Romeo's father Montague boasts:

> For I will raise her statue in pure gold,
> That whiles Verona by that name is known,
> There shall no figure at such rate be set
> As that of true and faithful Juliet.
>
> *RJ* V.3.299-302

Not to be outdone (apparently, the men's rivalry has not wholly subsided), Capulet rejoins that he will erect a statue of Romeo that is "as rich." By "as rich," one may assume that Capulet refers solely to the costly material—"pure gold"—of which the touted statues are to be made. "Pure gold," however, has additional connotations: for alchemists, gold was incorruptible, or immortal. Alchemists were said to be engaged in a quest to create gold out of "base" metals, meaning

metals that were prone to disfiguring, alterations over time.[74] Alchemical experiments involved the distillation of substances. Some perfume ingredients, too, were also submitted to distillation, Damascene roses being a notable example of this. In his verse, Shakespeare not infrequently makes figurative use of the distillation of Damascene roses in perfumery (as noted above), but also of alchemical processes.[75] Scholars often remark upon the alchemical undercurrent to the "pure gold" of the promised statues at the end *Romeo and Juliet.* I further suggest that Shakespeare portrays Juliet throughout the play as engaged in a figurative creation of incorruptible "gold": rather than raise a statue of supine lovers; rather than compose a sonnet or a play, however, she reconstitutes in the form of figurative perfume the savors that she ingested and inhaled when Nurse breastfed her with her sweet milk in Capulet's kitchen garden.

"Romeo" Transmuted to "Rose": Damask and Canker

As a perfume ingredient, the Damascene rose (*Rosa damascena*) is distinguished from other roses by the mode of its distillation. The Damascene's scent concentrates in the dew that collects at night upon its petals and its blossoms must be harvested for distillation early in the morning before the dew dissipates. In the

[74] P.G. Maxwell-Stuart, *Chemical Choir: A History of Alchemy,* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015) Introduction*:* x; xii.
[75] For an overview of those processes as they manifest in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, see Simonds, "'My Charms Crack Not,'" 538-570.

play's first mentions of Romeo, he is said to frequent a particular part of the city before daybreak, "a grove of sycamore" (I.1.119) on Verona's western-facing side: both a place and a time of day in which dew would abound. When Romeo's mother asks where he is, Benvolio tells her that he saw Romeo earlier that day:

> Madam, an hour before the worshipped sun
> Peered forth the golden window of the east,
> A troubled mind drive me to walk abroad,
> Where underneath the grove of sycamore
> That westward rooteth from this city side,
> So early waking did I see your son,
> Towards him I made, but he was ware of me
> And stole into the covert of the wood.
>
> *RJ* I.1.116-24

To Benvolio's account, Romeo's father Montague adds:

> Many a morning he hath there been seen,
> With tears augmenting the fresh morning's dew…
>
> *RJ* I.1.129-30

Romeo's father conflates the tears which Romeo emits from his own body with "the fresh morning's dew" (*RJ* I.1.130), in this way, through Romeo's father's report, Shakespeare implies that Romeo himself is (metaphorically) a Damascene rose on whose petals dew collects at night.

Friar becomes Romeo's surrogate father when he undertakes to assist Romeo in his desire to unite in marriage with a young woman whose family is the hereditary enemy of his own birth-family. Speaking in her imagination to Romeo (and, unbeknownst to her, also speaking to him in the flesh, as he eavesdrops on her) Juliet has urged Romeo, "deny thy father and refuse thy name" (*RJ* II.2.34). In seeking help in marrying Juliet, Romeo indeed does turn to Friar, instead of to

his own birth-father. Like Romeo's birth-father, Friar, too, as though helping Romeo to "doff [his] name" (*RJ* II.2.47) of Montague, equates Romeo with a flower which must be harvested before the heat of the sun evaporates the dew that has gathered upon its petals during the night:

> Now, ere the sun advance his burning eye
> The day to cheer and night's dank dew to dry,
> I must up-fill this osier cage of ours
> With baleful weeds and precious-juiced flowers.
> *RJ* II.3.1-4

As Friar begins to muse aloud upon a particular flower which he apparently has just plucked, Romeo enters the stage:

> Enter ROMEO
>
> Within the infant rind of this weak flower
> Poison hath residence and medicine power
> For this, being smelled, with that part cheers each part,
> Being tasted, stays all senses with the heart.
> *RJ* II.3.SD, 19-22

Romeo, who, by juxtaposition, is figured as the "weak flower" (*RJ* II.3.19) is thus one among the many plants which Friar is at pains to gather before the sun should dispel the dew.[76] Friar's description of the flower as deadly if "tasted" (*RJ* II.3.22) would hardly seem to suggest that he is talking about a rose. For roses are edible and, in Elizabethan times, their petals were often an ingredient in confections or other dishes. Thomas P. Harrison, Jr., argues persuasively that the identity of the "weak flower" is mandrake, given its wholesome-smelling blossom but its

[76] Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume,* 66, notes that, by entering the stage at this juncture, Romeo becomes identified with "this weak flower" (*RJ* II.3.19).

narcotic action, if ingested.[77] Even so, in the context of the play overall, for Friar to associate Romeo with a flower drenched with morning dew is to invite a comparison with "Romeo" and "rose." Through Friar's musings upon the "weak flower," Shakespeare may in part be suggesting that Romeo's rose-like sweetness masks the mandrake-like danger he poses to Juliet's life.

The richness of the wordplay on Romeo's name, in which several characters engage throughout the play, as though in support of Juliet's sensory perception of him, implies and emphasizes the depth of Juliet's sensory response to him. In the "balcony scene," Juliet, believing that Romeo is not present in the flesh, engages in wordplay not with him, in the form of the mutual, extemporaneous composition of a sonnet, as she does with him when they two first meet **(***RJ* I.5.92-105**)**, but alone, with the parts of Romeo's given name. She does so by denying that Romeo's surname, "Montague," is any "part" (*RJ* II.2.41) of his essential self, while at the same time suggesting that the sonic and/or orthographical "part[s]" that make up the word "Romeo" are what distinguish his self. She plays with the similarity in the beginning sounds and spellings of "Romeo" and "rose":[78]

> O Romeo, Romeo, wherefore art thou Romeo?
> …

[77] Thomas P. Harrison, Jr., "Hang Up Philosophy," *Shakesepeare Association Bulletin* 22 (1947): 203-209.
[78] As is often remarked, spellings were not fixed at this time. See, e.g., Margareta De Grazia. "Homonynms Before and After Lexical Standardization," *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft West*, *Jahrbuch* (*1990*): 143-156.

> ‘Tis but thy name that is my enemy.
> Thou art thyself, though not a Montague.
> What’s Montague? It is nor hand nor foot,
> Nor arm nor face nor any other part
> Belonging to a man. O be some other name!
> What’s in a name? That which we call a rose
> By any other word would smell as sweet;
> So Romeo would, were he not Romeo called,
> Retain that dear perfection which he owes
> Without that title. Romeo, doff thy name,
> And for thy name, which is not part of thee,
> Take all myself.
>
> *RJ* II.2.33; 38-48

Certain other characters, too—Nurse and, as just noted (and as I shall discuss at a later point in this chapter), Friar—effectively echo Juliet’s wordplay in which she both likens Romeo’s given name to the word “rose” and, in doing so, creates a pun on his name and the name of a particular building—The Rose Theater. Drawing attention after the fact to Juliet’s wordplay with the beginning parts of “Romeo” and “rose,” Nurse, when she has gone in search of Romeo, asks, “Doth not rosemary and Romeo begin both with a letter?” (*RJ* II.4.198-99). By playing with the way in which Romeo’s name begins in her soliloquy on his name, Juliet implies that Romeo and the rose share a sweet fragrance and, even, taste. Nurse’s question two scenes later in the play about the spelling of Romeo’s name underscores the very thing that Juliet implies: that is, that “Romeo”/Romeo is (being transmuted into) “rose”/a rose. When Juliet says “A rose by any other word would smell as sweet,” the audience, having only just heard her repeat “Romeo,” would for a split second expect her to say, “A Romeo…” rather than “A rose…” Upon saying, “A rose…,” Juliet then repeats the word “Romeo” three more times

in close succession, thus further instilling the sound of Romeo's name in the audience or reader's (mind's) ear. Despite her insistence that his name is irrelevant to who he, in essence, is, the impression one receives is that she feels close to him by repeating his name, as if, at the moments of her repetition of his name, his name stood in for himself. Upon detecting Romeo's presence under her window, Juliet expresses to him her perception that hearing him speak for the first time has been like drinking his words:

> My ears have not yet drunk a hundred words
> Of thy tongue's utterance, yet I know the sound.
> Art thou not Romeo?
>
> *RJ* II.2.58-60

By repeating his name, it is as though she were serving herself his name to drink. (One imagines his name as a drink made of sweet dew, such as collects at night on the petals of the Damascene rose, or as a drink consisting of sweet milk.) One might agree with Juliet that Romeo's name is not "a part / Belonging to [Romeo]" (*RJ* II.2.41-42), but rather were he himself in his entirety. Moreover, to manipulate its/his sound by removing, adding, and rearranging its/his parts, were to change his very self—into "rose"/a rose.[79]

---

[79] Romeo is not being compared to just any rose(s), and, in terms of naming, this is important because, of the two types of roses to which he is compared, one of them, the Damascene (*Rosa damascena*), was especially esteemed for use in perfumery and was, moreover, of the two types, the only one whose scent was capture by distillation of the dew that collected on its petals. Mark Griffiths and Edward Wilson. "Sweet Musk Roses: Botany and Lexis in Shakespeare." *Notes and Queries* 65:1 (2018): 59, refer to "the exactitude of English nomenclature of the kind enshrined in herbals of Shakespeare's day:

> Such specificity [i.e., in the matter of assigning names to types of roses] mattered in [the Elizabethan] period when plants were valued as the main ingredients of medicines and as the raw materials of England's fast-developing horticultural interests. Using a name inaccurately or loosely, or […] for more

Echoing Juliet's rhetorical efforts, the other characters who play with the sonic or orthographic parts of Romeo's name do so in a way that also implies his connection to the word "rose." Romeo himself does so when he utters the word "Rosaline"—at least, to an audience or reader, it seems so in retrospect. Once "Romeo" has been turned into "rose" by the removal of an "o" and the replacement of an "m" with an "s," he might, by the addition of a diminutive suffix, become the diminutive form of "rose"—that is, "little rose," or "Rosaline." Rosaline thus appears to be (merely) a diminutive variation on his own self.

Romeo's absorption with Rosaline indeed has appeared to be self-absorption; for it leads him to shun others' company so that he may spend time

---

> than one species, had unfortunate consequences that ranged from irritation at the money wasted on right label/wrong plant to accidental death by poisoning.

As they note, from the 1520's-1550's, *"damascena"* was used to designate other roses than the type now so termed; however, in 1568, the Flemish botanist Rembert Dudoens regularized the application of the name "*damascena*" to the rose from which rose oil may be attained by means of steam distillation (54-55).

There is a further refinement to the matter of naming: flowers typically bear more than one name, including folk names. The contemporary herbalist John Parkinson, *Paradisi in Sole Paradisus Terrestris (*London: Printed by Humfrey Lownes and Robert Young, 1629), 421, acknowledges this:

> on "The Names" of "Rosa: The Rose Tree or Bush"
> The Names
>
> The severall names, whereby they are most commonly knowne unto us in this Countrey, are expressed in their titles; but they are much differeing from what they are called in other Countries neare unto us, which to compare, conferre, and agree together, were a work of more paines then use: But to proportion them unto the names set downe by Theophrastus, Pliny, and the rest of the ancient Authors, were a worke, wherein I might be sure not to escape without falling into errour, as I verily believe many others have done, that have undertaken to doe it: I will therefore for this work desire that you will rest contented, with so much as hath already been delivered, and expect an exact definition and complete satisfaction by such a methodicall course as a general History will require, to be performed by them that shall publish it.

not with her, but alone outdoors, in a dark, dewy place under trees. Gayle Whittier points out that Rosaline is only a name.[80] This is true—and most sensitively observed—with respect to the character Rosaline, Capulet's "fair niece" (I.2.69), whose name appears on Capulet's list of hoped-for guests for his feast. But it is also a pun on the name of the tavern, "Little Rose" which once had stood where the Rose Theater stood in Shakespeare's lifetime, in one of the suburbs, or liberties of London. The site of the London performances of Shakespeare's first plays (but not of *Romeo and Juliet,* although Shakespeare had presumably intended that it first be performed there*)*, the "Little Rose" is arguably no mere name, but the ghost of an establishment that once stood on the same site as the Rose Theatre. The Rose Theatre was, furthermore, situated next to fields of Damascene roses, cultivated for use in perfumery.[81]

Friar indirectly likens Romeo to "*Rosa damascena*," as if he were a "weak flower" which must be collected at dawn, before the dew dries, if his figurative scent is to be distilled into perfume. As such a "weak flower," Romeo would be imperiled by the bud-destroying "canker." Alternatively, however, Friar subtly likens Romeo to a "canker," a word both for a disease that disfigures and

[80] Gayle Whittier, "The Sonnet's Body and the Body Sonnetized in *Romeo and Juliet*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40:1 (1989): 27-41. 29. When he appeals to Friar for help in marrying Juliet, Romeo assures Friar, "I have forgot *that name* (i.e. 'Rosaline')" (II.3.42; italics mine).
[81] Weis, in Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet,* ed. René Weis, on the fact that the probable site of the first performance of *Romeo and Juliet* was the Curtain in Shoreditch, Introduction, 35-36**;** Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume,* on the rose fields and the name of the Rose Theater, 60-67.

consumes a rose of any kind and for a kind of wild rose, the dog rose, or *Rosa canina*:[82]

> Within the infant rind of this weak flower
> Poison hath residence and medicine power
> For this, being smelled, with that part cheers each part,
> Being tasted, stays all senses with the heart.
> Two such opposed kings encamp them still
> In man as well as herbs, grace and rude will,
> And where the worser is predominant
> Full soon the canker death eats up the plant.
>
> *RJ* II.3.SD, 19-26

Thus, Shakespeare invites us to ponder whether it is true that "a rose by any other word would smell as sweet," as Juliet earlier has claimed. "Canker" confirms Romeo's simultaneously sweet and destructive role in Juliet's life, recalling too how the "weak flower" (*RJ* II.3.19) about which Friar muses as Romeo enters the space of the implied medicinal garden is both sustaining and fatal. The taste of his body and his name are sweet to Juliet, while his membership in a family that is her own family's hereditary enemy proves mortally dangerous to her. To re-phrase: Romeo's pedigree as a "dog of the house of Montague" (*RJ* I.1.7)—to use the Capulet retainer Samson's title for the males of the Montague clan—proves not sweet but bitter to Juliet. "Rose" "by any other word" would designate a different flower—still a rose, potentially, as in the case of "canker," or "dog rose"

[82] "canker, n.". OED Online. December 2022. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/27066?rskey=hPSznd&result=1&isAdvanced=false (accessed December 10, 2022), I.3 and II.3.b.

(*Rosa canina)*, but a rose with a different appearance and habits; a distinct—even if similar—fragrance; and a divergent pedigree. Herein we find the play encapsulated as a mortal conflict between nature and culture, distilled in the image of a rose that can be sweet or toxic.

Nurse's suggestion that Romeo and rosemary begins with the same letter, but not, she insists, "R" which she apparently believes to be a letter exclusive to the sound a dog makes, the growling sound "R(rr)," points indirectly toward the name "*Rosa canina*," or "'*R.' canina*," as it was (and is) sometimes spelled in herbals, with the "*Rosa*" reduced to "*R.*" When sent by Juliet to ascertain whether Romeo intends still to marry her, Nurse assures Romeo that Juliet "hath the prettiest sententious of […] you and rosemary" (*RJ* II.4.203-4) as though Romeo were a word with which Juliet composed "sententious." In reporting on Juliet's superlatively "prett[y]" (*RJ* II.4.203) combining of the words "Romeo" and "rosemary," Nurse may say "sententious" as a malapropism for "sentences."[83] If, however, Nurse retains only four of her teeth, as she has claimed, she likely has no choice but to mispronounce "sentences" as "sententious" (*RJ* I.3.14). Nurse's (probable) mispronouncing, or mistaking of a word—"sentences"—that indicates instances of words conjoined into a grammatical unit in such a way as to impart sense, and also aesthetic pleasure and an appreciation of rhetorical bravura is disarming. Her mispronunciation, or, alternately, malapropism, hints at the

[83] William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet,* ed. Jill L. Levenson (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), II.3, n. 200.

possibility of taking apart and re-assembling Romeo's name (never mind an entire sentence, or entire sentences, with his name and "Rosemary" incorporated in them) in such a way as to create chaos, or something monstrous, or simply mistaken, even if innocuous in its repercussions. Nurse's wordplay arguably, thanks-to her limited number of teeth, teeters on the edge of intelligibility. Through Nurse's use of "sententious," she indirectly responds to Juliet's rhetorical question, "What's in a name?" (*RJ* II.2.43). One answer, as Nurse's use of "sententious" seems to say, is that coherence is in a name. Yet, in the context of other characters' exertions to transform "Romeo" into "rose" via the dismemberment of his name and the recombination of its parts, chaos or monstrousness hardly seems to be a threat posed by Nurse's use of "sententious." For there is an alchemical, or perfumery-related undercurrent to the word "rosemary" as if it meant "rose" and "marry." Alchemists and perfumers were said to marry together the parts they combined in creating their concoctions.[84] The suggestion then would not be of monstrousness but of parts dissolved into other parts so that, having been conjoined, they would be together transformed into, so to speak, one coherent body. Nurse's "sententious" hints at this, too, after all: For it sounds like "sentences" coming apart into sloshing "shhh's," as though it were perfume ingredients dissolving, each into the others.

[84] Simonds, "'My Charms Crack Not,'" 538-570.

Nurse's Speech on Juliet's Weaning

When confronted by Juliet's mother with the news of Juliet's impending, arranged marriage to Paris, Nurse launches into a virtual monologue about her weaning of Juliet. Nurse's speech about that important occasion in the toddler Juliet's life provides context for fathoming the thirteen-year-old Juliet's suicide. Nurse's monologue, to which Juliet is privy, may even serve as a creative source for the form in which Juliet enacts her suicide; for Juliet's figurative perfume-making is a form of memorialization of her, strictly speaking, irrecoverable sensory experiences, as an infant, of Nurse's body during the episode of Nurse's weaning of her. Yet Juliet's figurative perfume-making is a bodily restoration in approximated form of the infant Juliet's sensory experiences, as mediated through Nurse's account of her weaning of Juliet:

> Faith, I can tell her age unto an hour.
> …
> I'll lay fourteen of my teeth,
> And yet, to my teen be it spoken, I have but four,
> She's not fourteen. How long is it now
> To Lammastide? […]
> Even or odd of all days in the year,
> Come Lammas Eve at night shall she be fourteen.
> Susan and she, God rest all Christian souls,
> Were of an age. Well, Susan is with God;
> She was too good for me. But as I said,
> On Lammas Eve at night shall she be fourteen,
> That shall she, marry! I remember it well.
> 'Tis since the earthquake now eleven years,
> And she was weaned, I never shall forget it,

Of all the days of the year upon that day.
For I had then laid wormwood to my dug,
Sitting in the sun under the dovehouse wall.
My lord and you were then at Mantua.
Nay, I do bear a brain. But as I said,
When it did taste the wormwood on the nipple
Of my dug and felt it bitter, pretty fool,
To see it tetchy and fall out with the dug!
'Shake,' quoth the dovehouse. 'Twas no need, I trow,
To bid me trudge.
And since that time it is eleven years,
For then she could stand high-lone, nay, by th' rood,
She could have run and waddled all about,
For even the day before she broke her brow.
And then my husband – God be with his soul,
'A was a merry man – took up the child:
'Yea," quoth he, 'dost thou fall upon thy face?
'Thou wilt fall backward when thou has more wit,
Wilt thou not, Jule?' And by my holidam,
The pretty wretch left crying and said 'Ay.'
To see now how a jest shall come about!
I warrant, an I should live a thousand years,
I never should forget it. 'Wilt thou not, Jule?' quoth he,
And, pretty fool, it stinted and said 'Ay.'
…
Yes, madam, yet I cannot choose but laugh,
To think it should leave crying and say "Ay';
And yet, I warrant, it had upon it brow
A bump as big as a young cockerel's stone;
A perilous knock, and it cried bitterly.
'Yea,' quoth my husband, 'fall'st upon they face?
Thou wilt fall backward when thou comest to age,
Wilt thou not, Jule? It stinted and said 'Ay.'
…
Peace, I have done. God mark thee to his grace,
Thou wast the prettiest babe that e'er I nursed.
An I might live to see thee married once,
I have my wish.

RJ I.3.12; 13-16; 17-49; 51-58; 60-63

Nurse recalls having the aid of the bitter herb wormwood in rendering her nipple unappealing to the nursing child Juliet:

> For I had then laid wormwood to my dug,
> Sitting in the sun under the dovehouse wall.
> My lord and you were then at Mantua.
> Nay, I do bear a brain. But as I said,
> When it did taste the wormwood on the nipple
> Of my dug and felt it bitter pretty fool,
> To see it tetchy and fall out with the dug!
>
> *RJ* I.3.27-33

Nurse further recalls an earthquake as taking place immediately after Juliet "f[e]ll out with the dug" (*RJ* I.3.33):

> 'Tis since the earthquake now eleven years,
> And she was weaned, I never shall forget it,
> Of all the days of the year upon that day,
> For I had then laid wormwood to my dug,
> Sitting in the sun under the dovehouse wall.
> My lord and you were then at Mantua.
> Nay, I do bear a brain. But as I said,
> When it did taste the wormwood on the nipple
> Of my dug and felt it bitter pretty fool,
> To see it tetchy and fall out with the dug!
> 'Shake,' quoth the dovehouse. 'Twas no need, I trow,
> To bid me trudge.
> And since that time is eleven years…
>
> *RJ* I.3.24-36

At the moment when, with finality, Nurse denies her breast and breast milk to Juliet, the earthquake mirrors and reinforces her own instability and impermanence as Juliet's nurturer. Startlingly, Nurse ventriloquizes the dovehouse, reporting it to have said, "Shake" (RJ I.3.34) simultaneously as the earthquake struck, while she, weaning Juliet, was:

> Sitting in the sun, under the dovehouse wall.

In Nurse's reminiscence, the dovehouse menaces both herself and Juliet, even if passively, with the threat of being broken apart in the earthquake and, as a result, crushing Nurse and Juliet, while spilling its contents of dove guano and doves upon them. In England, members of the nobility dined on the doves they raised in their dovehouses.[85] By her animating of, and speaking for, the dovehouse, Nurse indirectly draws attention to her own function in the Capulet household as a living source and receptacle, so to speak, of food for Lord Capulet's heir, Juliet. Could the implied menace of the dovehouse's crushing her and Juliet, as Nurse recalls it, be an indirect expression of hostility she feels toward Juliet? There might well be reasons for such hostility. Juliet has survived, whereas Nurse's own daughter, Susan, as Nurse recounts in passing in her monologue, did not live beyond babyhood. If Juliet's survival has provided a livelihood for Nurse, as a wet nurse then companion to Juliet, even so, Lord and Lady Capulet require of Nurse tendance of Juliet that is physically and emotionally intimate and that, moreover, presumes that Nurse's own body belongs to another family to feed upon. In Elizabethan England the guano which collected in a dovehouse would have been used to fertilize the fields, making it, in an indirect sense, a further source of sustenance for the household.[86]

[85] John McCann, "An Historical Enquiry into the Design and Use of Dovecotes." *Transactions of the Ancient Monuments Society* 35 (1991): 95, mentions dove meat as a delicacy.
[86] McCann, "Design and Use of Dovecotes," 95.

For an Elizabethan house to have a dovehouse in its grounds would have been an indication that the householder was a manorial lord.[87] If we imagine that the dovehouse is present only because the Capulets (although not English and not of the Tudor Era) are members of the nobility, it contributes to a portrayal of Nurse as a person of lesser status than the Capulets—not that this would be in question, in any case. For her to be in danger, however, of being buried alive in dove guano by the collapse of a building that only a lord would have been allowed to possess would underscore her status as a servant whose breasts and breast milk were equally at the disposal of the Capulets as was their dovehouse and its contents. And its contents would have smelled strongly of accumulated dove droppings. In *Romeo and Juliet*, this odor finds a counterpart in the smell of the Paris Garden, which Lady Capulet and Nurse indirectly evoke as they stress to Juliet various of Paris' appealing traits.

Nurse recalls Juliet's weaning as taking place out-of-doors in what seems to be a domestic space conducive to such tasks as nursing and weaning Juliet, while "[s]itting in the sun under the dovehouse wall" (*RJ* I.3.28). Architectural historian Paula Henderson notes that, within the grounds of Elizabethan great-houses, "dovecotes were often found in a kitchen-garden or near a pond or stream."[88] Nurse's own given name, "Angelica" (IV.4.5) is also the name for a type of herb, also named "angelica," which in its domesticated form (*Angelica*

[87] Robert Liddiard, *Landscape of Lordship: Norman Castles and the Countryside in Medieval Norfolk; 1066-1200* (Oxford: BAR Publishing, 2000), 59.
[88] Paula Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden* (New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2005), 14.

archangelica) was widely used in Shakespeare's time, in domestic settings, for culinary, medicinal, and, even, perfumery purposes. At that time, all of these purposes could have been considered to some degree under the purview of the domestic realm, thus making a kitchen garden a suitable setting for "Angelica."[89]

Nurse's role in Juliet's life is anachronistically reflective of the prevalence in Elizabethan England of the hiring of wet nurses by the members of the professional classes and the gentry.[90] Such parents typically handed over their newborn infants to a wet nurse, to breastfeed and to raise, at least until the time of the children's weaning.[91] Gail Kern Paster remarks that Lord and Lady Capulet seem to have granted Nurse more autonomy than would have been usual in weaning Juliet, as she does so at what would have been considered a relatively late age in a child, overseeing it herself, in the birth-parents' absence "at Mantua" (*RJ* 1.3.29).[92] Janet Adleman, in a general comment on the feeding of infants in Shakespeare's day, notes that, because nursing infants oftentimes did not receive enough nutritious sustenance soon enough, their weaning was often delayed owing to the facts that their teeth, with which they would eat solid food, had not

---

[89] Parkinson, *Paradisi in Sole Paradisus Terrestris,* 529, on domesticated angelica. Aftel, *Essence and Alchemy,* 30, reports that angelica was distilled—the implication being, potentially for use in perfumery—between 1500 and 1540. Theresa McLean, *Medieval English Gardens* (London: Collins, 1981), 183, states that "when distilled [angelica] makes a musky perfume."
[90] Wendy Wall, *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2002), 135.
[91] Gail Kern Paster, *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England,* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 221-222. Paster notes that, in Shakespeare's time, an infant usually would have lived at the wet nurse's own house, until it was weaned; however, as she further observes, at the time of Juliet's weaning, Nurse, together with her husband, formed a secondary household within Lord and Lady Capulet's larger household.
[92] Paster, *The Body Embarrassed*, 223-224.

yet formed or their legs had been slow to gain strength enough to hold them up, since poor nutrition had brought on rickets.[93] In light of these historical factors, it is interesting to ponder Nurse's reference to her own teeth in her speech on the topic of her weaning of Juliet:

> CAPULET'S WIFE (to Nurse)
> Thou knowest my daughter's of a pretty age.
>
> NURSE
> Faith, I can tell her age unto an hour.
>
> CAPULET'S WIFE
> She's not fourteen.
>
> NURSE
> I'll lay fourteen of my teeth,
> And yet, to my teen be it spoken, I have but four.
> She's not fourteen…
> *RJ* I.3.11-15

Here Nurse conflates awareness of the current number of her own teeth and the former number of Juliet's teeth as a place-holder for conflating her former concern with Juliet's readiness for weaning and her current concern for the thirteen-year-old Juliet's readiness for marriage: this latter being a putative concern of Nurse's, which Lady Capulet both attributes to Nurse and addresses by denying to Nurse that Juliet is too young to wed. Additionally, Nurse's reference to Juliet's ability to stand up on her own at the time of her weaning calls to mind

[93] Janet Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to Tempest* (London: Routledge, 1992), Introduction, 4-5. Adelman's brilliant book is about male protagonists' relationship with their mothers—or, as in the case of Antony and Cleopatra in the eponymous play, with their figurative mothers—beginning from the time of Shakespeare's *Hamlet;* however, I find her general remarks about contemporary wet-nursing practices to be relevant to my discussion of Nurse's and Juliet's relationship.

the danger posed by rickets in Elizabethan times to young children suckled by wet nurses (*RJ* I.3.36-42; 56). Nurse, in fact, dwells on an incident in which, on the day before she was weaned, the toddling Juliet had fallen down face-first. In this way, Shakespeare also indirectly calls into question how steady Juliet was on her feet, and, therefore, how ready to be weaned. In this way, Shakespeare also indirectly calls into question Juliet's readiness, at thirteen years of age, for marriage.

Adelman quotes contemporary sources, including some contemporary translations of texts from Classical antiquity, in which a (male) writer, one in the guise of his former infant self, vehemently apostrophizes his mother, accusing her of abandoning him to a wet nurse's ministrations.[94] Indeed, Juliet and Nurse clearly enjoy a closer relationship than do Juliet and her own birth-mother. As we learn from Nurse's monologue about her weaning of Juliet, it is Nurse, not Lady Capulet, who holds Juliet in memory with respect to this momentous event in her (and Nurse's own) life. It is Nurse, not Lady Capulet, who, in speaking of Juliet's weaning and Juliet's stage of growth at that time, repeats, with slight variation, as a near-refrain, the phrase: "I never shall forget it!" (*RJ* I.3.25; Nurse's varies the phrase at *RJ* 1.3:48: "…I never should forget it."). Nurse's repetition, with variation, of the sentiment that her memory of Juliet's weaning and its attendant circumstances will be enduring emphasizes the importance of memory to Juliet's response to Romeo; for Nurse's reminiscence of Juliet's weaning is our

[94] Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers,* Introduction, 4.

foundational source of Juliet's implied bodily memories of her sensory experiences when suckling at Nurse's breast. And it is these sensory experiences that Juliet seeks to restore through her experiencing of Romeo's presence and body.

Angelica: Sweet, Bitter, and Musky

When Juliet poses the question, "What's in a name?" I would assume that few, if any, people think to apply this question not just to consideration of Romeo's name but also to that of Juliet's Nurse; however, I would like to propose doing just that. The Nurse's given name—or what appears to be her given name, "Angelica" (*RJ* IV.4.5)—is also the name of an herb which, according to the historian of herbal lore, Mrs. M. Grieve, possesses a "pervading aromatic odor, a pleasant perfume," while Shakespeare's contemporary, the herbalist John Parkinson, observes of angelica that "the whole plant, both (sic) roote, leafe, and feede, is of an excellent, comfortable fent, favour, and taste." [95]

Admittedly, the name "Angelica" is uttered only once in the play, and not until Act IV, scene 4, when Capulet enjoins Nurse:

> Look to the baked meats, good Angelica:
> Spare not for the cost.
>
> *RJ* IV.4.5-6

[95] Liane Ferguson and Paul Yachnin. "The Name of Juliet's Nurse." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 32:1 (1981): 95-96. Mrs. M. Grieve*, A Modern Herbal,* Volume I. (New York: Dover Publications, 1971), 36; Parkinson, *Paradisi in Sole Paradisus Terrestris*, 529.

As A. Jonathan Bate notes, scholars argue over whether the "Angelica" (*RJ* IV.4.5) whom Capulet addresses is, indeed, Nurse, rather than Lady Capulet, his wife.[96] Both Nurse and Lady Capulet are present in the scene, and both prepare food for Juliet's wedding to Paris. Thus, Capulet might address his remark to either one. The very ambiguity as to who bears the name, Juliet's former wet nurse, or her birth-mother, may, however, be significant, as it indicates the blurred boundaries between the roles the two women play in Juliet's life, in accordance with Elizabethan child-rearing practices among the upper classes (although the play is not set in Elizabethan England).

Yet, while the ambiguity as to whom Capulet addresses could be construed as significant, it is at the same also true that it makes poetic sense for Nurse, rather than Lady Capulet, to bear the name "Angelica"; for Nurse's attributes; the uses to which she is put by Lord and Lady Capulet; and, to some extent, what one might term her "habitat" "under the dovehouse wall" (*RJ* I.3.28) (assuming that the dovehouse is situated in a kitchen garden), suggest her affinity with, or assimilation to, the herb angelica.[97]

While Paris' name is associated with a place—the Paris Garden—outside the walls of Elizabethan London, the Nurse is linked, in part through her account of her memory of weaning Juliet on the day of an earthquake, with particular

[96] A. Jonathan Bate. "An Herb by Any Other Name: *Romeo and Juliet,* IV.iv.5-6." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33:3 (1982), 336.

[97] As a supplement to his advice on what to plant in one's kitchen garden, Parkinson, *Paradisi in Sole Paradisus Terrestris,* 529*,* mentions angelica as an herb that is "of profit & ufe" to "Country Gentlewomen and others" "to have at hand in their gardens."

spaces or structures—predominantly domestic in nature—within the imaginary Verona of the play itself: the Capulets' "pantry" and "pastry" as well as their dovehouse, which presumably, as noted above, would have been located in their kitchen-garden. These particular spaces or structures underscore the Nurse's role in providing sweet food to Juliet, and indeed in providing sustenance to Juliet's whole family. The Capulets' pantry would be a place, like a dovehouse—or a nursing woman's breast— in which food was stored, while their pastry would be a room—in the Elizabethan era, oftentimes comprising an outbuilding—where pastry was made.

Nurse Angelica is linked with spaces for food preparation and storage in the Capulets' house in another way as well: other characters summon her to those spaces, expecting to benefit from her labor there. At least, we glean that on occasions meant to mark milestones in Juliet's life, the Nurse is assumed to be at the disposal of the household to help make food for the Capulets and their guests. When, in Nurse's hearing, Lady Capulet informs Juliet that she is to marry Paris, who will be present that very evening at the Capulets' house, a Servingman breaks in to say, "the Nurse [is] cursed in the pantry" (I.3.102-103). It seems that, instead of helping to prepare food in the pantry, Nurse has been recalling how she once used to feed Juliet from her breast with the substance of her own body, until the memorable day when she weaned Juliet with the bitter herb wormwood.

As the Capulet household's preparations of food is underway for what is intended to be a feast in honor of Juliet's wedding to Paris, the Nurse receives

instructions and exhortations from both Lord and Lady Capulet about her (the Nurse's) part in making the celebratory food. Although the Nurse no longer feeds Juliet with what the play implies to be her sweet milk, nevertheless, to mark the occasion of yet another rite of passage in Juliet's life, Nurse is expected to help in making preparations for feeding Juliet and her family and their guests with sweet food. Lady Capulet and the Nurse enter what may be the Capulets' kitchen together. The stage directions do not specify the setting, nor does the dialogue make plain where the characters are; however, preparation of food is the clear focus of the scene. Nurse Angelica, who, as noted earlier, shares a name with an herb used in Elizabethan confectionery, enters, as the stage direction specifies, "with herbs" (*RJ* sd IV.4), only for Lady Capulet to order Nurse Angelica to fetch "more spices" (*RJ* IV.4.1) as though she, the living store of food, who shares a name with an herb, and enters the scene "carr[ying] herbs," should unlock her store, or some other store belonging to the Capulets', of spices. As the elder Capulets pepper Nurse Angelica with orders, the folk in the pastry are clamoring for ingredients. The Nurse herself remarks that, "They call for quinces and dates in the pastry" (*RJ* IV.4.2). From medieval times onwards, quinces and dates were often candied.[98] To speak figuratively, the Nurse Angelica, "as" angelica the herb, may also be needed in the pantry to help sweeten the quinces and dates from her own substance. This association of Nurse with domestic food supplies and

[98] Darra Goldstein, *The Oxford Companion to Sugar and Sweets* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press: 2015), 101-102.

preparation is in keeping with Shakespeare's portrayal of her as a servant, certain parts of whose very body—her breasts—might be termed "storehouses of food," akin to dovehouses. As her seeming given name, "Angelica," would suggest, she, at least figuratively speaking, is also a general source of confectionery sweetness for the Capulet household and its guests.

If Nurse is portrayed as a repository, source, preparer, and bestower of, as well as an ingredient in, sweet foods, Romeo too is shown as closely associated with sweet food. His entrance into the Capulets' house for the banquet at which he meets Juliet for the first time follows shortly after the Capulets' Head Servingman asks another household servant to set aside for him a piece of "marchpane" (*RJ* I.5.8), a confection that, in the Elizabethan era, might well be made with rosewater.[99] It is as though Romeo, the savor of whose breath and essence inspire Juliet to speak of the sweetness of the rose, is himself figured as a piece of marchpane, a type of confection often formed into miniature facsimiles of familiar objects, including flowers.[100]

Nurse, in order to wean Juliet from her sweet milk, substitutes for her milk the bitter herb wormwood, the bitterness of which is reflected in Nurse's own seeming-namesake herb, angelica; for the herb angelica is varied with respect to its flavors, which differ according to the part of the plant. While angelica

[99] Almonds and sugar, however, were the chief and defining ingredients of marchpane, Goldstein, *The Oxford Companion to Sugar and Sweets,* 432.
[100] Miriam Jacobson, *Barbarous Antiquity*, 58; 74.

possesses stems sweet enough to be used in confectionary, its dried root tastes "at first sweetish, afterwards warm, aromatic, bitterish, and somewhat musky."[101] The bitterness of wormwood's taste thus finds a counterpart in the flavor of angelica root (although the bitterness present in the taste of angelica root is not as extreme as is that of wormwood). By applying wormwood to her nipple, the Nurse, "as" the herb angelica, has used a part of her own substance—a bitter part—to counteract the sweet part made up of her body's own milk and nipple. Embodied within her namesake herb as manifestations of sweetness and bitterness is the ambiguous atmosphere, composed both of menace and solicitude, which, according to her own account, prevails as she weans Juliet.

Friar on Nurse and Friar "as" Nurse

If Nurse's virtual monologue on the subject of Juliet's weaning seems merely the self-indulgent outburst of a garrulous, buffoonish, uncultivated woman, Friar delivers what is in effect an answering soliloquy, through which he provides an antidote, so to speak, to such an impression of Nurse; for, through Friar's words, Shakespeare equates Nurse not only with a single—albeit multi-faceted—herb, angelica, but, in part by alluding subtly to two tales from Ovid's *Metamorphoses,*

[101] Grieve, *A Modern Herbal, Volume. I,* 37.

with the earth itself in the aspect of "nature's mother" (II.3.5), "on (whose) natural bosom" (II.3.8) "children of divers kind" (II.3.7) suckle:

> Now, ere the sun advance his burning eye
> The day to cheer and night's dank dew to dry,
> I must up-fill this osier cage of ours
> With baleful weeds and precious-juiced flowers.
> The earth that's nature's mother is her tomb,
> What is her burying grave, that is her womb;
> And from her womb children of divers kind
> We sucking on her natural bosom find,
> Many for many virtues excellent,
> None but for some, and yet all different.
> O, mickle is the powerful grace that lies
> In plants, herbs, stones, and their true qualities,
> For naught so vile that on the earth doth live
> But to the earth some special food doth give,
> Nor aught so good but, strained from that fair use,
> Revolts from true birth, stumbling on abuse.
> Virtue itself turns vice, being misapplied.
> And vice sometime by action dignified.
>
> *Enter Romeo*
>
> Within the infant rind of this weak flower
> Poison hath residence and medicine power,
> For this, being smelled, with that part cheers each part,
> Being tasted, stays all senses with the heart.
> Two such opposed kings encamp them still
> In man as well as herbs, grace and rude will,
> And where the worser is predominant
> Full soon the canker death eats up the plant.
>
> *RJ* II.3.1-26

Through his soliloquy, Friar counteracts the apparent vacuousness of Nurse's monologue on the topic of Juliet's weaning, imparting weightiness to Nurse's persona and to such authority as she wields. Friar's speech gives new meaning, too, to the earthquake of Nurse's reminiscence, suggesting behind it a will that is both divine and maternal.

In a figurative sense, the weaning of Juliet from her Nurse's tendance is re-enacted as Friar gradually supplants Nurse as Juliet's surrogate parent, effectively re-enacting, in new form (as Ovid might say), the role of Juliet's wet nurse. Yet, if Shakespeare, through Friar's soliloquy, indirectly attributes to Nurse the twinned succoring and fatal powers of the earth as "nature's mother," then one might ask whether Friar, too, possesses such powers as he himself obliquely ascribes to Nurse, or whether, alternatively, he might be Nurse's /earth's/mother nature's priest.

The two tales from Ovid's *Metamorphoses,* in Arthur Golding's translation, to which Friar may subtly allude are both concerned with mortals' pious, or otherwise, veneration of the gods. In the story of Deucalian and his wife Pyrrha, the pair—the only human survivors of a flood which Jupiter has unleashed on the impious race of mortals— consult the goddess Themis as to how "to repaire / The world" (Ovid, *Met.* I, trans. Golding), including how to re-people it. The couple are advised by Themis in the traditionally obscure language of oracular utterance as follows: "both of you your Graundames bones behind your shoulders cast" (*Met*. I.). Deucalion interprets the oracle as metaphorical language according to which their "Graundame," or grandmother, is the earth and her bones stones (*Met.* I.).[102] When Deucalion and Pyrrha throw stones behind them, Deucalion's interpretation is proved correct, as the stones do turn into human

[102] P. Ovidius Naso, *The XV Books of P. Ovidius Naso, Entytuled Metamorphosis,* trans. Arthur Golding (London: By Willyem Seres, 1567). Accessed through Early English Book Online.

beings who are, in essence, earth's children. Friar appears to include "stones" among the "children of diverse kind / We sucking on [earth's] natural bosom find" (*RJ* III.2.12; 7-8), as though Shakespeare has in mind this Ovidian landscape of stones that turn into people.[103] If stones turn into people, then why not the herb angelica into Nurse Angelica, or "Romeo" into "rose"? Why should not two people, at their death as humans, become transformed into two trees, growing together as one, inextricably conjoined, rather as Romeo and Juliet, at their deaths, become transmuted into a single golden statue, a metaphor for their alchemical marriage?

Shakespeare implants the word "osier" (*RJ* III.2.3) in Friar's soliloquy, seeming thus to link Friar's speech to Golding's translation of yet another tale from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: the account of the elderly married couple, Baucis and Philemon, eventually metamorphosed into two, intertwined trees, and the only two people whom "mighty Jove and Mercurie his sonne, in shape of men" (*Met*., VIII) could find on earth who treated their guests—namely, Jove and Mercury, disguised as humble wayfarers—with the hospitality that it was their sacred duty to show to their guests. Although described as poor themselves, Baucis and Philemon's store of food sounds like the wealth of the fertile earth. In Golding's translation "osier" appears amidst a catalogue of the earth's bounty

[103] It is true that in the corresponding passage from Brooke's earlier version of the Romeo story, Friar makes mention of stones, but Shakespeare need not have reproduced this detail.

which the humble couple have to hand in their cottage to offer their unexpected guests:

> And when they pawsed had a tyde,
> Hot meate came pyping from the fyre. And shortly thereupon
> A cup of greene hedg wyne was brought. This tane away, anon
> Came in the latter course, which was of Nuts, Dates, dryed figges,
> Sweete smelling Apples in a Mawnd made flat of Osier twigges,
> And Prunes and Plums and Purple grapes cut newly from the tree,
> And in the middes a hannycomb new taken from the Bee.
>
> Ovid, Met., VIII, trans. Golding

Not just the word "osier," which Shakespeare does not frequently use, but also the suggestion that the earth is teeming with offspring in the form of plants and creatures may find an echo in Friar's characterization of earth as "nature's mother." The "Bee" (*Met.,* VIII.) from which a honeycomb had recently been plundered is arguably significant, too, to Friar's characterization of the earth and, by extension, of Nurse. Ovid likens Baucis to a "bee," as he describes how she sets the table with overflowing generosity and with what sounds to twenty-first century ears like a wealth of the earth's riches.

> The Gods sate downe. The aged wife right chare and busie as
> A Bee, set out a table…
>
> Ovid, Met., VIII, trans. Golding

That "bee" reads, in effect, as the source not just of the newly acquired honeycomb but of all the food laid out on the table for the two gods. Because it is Baucis, the woman of the pair, who is likened to a "bee," the abundance seems to flow from her, although it flows from the bee's honeycomb and, one could say,

ultimately, from the earth. It seems to me that something of this sense of a female source of abundant sweetness stemming from the earth is captured in Friar's speech. In the dawn-time garden-space, in the dew, in the vicinity of Friar's cell, we may encounter through Shakespeare's words, a veiled tribute to a female aspect of God, one that in Friar's Roman Catholic religion, had a ghostly status as the Mother of God: God was "the fruit of [her] womb."[104]

Similarly to Nurse in her role as wet nurse, Friar first provides Juliet with a succoring, sleep-inducing liquid only, at length, to startle her with figurative wormwood in the form of the bitter news he gives her that Romeo lies dead "in [her] bosom" (*RJ* V.3.155). That Friar is present with Juliet when she awakens from the effects of his soporific potion within her family's tomb finds a counterpart, too, in Nurse's self-reported presence next to the dovehouse wall, when she surprised the unsuspecting, suckling Juliet with the intensely bitter taste of wormwood.

Similarly as Friar offers a liquid as comforting as breast milk to Juliet in the form of the sleeping potion he concocts for her in the face of Romeo's banishment from Verona, Friar attempts to acquaint Romeo with an alternative

[104] From the Roman Catholic prayer, "Hail Mary (*Ave Maria*)." Anonymous, *The Book of Common Praye*r*, and Adminystracion of the Sacramentes, and Other Rites and Ceremonies in the Churche of Englande* (London: in Officina Edovardi Whitchurche, 1553), does not include this prayer, presumably because veneration of Mary was not endorsed by the Church of England. While *The Book of Common Praye*r does present the passage from the Gospel of Luke from which this prayer is derived, it does not use the phrase "fruit of thy womb." Shakespeare may have known the phrase "*fructus / ventris tui, Jesus (fruit / of thy womb, Jesus)*" from the Roman Catholic prayer, especially if his parents were recusants, as some have suggested.

form of "sweet milk" (*RJ* III.3.55), by way of sustenance when he is apart from Juliet, telling him that, while in Mantua, he will be able to avail himself of:

> Adversity's sweet milk, philosophy,
> To comfort thee when thou art banished.
>
> *RJ* III.3.55-56

Mantua is where Juliet's birth-parents, Lord and Lady Capulet were when Nurse wrested her from her nipple, replacing "sweet milk" not with "philosophy" (*RJ* III.3.55) but with the most bitter of herbs. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that, as a replacement for "sweet milk," Romeo buys in Mantua an herbal poison in potable form—very likely aconite, which is bitter to the taste —before returning to Juliet in Verona, to "lie in [her] bosom" (*RJ* V.3.155).[105]

"She Could Stand High-Lone"

Juliet's penetrating of her own bosom with a blade as a result of her wish to follow Romeo in death is in its grim way a fitting end to her life; for Juliet is drawn to Romeo in part because she perceives him to exhale a sweet savor, like that of a rose. At least, Juliet associates Romeo with the sweet smell of a rose, a scent that, in its sweetness, implicitly recalls her to her infancy, when her surrogate mother, Nurse, suckled Juliet with breast milk which the play implies to

[105] Harrison, "Hang Up Philosophy," 205-206. Interestingly, Gerard, *The Herballe*, 329, notes that the French herbalists Mathias de L'Obel and Petrus Pena regarded the truelove plant, or herb Paris, as "one of the aconites."

be sweet. By plunging the blade into the part of her body from which sweet milk might one day come, Juliet figuratively combines "in [her own] bosom" (V.3.155) the scents of both Paris and Romeo. In Nurse's reminiscence of her weaning of Juliet from her breast, she has recalled how the dovehouse wall spoke the word "shake" even as the earthquake agitated the wall; the wall, it is implied, of the enclosed, presumed kitchen-garden in which Nurse had sat while nursing Juliet. Romeo's blade, which Juliet takes up, is the instrument that enacts another, this time figurative, earthquake: the vexing, or agitating of Juliet's bosom. The agitation is a metaphoric reenactment of the consummation of Romeo and Juliet's marriage. Romeo's blade, wielded by Juliet within the cavity of her own bosom, is the "Shakespeare": that is, the "spear(e)" that "shake(s)" her and him in the act of poetic creation through which the dew on the petals of the rose are distilled. From the figurative conjoining of their two scents, moreover, Juliet creates "in [her own] bosom" (V.3.155) a single fragrance—a perfume—that is both sweet and enduring. By combining a sweet smelling ingredient with a musky, animalic one which imparts extreme tenacity to a fragrance, Juliet's action is in keeping with the Elizabethan-era fashion in perfume-making for using animal-based scents in order to achieve what is generally regarded as a primary goal of perfumers: a fragrance with an enduring scent.[106] In figuratively conjoining her two suitors' scents, it is as though Juliet reconstituted, in the form of perfume, what the play intimates is her Nurse Angelica's all-encompassing presence during

[106] Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume*, 63.

the first years of Juliet's life, when her Nurse was still her wet nurse. Juliet's figurative perfume-making, thus, is seen to be a form of memorialization of her strictly speaking irrecoverable sensory experiences, as an infant, of the Nurse's body and immediate environment.

Romeo and Juliet become interchangeable as scent. After they have consummated their marriage, Juliet takes on Romeo's flower-like, sweet smell. When, at separate times, Lord Capulet and Paris come upon Juliet's drugged, seemingly dead body, each man refers to her as a "sweet(est) flower" (IV.5.29; V.3.12), as though Juliet, in consummating her marriage, had been contaminated, so to speak, by her husband Romeo, becoming sweet, like him. By contrast, the implication has been that for her to join together solely with Paris, she would smell like carrion by way of reflecting the merely profane nature of his love for her, as emblemized by the odor both of herb Paris and of the slaughtered animals in the Paris Garden. By marrying Romeo, she begins to evade the threat of smelling, in death, solely like carrion. By joining with Paris, too—but not solely with him—in death, she is able to render her and Romeo's sweet smell ever-lasting by preserving it through the fixative power of Paris' fetid, fecal odor. If Juliet were to have married Paris, Shakespeare implies, without Romeo's sweet savor intermingling with Paris' fetid one, she would have remained as mere mortal flesh, subject to decay.

Indeed, through Romeo's mention of carrion-flies in his lament over his banishment from Verona and his new bride Juliet, he indirectly associates Juliet's hand with putrefying flesh:

> …Heaven is here
> Where Juliet lives, and every cat and dog
> And little mouse, every unworthy thing,
> Live here in heaven and may look on her,
> But Romeo may not. More validity,
> More honourable state, more courtship lives
> In carrion flies than Romeo. They may seize
> On the white wonder of dear Juliet's hand
> And steal immortal blessing from her lips…
> III.3.29-37

Through this imagery, Romeo implies that Juliet's body—especially, as we shall see, "her lips (III.3.37)," bearing in mind the double-entendre of that phrase—is carrion and therefore is possessed of the stench that draws to it "carrion flies" (III.3.34).

While berating Juliet for her stated wish to put off her marriage to Paris, Juliet's father outright calls her "you green-sickness carrion" (III.5.156). Lord Capulet uses the term "carrion" contemptuously to suggest that Juliet is no more than mere, already-decaying flesh, at the mercy of its own "green-sickness" (III.5.156).[107] Ursula Potter explains that Shakespeare's contemporary audience would have been familiar with green-sickness as a disease especially prevalent among virginal, thirteen-year-old, well-born young women. According to at least

[107] See "carrion, n. and adj.". OED Online. December 2022. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/28233?redirectedFrom=carrion (accessed December 11, 2022), 3.

one theory current at the time, as a young woman suffering from green-sickness (as Capulet supposes; Juliet, in fact, already has consummated her marriage to Romeo), the cure she would require would be marriage, so that she might engage in socially condoned sexual relations, which, according to contemporary medical beliefs, would save her from the threat of her private parts—what Shakespeare could, in part, mean by Romeo's phrase "her lips" (III.3.37)—decaying while she was still alive, in this way bringing about her premature death.[108]

That Capulet should berate Juliet with the word "carrion" is ironic, since Shakespeare insinuates, by means of Lady Capulet's and Nurse's punning, that Paris smells of carrion and that for Juliet and Paris to join in marriage, as Capulet wishes, would be for the pair of them to create a very bad smell: namely, the stench of carrion twice over. Juliet counteracts this danger, however, with her figurative ability to "stand high-lone" (I.3.37). As noted earlier, in Elizabethan England, a child's ability to stand upright on its own was one way to determine whether that child was ready to be weaned. The play, however, establishes that the meaning within it of "to stand" also includes "to have an erection"—and, by extension, "to be virile," or "masculine." In the play's opening scene in which the Capulets' servants engage in wordplay about swords, making indirect threats to impale men of Romeo's clan, the Montagues, with swords and to rape their

[108] Ursula Potter, "Greensickness in *Romeo and Juliet: Considerations on a Sixteenth-Century Disease of Virgins,* in *The Premodern Teenager: Youth in Society 1150-1650,* ed. Konrad Eisenbichler (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies 2002), 271-291; Ursula Potter, "Navigating the Dangers of Female Puberty in Renaissance Drama," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 53:2 (2013): 422-423; Ursula Potter, *The Unruly Womb* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, University of Western Michigan, 2019), 99.

women, "to stand" has the sexual sense, "to be erect."[109] The servants' wordplay thus contributes to the figuring in the play of phalluses as lethal blades. In hearing Nurse recount how her now-deceased husband directed sexualized banter at the toddler Juliet, asking her whether, once she has gained more "wit" (*RJ* I.3.43), she won't "fall backward" (*RJ* I.3.43), as if to receive a man's sexual attentions, we may recall how at play's end Juliet plays two parts: that of the woman who "fall[s] backward"—albeit in death—and the part of the virago; for, rather than with a noose or with poison, like a decorous tragic heroine, she kills herself with a phallic blade. Nurse's use of the exclamation "by the rood" (*RJ* I.3.37) in close conjunction with the phrase "[Juliet] could stand high-lone" emphasizes the connection in the play between the act of standing and a lethal weapon; for "the rood," or Cross, is a sturdily upright instrument of death which, in silhouette, bears resemblance to a dagger.[110] The fact that, as Nurse says, Juliet "could stand high-lone" (*RJ* I.3.37) foreshadows her use of a phallic blade, or "-speare," when she kills herself by piercing her own breast—and, in perfumer's or alchemist's fashion, agitating it—or as the dovehouse wall declared, "shak[ing]" it—so as to combine "in [her] bosom" (*RJ* V.3.155) the distilled essence of the Damascene rose with that of musk, in order to make the sweet scent last.

[109] See also Coppélia Kahn, "Coming of Age in Verona." *Modern Language Studies* 8: 1 (1977-1978), 7.
[110] Herb Paris, too, bears a symmetrical, cross-like form, arguably suggestive of a stylized dagger; but perhaps the shape its blossom bears is more likely to have alchemical overtones owing to its resemblance to a Crucifix. See Abraham, *A Dictionary of Alchemical Imagery, "*cross," 48-49.

II. "I AM AGAIN FOR CYDNUS": CLEOPATRA'S PERFUMED, RENEWING PURSE

Cleopatra as Self-Aware Figurative Perfumer

In enacting her protracted suicide, Cleopatra, in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra,* proclaims to her attendants, "I am again for Cydnus / To meet Mark Antony" (*AC* V.2.196-97). Cleopatra speaks of her suicide-in-progress as a mode of return to the now-dead Antony in the locale where, to judge from Enobarbus' account in his celebrated description of the pair's first meeting, each first breathed the same air. With her phrase, "again for Cydnus/ to meet Mark Antony" (*AC* V.2.196), Cleopatra implies, too, a temporal return, as if to say that Antony's and her suicides should be understood to result in a re-enactment of their first meeting on, and in the vicinity of, the River Cydnus—a meeting which took place while each was—to speak in terms of topography—in a different place (one on the river, the other near it), but where both were sharing the same envelope of perfumed air, issuing from Cleopatra and her barge. Indeed, it is the perfumed air that, in its spatial extent and temporal duration, defines the place where, according to Enobarbus, they first met (*AC* II.2.202-3; 221-23). Although it is through Enobarbus' account that the audience or reader learns of this first meeting, nevertheless Cleopatra's own articulation of her anticipated return to Antony implies that she herself indeed holds a memory of Antony at this particular place

that is defined by her own perfume, a memory that she intends, quite literally, to relive, in this way (re-)capturing and reviving Antony.[111]

Strikingly, to the reader's or audience's apprehension, Cleopatra's implied memory of Cydnus and of her meeting with Antony in Cydnus' vicinity is primarily contextualized not by Cleopatra's own divulgences, but by Enobarbus' "barge speech" and the lines immediately preceding it (*AC* II.2.196-236), in which he describes not her own sensations upon her first meeting with Antony but instead her presentation of herself for that meeting, and, more succinctly, Antony's responding, mirroring self-presentation at her "feast" (*AC* II.2.234).

ENOBARUS (to Agrippa and Maecenas)
When she first met Mark Antony, she
pursed up his heart upon the river of Cydnus.
[…]
I will tell you.
The barge she sat in, like a burnished throne,
Burned on the water; the poop was beaten gold;
Purple the sails, and so perfumed that
The winds were love-sick with them; the oars were silver,
Which to the tune of flutes kept stroke, and made
The water which they beat to follow faster,
As amorous of their strokes. For her own person,
It beggared all description: she did lie
In her pavilion, cloth-of-gold of tissue,
O'er-picturing that Venus where we see
The fancy outwork nature. On each side her
Stood pretty dimpled boys, like smiling cupids,

[111] Similarly, Pollard, *Drugs and Theater*, 77, argues that Cleopatra "resurrects" Antony as a sleep- and drug-induced dream-vision of an Emperor, a vision which, Pollard suggests, is a staged, narcotic facsimile of the real Antony; while Jennifer Park, "Discandying Cleopatra: Preserving Cleopatra's Infinite Variety in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Studies in Philology* 113:3 (2016): 595-633, discusses how "Cleopatra" was the name not only of the historic queen whose consort Mark Antony was, but also of an alchemist to whom various recipes for the preservation of substances were attributed. Park proposes that the character Cleopatra in Shakespeare's play is a master preserver who preserves both herself and also Mark Antony, as though they both were perishable foodstuffs.

With divers-colored fans, whose wind did seem
To glow the delicate cheeks which they did cool,
And what they undid did. […]
Her gentlewomen, like the Nereides,
So many mermaids, tended her i'th' eyes,
And made their bends adornings. At the helm
A seeming mermaid steers. The silken tackle
Swell with the touches of those flower-soft hands
That yarely frame the office. From the barge
A strange invisible perfume hits the sense
Of the adjacent wharfs. The city cast
Her people out upon her, and Antony,
Enthroned i'th' market-place, did sit alone
Whistling to th'air, which, but for vacancy,
Had gone to gaze on Cleopatra, too,
And made a gap in nature.[…]
Upon her landing, Antony sent to her;
Invited her to supper. She replied
It should be better he became her guest,
Which she entreated. Our courteous Antony,
Whom ne'er the word of 'No' woman heard speak,
Being barbered ten time o'er, goes to the feast
And, for his ordinary, pays his heart
For what his eyes eat only.

AC II.2.196-197, 200-236

Through its series of images, Enobarbus' speech conveys to the reader or audience the mode by which Cleopatra brings Antony into her inmost sphere of influence—images adapted not only to the sense of sight, but also to the senses of hearing, touch, implied taste, and, arguably above all, scent. Much of the passage's sensory imagery, I would suggest, may be construed as mapping the effects upon Antony of the perfumes which emanate from Cleopatra's barge, by means of which Cleopatra, as Enobarbus says, "pursed up [Antony's] heart" (*AC* II.2.196).

In that it displays the dynamics between Cleopatra and Antony in a fundamental manner for the play, Enobarbus' speech is not unlike Nurse's speech in *Romeo and Juliet* on the topic of Juliet's weaning: through this speech, Nurse is shown to be the bearer of memories of significant events in the toddler Juliet's life. Through her memory-laden speech about Juliet's weaning, Nurse provides, moreover, context relevant to savors and fragrances evoked in the play and their connection to Juliet's memory as well as to her efforts to re-make Romeo. (For a discussion of Nurse's speech, see Chapter 1.) Both Enobarbus and Nurse describe a momentous occasion on behalf of another character, or characters—and not just any characters, but protagonists. Similarly as does Nurse in her speech in which she evokes the very savors that Juliet later seeks out in Romeo, Enobarbus, in his speech, refers to scents in a way that links Cleopatra and Antony together. Enobarbus implies that it is the fragrance of Cleopatra's "strange invisible perfume" (*AC* II.2.232) which draws Antony to her, inspiring in him an answering, fragrant self-presentation, which, in its tenor, is simultaneously erotic and infantilized.

If Enobarbus adopts an important aspect of Nurse's role in *Romeo and Juliet*, so, too, does Cleopatra adopt another. Scholars have noted that *Antony and Cleopatra* may be understood as a re-worked *Romeo and Juliet,* with its protagonists now middle-aged— and, in the case of Cleopatra, as Tanya Pollard argues, now self-aware in terms of her ability to stage-manage her effect upon

others.[112] Building upon Pollard's work, I would add that Cleopatra encompasses traits which, in *Romeo and Juliet,* are shared out between Juliet and Juliet's surrogate mother, Nurse: Similarly as Nurse, who has provided breast milk to Juliet, Cleopatra proffers figurative breast milk to her figurative "baby" (*AC* V.2.308), Antony, represented by the snakes which she holds to her arms and breast so that they will bite her, injecting her with the fatal poison which will permit her to return to Cydnus and Antony. As Cleopatra says of one of these deadly snakes which she holds,

> Dost thou not see my baby at my breast
> That sucks the nurse asleep?
>
> *AC* V.2.308-309

And, just as Juliet blazons Romeo—albeit with figurative, enduring perfume rather than with words—Cleopatra, too, blazons her own lover, Antony, but seemingly more conventionally, with words. In this way, she both recollects and re-makes him with her breath, which we understand from the play's figurative language to be perfumed air.

Perfumed air, indeed, is the very medium by which Cleopatra and Antony first correspond with one another, as Enobarbus implies in his barge speech:

> From the barge
> A strange invisible perfume hits the sense
> Of the adjacent wharves. The city cast
> Her people out upon her, and Antony,
> Enthroned i'th' market-place, did sit alone,
> Whistling to th'air…
>
> *AC* II.2.221-226

[112] Pollard*, Drugs and the Theater,* 56; 75-77.

By "whistling to the air," Antony already, even before coming to her supper, responded with his breath to her perfume and so began his intimate dealings with her. Enobarbus' barge speech is a lyrical explication of his claim, uttered in prose in the form of a salacious metaphor, that:

> When [Cleopatra] first met Mark Antony, she
> pursed up his heart upon the river of Cydnus.
> *AC* II.2.196-197

At the conclusion of his barge speech, Enobarbus resumes and elaborates upon his metaphorical use of "purse[…]" (*AC* II.2.196) and "heart" (*AC* II.2.196), stating that Antony "pa[id]" (*AC* II.2.235) for the meal which Cleopatra "entreated" (*AC* II.2.232) him to accept from her with his "heart" (*AC* II.2.235), the very heart that, according to Enobarbus, Cleopatra had "pursed up" (*AC* II.2.196):

> Upon her landing, Antony sent to her;
> Invited her to supper. She replied
> It should be better he became her guest,
> Which she entreated. Our courteous Antony,
> Whom ne'er the word of 'No' woman heard speak,
> Being barbered ten time o'er, goes to the feast
> And, for his ordinary, pays his heart
> For what his eyes eat only.
> *AC* II.2.229-236

Enobarbus' double-entendre in his use of the word "purse[…]" prefigures his subsequent reference to perfume. With his pun centering on the object designated by "purse[…]," which is contained in the verb "pursed"(*AC* II.2.196), Enobarbus indirectly introduces the topic of Cleopatra's perfume before he says the words "perfumed" and "perfume" (*AC* II.2.203, 222). For it would not have been unusual for a literal purse of Shakespeare's own day, if it were made of cloth or

paper, to have held perfume.[113] If, moreover, a purse were made of tanned animal skin, it would likely have been treated with perfume so as to drown out the stench brought on by the tanning process. The perfume's raw materials—strong enough, in admixture, to counteract the stench of tanned leather—in fact were themselves derived from animals (albeit in combination with floral and spice materials): ambergris, a substance originating in the digestive tract of the sperm whale, and civet and musk, harvested from the sexual glands of the civet and musk deer, respectively.[114] Perfumes made from such ingredients were also worn by women to mask their own natural, bodily, including sexual, odors.[115]

A figurative purse in the sense in which Enobarbus uses the term: that is, to mean a vagina belonging to a seductive, sexually experienced woman, would have been understood in Shakespeare's time to emit a strong, rank odor. In his study of smells in the early modern period, Robert Muchembled notes that contemporary prints and paintings featuring a well-dressed, attractive young woman holding flowers sometimes included a strategically placed dog by way of informing the viewer that the private parts of the young woman in the painting stank.[116] Kennedy states that a woman of child-bearing age was held to vary in her scent, depending on whether or not she had (just) copulated:

---

[113] Jo Wheeler, *Renaissance Secrets, Recipes, and Formulas* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2009), 64, Figure: The embroidered paper purse depicted in the figure in Wheeler's book is from the Victoria and Albert Museum's collection.
[114] Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume*, 136.
[115] Kennedy, "'Do You Smell A Fault?'" paragraphs 7 and 8.
[116] Robert Muchembled, *Smells: A Cultural History of Odours in Early Modern Times,* trans. Susan Pickford (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2020), 69-70; Figures 7 and 10.

> If the emanations of the early modern English woman's body are problematic in that the potentially fertile body emits attractive scents and the recently sexualized body emits stench, the female body is dangerous because it functions like a poisonous flower: it draws the bee through its scent, the bee enters the flower, and then the bee leaves covered in the pollen on the way to the next flower, to further pollute and to become further polluted.[117]

In the paintings which Muchembled discusses, the dogs represent the women's odor-to-be-revealed, once a man has had sexual relations with her. While Enobarbus, in his speech, does not suggest outright that Cleopatra's perfumes are vilely scented (or have an underlying, rank base note), nevertheless, within the broader context of the play, the setting of the barge ekphrasis implies that, at least in part, they smell rank.[118] For the setting of the ekphrasis on the Cydnus River is recalled at later points in the play when Cleopatra is associated with a different river: the Nile River, and the dissolving mud on its margins, or the slimy animals which live near, or in, its water. For example, in the image Cleopatra evokes in her fantasy of angling for fishes, each of which she imagines would be an Antony, pierced through its "slimy jaws" (II.5.13), there is latent the smell of rotting fish, an odor derisively associated (then as now) with women's private parts:[119]

> Give me mine angle; we'll to the river. There,
> My music playing far off, I will betray
> Tawny-finned fishes. My bended hook shall pierce

[117] Kennedy, "'Do You Smell A Fault?'" paragraph 6.
[118] "Base note" is a term from modern perfumery for the perfume ingredients which linger the longest on the wearer's skin and grant a lasting quality to a perfume. Such ingredients—especially the animal-based ones—in large enough quantities may be repellent. In fact, they may simultaneously be experienced as slightly repellent and as lending an intoxicating, appealing depth to a scent. See Aftel, *Essence and Alchemy*, 70-71; 74; 76.
[119] Muchembled, *Smells,* 65; Shakespeare seems to make this connection between the odor of rotting fish and women's genitalia: Mercutio, supposing Romeo to have been spending time with Rosaline, seems to suggest to Romeo that he smells of fish, saying to him, "O flesh, flesh, how art thou fishified!" (*RJ* II.4.38).

> Their slimy jaws, and, as I draw them up,
> I'll think them every one an Antony,
> And say, 'Ah, ha! You're caught!'
>
> *AC* II.5.10-15

Shakespeare's *King Lear,* the first recorded performance of which took place in 1605, one year before that of *Antony and Cleopatra,* opens with a reference to the odor of a woman's vagina. In this instance, however, it is referred to, metaphorically, not as a "purse," but as a "fault." As John Astington and Kennedy discuss, Gloucester opens the play by means of a jocular reference to the odor of his illegitimate son Edmund's mother's vagina, saying, by way of acknowledging Edmund's presence, "Do you smell a fault?" (*KL* I.1.15).[120] Gloucester puns on the word "fault," meaning by the word both Edmund himself, as a living "fault," or mistake and Edmund's mother's genitalia.[121] Through the (alleged or figuratively) persistent scent of her vagina, as embodied in her illegitimate son, she remains, as it were, present after-the-fact of Gloucester's limited use for her as an object, as he puts it, of his "good sport" (*KL* I.1.20).

Given Gloucester's marked playing of favorites among his children and his misogyny, he functions as a reflection of Lear. Thus, his witticism about the scent of a "fault" suggests that Lear's (and, in fact, his sometime-favorite daughter Cordelia's) disparaging of Goneril and Regan over the supposed malodorous state of their private parts is a way of objecting to the unbounded

---

[120] William Shakespeare, *King Lear,* Ed. R.A. Foakes (The Arden Shakespeare Second Series, 1997, reprinted 2017).
[121] John H. Astington, "'Fault' in Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 36:3 (1985): 330-334; Kennedy, "'Do You Smell A Fault?'" paragraph 1.

nature of their ambition for political power. The two elder daughters have taken up Lear's authority to a greater degree than he had anticipated when he handed over part of his kingdom to them. Lear translates this audacity on Goneril's part, in particular, as a repugnant, invasive smell emanating from her genitalia.[122] Holly Dugan argues that the scent of the Damascene rose became eroticized in England when Henry VIII enthusiastically bestowed perfume distilled from it to his several mistresses: not, she suggests, to mark them with a scent that was alluring to him, but—considering that he, too, wore Damascene rose-scented perfume—to mark them as extensions of his own powerful self.[123] In similar vein, Enobarbus' reference to Cleopatra's "purse[..]" and its implied odor suggests that he views—or, in the presence of his fellow Romans Maecenas and Agrippa, purports to view—the extent of her authority (over Antony) as excessive and untoward.

Cleopatra's figurative purse is not, however, the only source of perfume to feature in Enobarbus' barge speech. There are others, which, unlike Cleopatra's "purse," Enobarbus presents as objects visible to the spectators of her barge, although not to Antony, who did not see her on her barge but, rather, smelled her. The fans, for example, wielded by the "the pretty dimpled boys" (II.2.212) would have been understood by a Jacobean audience as likely having been manufactured

[122] Kennedy, "'Do You Smell A Fault?'", paragraph 12, discusses Lear's disgust at the odor of the genitalia of Goneril in particular. As Kennedy observes, "Goneril" sounds rather like "gonorrhea." This is significant to Kennedy's discussion of the repugnance Lear expresses toward what he implies is the odor of his daughter's genitalia, given the belief held in Shakespeare's day that inhaling bad odors caused disease. Thus, in the case of gonorrhea, a disease characterized by foul smells, to smell it would be to risk infection from it.
[123] Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume,* 58-59.

from tanned leather which, after its tanning, had been impregnated with perfume, as was the custom in Shakespeare's time. That the fans' "wind did seem / To glow the delicate cheeks which they did cool, / And what they undid did" (*AC* II.2.214-216) suggests that, even as the puffs of air they directed onto Cleopatra's cheeks cooled her, so did the scent borne by those puffs of air heat, or "glow," as with the flush of orgasm, those same cheeks.[124] The "flower-soft hands" (*AC* II.2.220) manipulating the tackle—assuming that they had become "flower-soft" by means of the wearing of gloves treated with strong-smelling, emollient perfume—are also defined by their floral scent:

> At the helm
> A seeming mermaid steers. The silken tackle
> Swell with the touches of those flower-soft hands.
> *AC* II.2.218-220[125]

Antony's own person, too, having been, as Enobarbus claims, "barbered ten times o'er" (*AC* II.2.234), should be understood as perfumed, since a barber of early Jacobean times would have applied scented preparations to his clients' faces and hair (including beards, which men of the Jacobean era—although not of Triumviral Rome—oftener than not sported).[126] In suggesting that Antony makes

---

[124] "glow, v.1". OED Online. December 2022. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/79220?rskey=F85ZqD&result=2 (accessed December 09, 2022), v.1, 7.

[125] On the variety of scented personal accoutrements in Shakespeare's day: see Constance Classen, David Howe, and Antony Synnott, *Aroma: The Cultural History of Smell* (New York; London: Routledge, 1994) 72; also cited in Kennedy, "'Do You Smell A Fault?'", paragraph 8; Evelyn Welch, "Scented Buttons and Perfumed Gloves: Smelling Things in Renaissance Italy," in *Ornamentalism: The Art of Renaissance Accessories, 13-39,* ed. Bella Mirabella (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014): 14-28.

[126] On a barber's application of perfume preparations: Margaret Pelling, "Appearance and Reality: Barber-Surgeons, the Body, and Disease," in *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis,* ed. A.L.Beier and Roger Finlay (London: Longman, 1986): 94. As Pelling states, to scent their

excessive use of a barber's services, Enobarbus is, in fact, insinuating that Antony has been unmanned by Cleopatra. For to be barbered also bore the sense of "to be castrated."[127] In his susceptibility to Cleopatra's perfumes, Antony thus is depicted by Enobarbus as effete and, furthermore, as infantilized.[128]

According to English Renaissance theories of olfaction, the upper reaches of the human nostrils, next to the brain, contained tiny nipple-like nodules, called "mammillaries,"[129] through which scent entered the brain. Rather than being alike in mechanism to a lactating mother's or wet nurse's "mammillaries," from which an infant might draw milk, however, the mammillaries supposed to be housed within the nostrils were believed themselves to take in scent from the air, delivering it directly to the brain.[130] In Thomas Thomkis' 1607 play *Lingua,*

---

customers, barbers often used camphor. On the subject of camphor, Jonathan Reinarz, *Past Scents: Historical Perspectives on Smell* (University of Illinois Press, 2014), 62, notes, "In contrast to aphrodisiacs, such as musk or other animal scents, camphor extinguished sexual excitement and its odor was considered suitable to treat cases of priapism." In James Shirley's, *A Lady of Pleasure* (1637), ed. Marilyn J. Thorssen (New York: Garland Publishing, 1980), the barber character is named Camphire-ball ("Camphor-ball"), as a seeming pun upon the effects of camphor. Shakespeare does not directly name camphor, even if he implies its presence in this scene. In his *Antony and Cleopatra,* camphor would be a scent anachronistically oriented not towards Triumviral Roman, but toward Elizabethan and early Jacobean sensibilities and "realities. On the prevalence of beards in Shakespeare's day: Fisher, Will. "The Renaissance Beard: Masculinity in Early Modern England," *Renaissance Quarterly*, 54 (2001), 155-87.

[127] Patricia Parker, Barbers, "Infidels, and Renegades: Antony and Cleopatra" in *Center or Margin: Revisions of the English Renaissance in Honor or Leeds Barroll* (Selinsgrove, Pennsylvania: Susquehanna University Press), Rprtd. In *Shakespeare Criticism* 110, 2006.

[128] Kennedy, "'Do You Smell A Fault?'", paragraph 2, argues, albeit for different reasons, that Lear is rendered infantilized and effete upon his yielding of his kingdom to the purportedly foul smelling Goneril and Regan.

[129] For overviews of beliefs about olfaction in the Renaissance, see Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume*, 11-17; Richard Palmer, "In Bad Odour: Smell and its Significance in Medicine from Antiquity to the Seventeenth Century," in *Medicine and the Five Senses,* 63-38, ed. W.F. Bynum and Roy Porter. Cambridge University Press, 1993. For a review of mammillaries, see Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume,* 13.

[130] Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume,* 13.

Olfactus, the personified sense of smell, makes reference to the mammillaries, at one point declaring that he, at the top of the nostrils,

> "lay[s] [his] head between two spongeous pillowes
> like faire Adonis twixt the paps of Venus."[131]

In Olfactus' simile, an image of a nursing infant and lover at rest on his mistress' breast converge in a manner reminiscent of Antony's relationship to Cleopatra—and, indeed, in a manner that accords with her own simultaneously amatory and maternal disposition towards him. Antony's mammillaries' imbibing of Cleopatra's scent conditions him, or reveals his predisposition, to become infantilized and infatuated in response to her scent.[132] Similarly as an infant mirroring its mother's gestures—or, as one might equally say, similarly as a lover mirroring the gestures of his beloved when in her presence—Antony figuratively mirrors her when he presents himself, adorned with fragrance, at her "feast" (II.2.234). In his barbered, scented self-display, there may be an undercurrent stemming from Philemon Holland's 1603 translation of Plutarch's account in his "Of Isis et Osiris" (published within his *Moralia)* of the disguised Isis' hairdressing and perfuming of some female attendants of the queen of Byblus,

---

[131] Thomas Thomkis, *Lingua or The Combat of the Tongue and the Five Sense for Superiority, A Pleasant Comœdy* (London: Printed by G. Eld for Simon Waterson, 1607.) Act IV, scene 4 (page 142); cited in Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume*,13, in her discussion of the role of the nostrils in olfaction, as it was understood in Early Modern times.

[132] Shakespeare's character Mamillius from his later play, *A Winter's Tale* (1610), embodies the sort of reliance Antony exhibits for nourishment via his mammillaries. So sensitive is Mamillius to his mother's absence that he dies very shortly after she is imprisoned by her husband (his father) for what her husband convinces himself is her adultery. It is as though Mamillius dies in lieu of his newly born sister Perdita who, mysteriously, does not seem to require mother's (or wet nurse's) milk, but does well enough with, first, Antigonus, then two male shepherds as guardians or caretakers.

whose land Isis was wandering through in her search for the coffin containing her murdered and castrated brother-lover Osiris' body:

> whereof *Isis* by report being advertised by a certaine divine spirit or winde of flying fame, came to *Byblus,* where she sat her downe by a certeine fountaine, all heavie and in distresse, pitiously weeping to herselfe; neither spake she a word unto any creature, onely the Queenes waiting maids and women that came by, she faluted and made much of, *plaiting and broiding the […] of their haire most exquisitly, and casting from her into them a marvellous sweet and pleasant sent issuing from her body, whiles she dressed them*. The queene perceiving her women thus curiously and trimly set out, had an earnest desire to see this stranger, aswell *for that she yeelded such an odoriferous smell from her body*, *as because she was so skilfull in dressing their heads*: so she sent for the woman, and being growen into some familiar acquaintance with her, made her the nourse and governesse of her yoong sonne.... And the speech goes, that *Isis* suckled and nourished this infant, by putting her finger in stead of the bresthead or nipple, into the mouth thereof (my emphases).[133]

Antony's susceptibility to Cleopatra through his (supposed) mammillaries is demonstrated by his interacting with the perfumed wind that blows from her barge. Isis' having heard "report" of the whereabouts of the coffin by a "winde" perhaps finds an echo in Caesar's saying of Antony, "His affairs come to me on the wind" (III.6.64)—especially given that these particular "affairs" of Antony's have to do with how Cleopatra has "appeared" (III.6.18) in the "habilements of the goddess Isis" (*AC* III.6.17).

Because, by Enobarbus' account, Antony does not join the rest of the city's people in flocking to the riverbank, Antony may seem impervious to

[133] Plutarch, *Moralia,* trans. Philemon Holland, 1293. That Isis suckled the queen's son with her finger perhaps suggests that Isis' whole body, even the phallic-appearing—so therefore the male-seeming—parts, such as her finger, exude milk, if suckled. Indeed, we know from Plutarch's "Of Isis and Osiris," that Isis is both female and male.

Cleopatra's influence. Nevertheless, by "whistling to the air" (*AC* II.2.226), he communes with Cleopatra, wordlessly, and from far enough away that he cannot see her. Philo opens the play with scoffing remarks about Antony's besottedness with Cleopatra, which, he avers, may, in part, be discerned by noting that Antony's gaze is (figuratively, if not literally) fixed on Cleopatra's face:

> Nay, but this dotage of our general's
> O'erflows the measure. Those his goodly eyes,
> That o'er the files and musters of the war
> Have glowed like plated Mars, now bend, now turn
> The office and devotion of their view
> Upon a tawny front. His captain's heart,
> Which in the scuffles of great fights hath burst
> The buckles on his breast, reneges all temper
> And is become the bellows and the fan
> To cool a gipsy's lust.
>
> *AC* I.1.1-10

Antony's "goodly eyes" (*AC* I.1.2), however, are less implicated in his "dotage" (*AC* I.1.1) than is his "captain's heart" (*AC* I.1.6), as Philo terms it. In Philo's description, Antony's "captain's heart" is phallic, swelling up during "scuffles" (*AC* I.1.7) and "burst[ing]" (*AC* I.1.8) out of its containing armor. Antony's engorged "heart" is summarily metamorphosed in Philo's portrayal into "the bellows and the fan / To cool a gipsy's lust" (*AC* I.1.6; 9-10). Able to expand and contract, as a phallus is able to do, a bellows and a fan both create currents of air that are perceptible not only to the senses of touch and pressure, but also to one's (supposed) mammillaries, or sense of smell. Moreover, "the bellows and the fan" (*AC* I.1.9) into which, Philo claims, Antony's "captain's heart" has been changed

would, in Shakespeare's time, likely have been infused with perfume.[134] Philo thus presents Antony as a compromised Martial (pun intended) figure whose "captain's heart" "is" a bellows and a fan, as though it were merely an instrument of one of the Cupid-like, fan-wielding boy attendants, indistinguishable, which Enobarbus subsequently describes as arrayed on Cleopatra's barge, stirring up and disseminating her perfume, alternately titillating her and cooling her. Philo speaks scornfully of Antony as unmanned by Cleopatra, while at the same time he attunes the reader or audience member to Antony's propensity for communicating with Cleopatra through, and by means of, scented air.

Enobarbus gives the impression in his barge speech that Cleopatra, like Antony in Philo's introduction of him, is characterized more by wordless air than by words. Yet, immediately following this speech, in what he asserts to be his own eye-witness account of Cleopatra, Enobarbus dwells on her ability to speak volubly and in such a way as to reflect supremely well on herself, despite having only just made herself "breathless" (*AC* II.2.242) through a display of vigorous, "public" (*AC* II.2.239) leaping for which the street has effectively served as Cleopatra' stage:

> I saw her once
> Hop forty paces through the public street
> And, having lost her breath, she spoke and panted,
> That she did make defect perfection,
> And, breathless, pour breath forth.[135]

[134] Palmer, "In Bad Odour," 66.
[135] I concur with Wilder in his reading of line *AC* II.2.242 as "pour breath forth." As he notes, the Folio's orthography leads to ambiguity of meaning, so that the line could be rendered either as "power breathe forth," or as "pour breath forth." "Power breathe forth," in fact, would equate power and scent in a manner such as I have been suggesting; however, I agree with Wilder that,

AC II.2.238-242

Enobarbus' first-hand report of seeing Cleopatra "[h]op forty paces through the public street" (*AC* II.2.239) begins as a variation upon his description of Cleopatra floating down the River of Cydnus, in which, rather than "[o]'er-picturing that Venus where we see / The fancy outwork nature" (*AC* II.2. 210-211), Cleopatra appears as vulgar. Plutarch wrote in his *Life of Marcus Antonius* of how Antony and Cleopatra used to roam the streets at night, disguised clownishly, as noisy, quarrelsome slaves:

> And somtime also, when he would goe vp and downe the citie disguised like a slaue in the night, & would peere into poore mens windowes & their shops, and scold & brawle with them within the house: Cleopatra would be also in achamber maides array, & amble vp & downe the streets with him…[136]

Shakespeare may allude to Plutarch's description in Enobarbus' lines about Cleopatra's appearance on the "public street" (*AC* II.2.239). It is also the case that, in Jacobean England, for a woman to appear on a "public street" (*AC* II.2.239) was associated with prostitution or vagrancy, or both, and with the danger, moreover, of becoming irrevocably morally tainted.[137] As Enobarbus presents it, Cleopatra transforms what Jacobean audiences presumably would

---

"breathless pour breath forth" being "consistent as it is with Cleopatra's other paradoxical qualities, is the more likely" (*AC* II.2, n. 242).

[136] Plutarch. The *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes compared together by that grave learned philosopher and historiographer, Plutarke of Chæronea; translated out of Greek into French by James Amyot; and out of French in Englishe, by Thomas North* (London: By Thomas Vautroullier and John Wight, 1579), 983.

[137] Sharon Emmerich, "Traversing Monstrosity: Perilous Women and Powerful Men upon Shakespeare's Roads," in *Reading the Road, from Shakespeare's Crossways to Bunyan's Highways,* 87-103*,* ed. Lisa Hopkins and Bill Angus (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2019), 87-103.

have understood as the impropriety of her appearing, on foot, in the "public street" (*AC* II.2.239), at all, not to mention the indecency of her hopping there—until out of breath, no less—into something beyond reproach. In Enobarbus' telling, Cleopatra's breath, which he conflates with her speech, transmutes the scene from unseemly self-display to a demonstration of her power to generate wholeness, or "perfection" (*AC* II.2. 241), out of incompletion, or a "defect" (*AC* II.2.241).

In his eye-witness anecdote about Cleopatra's public hopping, Enobarbus grants primacy to his sense of sight, even though what he in part is marveling over is Cleopatra's prodigious power to "pour…forth" (*AC* II.2.242) invisible breath despite having made herself "breathless" (*AC* II.2.242). Likewise, in his immediately preceding barge speech, Enobarbus, like Philo in the play's opening lines, accords to Antony's sense of sight an importance which it does not have in influencing his capitulating to Cleopatra; for Enobarbus declares that Antony "paid with his heart for what his eyes eat only" (*AC* II.2.236). Yet Antony's (supposed) mammillaries would also have partaken of the, so to say, "refreshments" offered by Cleopatra in the form of perfumes and would have done so even before Antony's presentation of himself at her "feast" (*AC* II.2.236). His (supposed) mammillaries, moreover, were, we may conclude, what persuaded him to attend upon her at the meal she offered, even though he at first had

summoned her to attend upon him.[138] Indeed, Enobarbus reveals through his account that it is indeed her perfume's power, and her seeming control over it, that has the greatest effect upon Antony.[139] Although Enobarbus intimates its existence, he stands outside of the intimate, fragrant atmosphere which envelopes both Cleopatra and Antony.

In his barge speech, Enobarbus utters language that in its bewildering, ravishing effects is tantamount to Cleopara's perfume; for his speech is formed of language which has been metamorphosed. As is well known, the speech is drawn in large part from lines of Thomas North's English translation of Plutarch's *Life of Marcus Antonius* (1579).[140] Through the mouth of Enobarbus, Shakespeare transfigures North's already quite lovely English prose into mesmerizing lyric poetry. I would suggest that this metamorphosed language is a figure for the perfume through which Cleopatra ensnares Antony and with which she blazons him, thereby transmuting him from—as Philo would have it— a defective, fan-wielding Mars to a reassembled, perfected "emperor" (*AC* V.2.75). As Cleopatra declares after Antony's suicide:

> I dreamt there was an emperor Antony
> …

[138] Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume*, 20; 198, n. 77, notes—as observed earlier—that Antony fell in love "not at first sight, but at first smell" (20).
[139] Danielle Nagler, "Towards the Smell of Mortality: Shakespeare and the Ideas of Smell 1588-1625." *The Cambridge Quarterly* 26:1 (1997): 49-51.
[140] Thomas North's translation of Plutarch's The *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes* is a translation of James Amyot's French translation of the Greek text. Michael Neill remarks, "The two passages (the one in North's Plutarch, the other in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*) are worth detailed comparison in order to see how fine prose is alchemized into great poetry" (II.2 n198-233); while Neill is not proposing an actual comparison with the creation of perfume, his analogy speaks of the extraordinary quality of Shakespeare's versifying.

> …His voice was propertied
> As all the tuned spheres, and that to friends;
> But when he meant to quail and shake the orb,
> He was as rattling thunder. …
> …
> … Realms and islands were
> As plates dropp'd from his pocket.
>
> *AC* V.2.75; 82-85; 90-91

In her blazoning of him, Antony's voice is as harmonious as the music the planets were thought to make as they moved along their orbits, or as sonorous and evocative of impending danger as thunder.[141] In her blazoning of him, Antony's voice is also as wordless and as non-human as the planets' song and the thunder's rumble. His voice is like wind or breath, as though she had begun to assimilate him to herself as she first "appeared" to him on her barge: from a distance, so that he could not see her, but could only smell her and feel, and even taste, her breath, in what might be termed a fragrant epiphany.

Cleopatra as Isis(-Like)

Enobarbus explicitly compares Cleopatra to a particular pagan goddess, Venus. Upon depicting the barge which conveys Cleopatra, Enobarbus informs his audience that "her own person" (*AC* II.2.207) eluded any attempt at representation:

[141]V.2, n. 83. The "tuned spheres" are the planets, each of which, according to received Pythagorean doctrine, was believed to create a musical note by means of its motion in the heavens.

> For her own person,
> It beggared all description: she did lie
> In her pavilion, cloth-of-gold of tissue,
> O'er-picturing that Venus where we see
> The fancy outwork nature.
>
> *AC* II.2.207-211

Yet another goddess, too, whom Enobarbus does not directly name, is evoked in his speech: the goddess Isis. As I have proposed above, Enobarbus' reference to Antony's well-barbered condition when paying his first visit to Cleopatra is suggestive of a passage from Plutarch's work in which Isis, although seemingly as vulnerable in her vagrancy and pregnancy as a mortal woman would be, exhibits her superhuman ability to imbue with divine fragrance lowly mortal serving maids and various female passersby, whose hair she expertly dresses. Through Enobarbus' emphases on both the perfume which emanates from Cleopatra's barge as well as on the breath she pours forth in the "public street" "public street" (*AC* II.2.239), Shakespeare identifies Cleopatra with the goddess Isis as she is portrayed in Philemon Holland's translation of Plutarch's *Moralia* (1603), within the section entitled "Of Isis and Osiris."[142] Scent is, so to speak, a conspicuous presence in "Of Isis and Osiris"; for Plutarch presents scent as intrinsic both to the rites of Isis' cult and— to borrow a phrase from Enobarbus' barge speech—to Isis' "own person." This is evident, for instance, in the passage from "Of Isis and Osiris" (quoted above) in which Plutarch relates how Isis, when in search of Osiris' coffin, goes among mortals in disguise, so that she appears to be not just a

[142] Plutarch, *Moralia,* trans. Philemon Holland.

mortal herself, but a lowly, wandering one, "heavie" (sic) with pregnancy, thus visibly eligible to serve as a wet nurse.

Janet Adelman argues that, alone of the tragic mothers in Shakespeare, Cleopatra possesses an unstinting, generative bounty which, like mother's breast milk, is ever-renewing. Adelman further asserts that, when Cleopatra effectively re-makes Antony as an heroic male in the dream-vision of him which she utters from her monument, she imparts to him this same ability to bestow largesse from out of a surfeit of plenty.[143]

> I dreamt there was an emperor Antony.
> O, such another sleep, that I might see
> But such another man! […]
> His face was as the heavens, and therein struck
> A sun and moon which kept their course and lighted
> The little O, the earth. […]
> His legs bestrid the ocean; his reared arm
> Crested the world; his voice was propertied
> As all the tuned spheres, and that to friends;
> But when he meant to quail and shake the orb,
> He was as rattling thunder. For his bounty,
> There was no winter in't; an autumn it was
> That grew the more by reaping. His delights
> Were dolphin-like: they showed his back above
> The element they lived in. In his livery
> Walked crowns and crownets; realms and islands were
> As plates dropped from his pockets.
>
> *AC* V.2.75-91

Adelman notes that Caesar extols in Antony an austere and barren version of manhood, which is a reflection of Caesar's own Roman values and desire to view

[143] Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers,* 176; 177-178; 189-190.

Antony as his rival in terms of those same values.[144] Apostrophizing Antony, Caesar recalls how Antony survived as a fugitive soldier:

> Antony,
> Leave thy lascivious wassails! When thou once
> Was beaten from Modena, where thou slew'st
> Hirtius and Pansa, consuls, at thy heel
> Did famine follow, whom thou fought'st again,
> Though daintily brought up, with patience more
> Than savages could suffer. Thou didst drink
> The stale of horses and the gilded puddle
> Which beasts would cough at. Thy palate then did deign
> The roughest berry on the rudest hedge.
> Yea, like the stag when snow the pasture sheets,
> The barks of trees thou browsed. On the Alps,
> It is reported, thou didst eat strange flesh
> Which some did die to look on. And all this—
> It wounds thine honour that I speak it now—
> Was borne so like a soldier that thy cheek
> So much as lanked not.
>
> *AC* I.4.56-72

I would add that Caesar does not straightforwardly hold up Antony's former feats of endurance as praiseworthy. Rather, Caesar simultaneously insinuates that Antony degraded himself by the excessive manner in which he contrived to survive in such harsh conditions. He exhibited his proclivity to endure starvation "with patience more / Than savages could suffer"(*AC* I.4.61-62). Furthermore, he evaded dying of thirst by his indelicate choice to drink from urine-tainted puddles, which "beasts would cough at" (*AC* I.4.62). Thus, Caesar implies, Antony proved himself more savage than savages and more bestial than beasts. Yet, because Caesar's disapprobation lies in Antony's immoderate approach to surviving this

[144] Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers*, 182-183.

wasteland, it is not wholly at odds with his scorn for Antony's life of extravagance with Cleopatra. Moreover, Caesar does view Antony's former extreme feats of hardiness as laudable, at least by comparison with his current life of riotous wine-drinking ("wassails" [*AC* I.4.57]) in Cleopatra's company. By contrast with Caesar, Adelman observes, Cleopatra attributes to, and, indeed, creates in, Antony a bounty that emerges from her own endlessly renewing potential to procreate from "the memory of [her] womb" (*AC* III.13.168).[145] I both build upon and diverge from Adelman. Although Adelman does not acknowledge Plutarch's references in "Of Isis and Osiris" to Isis' fragrance, she nevertheless provides a rich discussion of Cleopatra as an Isis-like genetrix, whom, she believes, Shakespeare patterns after the Isis of "Of Isis and Osiris." Adelman's basis for deducing there to be a strong similarity between Plutarch's Isis and Shakespeare's Cleopatra lies in Shakespeare's incorporation of the word "habiliments" in Caesar's account of Cleopatra's display of herself to her Egyptian subjects:

> …She
> In th'habiliments of the goddess Isis
> That day appeared…
>
> *AC* III.6.16-18[146]

[145] Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers,* 176-185; 186; 187; 190; 191.
[146] Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers*, 337, n. 37; Adelman also remarks, "The word 'becomes,' like 'habiliments,' seems to me to register the presence of Plutarch's Isis in Shakespeare's Cleopatra. Virtually absent from "The Life," it is central to Plutarch's characterization of Isis, and Cleopatra's of Shakespeare" (338, n. 43).

As Adelman notes, Plutarch does not use "habiliments" in his description of this same scene in his *Life of Marcus Antonius*; however, he does employ the word several times in his "Of Isis and Osiris."[147] I base certain aspects of my discussion of Cleopatra's erotico-maternal relationship with Antony upon Adelman's magisterial discussion of Shakespeare's portrayal of Cleopatra's (re)generative power as anchored in Plutarch's portrait of Isis in Holland's translation of "Of Isis and Osiris." I diverge from Adelman's interpretation of the exact nature of Shakespeare's debt to "Of Isis and Osiris," however, in that I consider references to fragrance to form a crucial link between the two texts.

In terms of fragrance, Antony's imitating of Cleopatra in his implicitly adorning of himself with perfume such as a barber would apply to a customer's beard and hair is not merely a sign that he has aimed to heighten his sexual appeal and to signal his sexual readiness. It is also a sign that the scent of Cleopatra's figurative purse, or womb is the first trait that he has taken on in his transformation into the Antony of Cleopatra's blazon, in which he is re-made by her with her perfumed breath. Our first indication, I suggest, that Cleopatra "ma[kes] defect perfection" (*AC* II.2.240) out of Antony is that she has inspired Antony to mirror, so to speak, her scented state. Adelman speaks of Antony as the object of Cleopatra's "making defect perfection" (*AC* II.2.240) but she does not

[147] Ibid.

connect Cleopatra's "making defect perfection" (*AC* II.2.240) to the scent which Antony implicitly emits.[148]

In Cleopatra's revision of Antony, he possesses a "pocket" full of seed-like "plates" (*AC* V.2.91):

> …For his bounty,
> There was no winter in it; an autumn it was
> That grew the more by reaping…
>
> …[R]ealms and islands were
> As plates dropped from his pocket.
>
> *AC* V.2.85-87; 90-91

The "pocket" (*AC* V.2.91) which Cleopatra attributes to Antony in her blazoning of him, is, as I shall discuss, codpiece-like. Indeed, being figuratively generative, with its seed-, or sperm-like "plates" (gold or silver coins) which tumble from it, his pocket is a figurative reflection of her figurative purse.

Enobarbus' Bewildering, Enthralling, Perfume-Like Rhetoric

Upon claiming that Cleopatra "pursed up [Antony's] heart upon the river of Cydnus" (*AC* II.2.198), Enobarbus indicates his intent to elaborate upon this figurative statement. "I will tell you" (*AC* II.2.200) he says, embarking upon a speech remarkable both for its astonishing sensory richness and its associated,

[148] Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers,* e.g., 191.

stealthy power to bewilder and enthrall. The barrage of sensory representations which Enobarbus musters, together with his assertions and insinuations of causal, and other logical connections between elements of Cleopatra's self-presentation divert attention from that which Enobarbus says, without obviously seeming to say, is the true cause of Cleopatra's "purs[ing] up of [Antony's] heart" (*AC* II.2.198)—that is, her capturing of his devotion with the scent of perfume, bafflingly said to assault not his nostrils but instead the "sense" of the riverbanks (the "wharfs" in line *AC* II.2.223):

> From the barge
> A strange invisible perfume hits the sense
> Of the adjacent wharfs.
>
> *AC* II.2.221-23

Here, Enobarbus' use of displacement results in the reader's or audience's disorientation. Of Enobarbus' portrayal of Cleopatra's barge overall, Mary Thomas Crane observes that "the accoutrements are difficult to attach definitively to a solid surface."[149] This assessment of the barge speech is part of her overarching argument that Shakespeare associates the Egyptians in *Antony and Cleopatra* with soft surfaces, such as mud, into which they may be absorbed, or from which they imagine themselves to be fashioned, but the Romans with hard surfaces over which they assume themselves to exercise control. For my purposes, I would broaden Crane's interpretation by suggesting that it is not strictly that "the accoutrements are difficult to attach definitively to a solid surface," but that

[149] Mary Thomas Crane, "Roman World, Egyptian Earth: Cognitive Difference and Empire in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Comparative Drama* 43:1 (2009): 12.

there is a pervasive rhetorical disposition in the speech that makes it difficult to connect any part of it logically with any other. This is the case, despite the fact that the speech itself invites the audience or reader to resort to logic as a means of grasping its import and sense. Amidst his extended references to *Antony and Cleopatra* in *The Wasteland*, T. S. Eliot summarizes the effect of the speech in the following lines:

> I can connect
> Nothing with nothing.
>
> III.301-2[150]

As Eliot seems to acknowledge, it is not easy to disentangle what exactly Enobarbus is describing in a way that makes it answer to a rational consideration of cause and effect.[151] It may, indeed, not be possible, and therein lies a great part of the speech's rhetorical power. The absence of logical connections in Enobarbus' report is analogous to the insubstantial air as the vehicle of sound, of tactile pressure, and, above all, of fragrance in the image he describes. This is fitting, given that Cleopatra herself overwhelms Antony not with rational arguments but with the scent—irresistible to him— of perfume.

---

[150] T.S. Eliot, *Collected Poems: 1909-1935* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1936).
[151] As Adelman, *The Common Liar*, Appendix B (181), says of Enobarbus' speeches in Shakespeare's play as well as from a passage in Christopher Marlowe's *Dido* from which Adelman argues that Shakespeare drew some of his inspiration for Enobarbus' speech, "[B]oth passages rely on verbal assertions which, momentarily at least, overwhelm the dictates of reason."

Quasi-Causal Connections

Amidst his speech's barrage of sensory stimuli, Enobarbus' listing of causal connections between elements of Cleopatra's self-dramatization on the barge is deceptively reassuring to an audience or reader. Asserting causes and results, Enobarbus reports, for example, that the barge's sails were "so perfumed that / The winds were love-sick with them" (*AC* II.2.203-4). The oars, he adds, as a result of their movement within the water, caused the water to become "amorous of [the oars'] strokes" (*AC* II.2.207). The touch of "flower-soft hands" (*AC AC* II.2.220), Enobarbus further claims, cause the barge's tackle to swell. By paratactic juxtaposition of phrases, moreover, Enobarbus implies that it is as a result of "a strange invisible perfume['s] hit[ting] the sense of the adjacent wharfs" (*AC* II.2.222-23) that the people of the city—but not Antony, who remained, "alone" (*AC* II.2.225) "enthroned i'th' market-place" (*AC* II.2.225)—all flocked to the riverside "to gaze on Cleopatra" (*AC* II.2.227), the presumed source of the "strange invisible perfume" (*AC* II.2.222). The relative clause, "Whom ne'er word of "No" woman heard speak" (*AC* II.2.233), too, may be construed as causal in the context in which Enobarbus uses it.

> ENOBARUS
> Upon her landing, Antony sent to her;
> Invited her to supper. She replied
> It should be better he became her guest,
> Which she entreated. Our courteous Antony,
> Whom ne'er the word of 'No' woman heard speak,
> Being barbered ten times o'er, goes to the feast,
> And, for his ordinary, pays his heart
> For what his eyes eat only.
> *AC* II.2.229-236

The clause's implication is that Antony consented to Cleopatra's importuning to become her dinner guest—rather than that she become his— because he never said "No" to any woman's persuasions. This slighting claim which Enobarbus makes of Antony is tailored to his Roman audience within the play. It may be true that no alluring woman (this being Enobarbus' insinuation, even though he simply says "[no] woman") ever heard Antony utter "No," because he is so indiscriminately dissolute. But this is a moot point, because Cleopatra's "strange invisible perfume" (*AC* II.2.222) is the real cause of Antony's capitulation to her invitation. In his presentation of supposed causes and results, Enobarbus deflects both his internal Roman audience and the play's London audience from an awareness of the true cause of Antony's having been captured: Cleopatra's perfume.

Enobarbus' deflecting of the role of Cleopatra's perfume in her enthralling of Antony is in accord with his portrayal of "flower-soft hands" (*AC* II.2.220) which navigate, or help to man (so to speak), Cleopatra's barge. Enobarbus singles out the barge's helmswoman from the rest of the crew of gentlewomen, saying:

> At the helm
> A seeming mermaid steers. The silken tackle
> Swell with the touches of those flower-soft hands
> That yarely frame the office.
>
> *AC* II.2.218-21

What is or is not part of the helmswoman's body, and what qualities those not-clearly-attributed body parts have, is uncertain. The arrangement itself of the lines

about the helmswoman contributes to this confusion: Because of the particular juxtaposition of the lines, one is disposed to assume that it is the helmswoman to whom the "flower-soft hands" are appended:

> At the helm
> A seeming mermaid steers. The silken tackle
> Swell with the touches of those flower-soft hands.
> *AC* II.2.218-20

The fact that it is difficult to tell to whom the hands are affixed is suggestive of how perfume acts: it is moveable, even if concentrated in particular spots. Similarly, because the phrase "strange invisible perfume" appears in the sentence immediately following the one in which the phrase "flower-soft hands" occurs, it creates the impression that the "strange invisible perfume" emanates "[f]rom the barge," certainly, but, more particularly, from the "flower-soft hands."

> …The silken tackle
> Swell with the touch of those flower-soft hands
> That yarely frame the office. From the barge
> A strange invisible perfume hits the sense
> Of the adjacent wharfs.
> *AC* II.2.219-23

Flowers emit fragrance. And yet it is not the "flower-soft hands" that emit fragrance, but the barge. "Flower," moreover, functions as a tactile adverb, describing the manner in which the hands are soft. One would expect it to be a noun—a noun described as giving off floral perfume proper to it. The direct effect of Cleopatra's perfume is diluted or watered down (both literally and figuratively); her perfume's smell, as conceived of as deriving directly from her

body, becomes less potent, even as the rhetorical deflection puts emphasis on her perfume's smell.

Pervasive Aural Perfume

Quasi-logical connections and instances of displacement in Enobarbus' speech together form an intrinsic part of its texture, or, as one might say, borrowing a word from his own speech, its "tissue" (*AC* II.2.209). One effect of these qualities of his speech, which bewilder and destabilize the reader or the play's external audience, is to mimic what we glean is the bewildering, destabilizing effect of the perfume upon Antony. For, through its rhythm (iambic pentameter with some long lines) as well as through its sonic repetitions, Enobarbus' speech is also hypnotic. Forming part of the hypnotic "tissue" (II.2.209) of Enobarbus' elaboration of his claim that Cleopatra "pursed up [Antony's] heart" (II.2.208) is an element that represents in aural form the pervasive, penetrating presence and action of the perfume "[f]rom the barge" (II.2.221): that is, assonance comprised of two overlapping sounds "pəː" and "əː." These two sounds knit Enobarbus' speech together, as though, by transference from scent to sound effect, they together stood for the fragrance of the perfume.

"Perfume" begins with a prepositional prefix, "per-," pronounced, "pəː," which Shakespeare, schooled as he was in Latin, would have recognized as meaning, at root, "throughout," a meaning suited to the repetition of the sound

throughout the speech.[152] "Per-" contains the "əː" sound, as though the perfume which pervades the scene, and infects Antony through the air that envelops both him and Cleopatra, were expressed in aural form by a preposition meaning "throughout," as in a thread that runs throughout a "tissue" "of cloth-of-gold" (*AC* II.2.209).

"Purse up" (*AC* II.2.218) also contains, within the sound of the "pur" of "purse," the sound "əː". The word "purse" contains these overlapping sounds, similarly as the "pəː" of the "pur-" of "purse" and the "per-" of "perfume" pervade the hypnotic speech, an aural image of Cleopatra's containing and pervading of Antony's own person by means of her irresistible perfume, which comes "from the barge" (*AC* 221), as Enobarbus declares, but also from Cleopatra's figurative purse. Although Enobarbus does not use the noun "purse," the suggestion of Cleopatra's figurative purse as something that is both passive receptacle and dynamic snare is captured in Enobarbus' phrase "pursed (up)."[153] The image of a snare-like purse, and the action of pursing up simultaneously, in sonic form, resound throughout the speech in the sound "pəː-." Notably, the

---

[152] I refer to the current British pronunciation of "-per"; on Shakespeare's schooling: e.g., Lynn Enterline, *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), provides examples of Shakespeare's engagement with Latin literature and a wealth of bibliographic information.

[153] In a note to the author dated 7 January 2020, Karen Bassi pointed out that the noun "purse" is from the Medieval Latin "bursa" meaning "little bag made of leather," as specified in the *Oxford English Dictionary:* "purse, n.". OED Online. December 2022. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/155036?rskey=pUK6N8&result=1&isAdvanced=false (accessed December 09, 2022). Thus, a "purse" of Cleopatra's, if assumed to be "made of leather" (*OED*) may be understood to give off an overpowering stench as of tanned leather, meaning, moreover, that in Enobarbus' phrase "pursed up" an evocation of an olfactory sensation and an aural one would coincide.

repetition of this sound does not occur in North's Plutarch. In his adaptation of North's translation, Shakespeare transforms the passage into poetry of surpassing lyrical power, in which, moreover, his language imitates the effects of Cleopatra's perfume upon Antony, although imitating those effects in a different—a "translated"— mode.

Savorous Comminglings Both Erotic and Infantile-Maternal

Enobarbus refers to Antony as "Our courteous Antony, / Whom ne'er the word of 'No' woman heard speak." (*AC* II.2.232-233). Antony answers Cleopatra's summons, Enobarbus suggests, just as he always has answered any woman's summons. Yet Enobarbus has just described Cleopatra as incomparably, more-than-divinely alluring, saying, among other things, that she "o'erpictur[ed] that Venus where we see/ The fancy outwork nature" (*AC* II.2.210-11). Nevertheless, the relative clause with which he modifies Antony implies, contradictorily, that Cleopatra is unexceptional in that Antony, in what Enobarbus hints is his usual libertine's fashion, is responding to her summons as he would to that of any other forward woman.

Antony's supposed susceptibility to any domineering woman is further expressed in Enobarbus' phrase "being barbered" (*AC* II.2.234). Yet, Enobarbus' belittling of Antony over his addiction to being barbered indicates only Antony's

susceptibility to one domineering woman, in particular: Cleopatra. While "being barbered" may appear, upon a superficial glance, to be a present active participle conjoined with an adjective, it is rather the equivalent of the perfect passive participle "having been barbered," as the adverbial phrase "ten times o'er" (*AC* II.2.234) makes evident:[154]

> Our courteous Antony,
> Whom ne'er the word of 'No' woman heard speak,
> Being barbered ten times o'er, goes to the feast
> And for his ordinary, pays his heart…
>
> *AC* II.2.232-235

Antony, we are to understand, has come to Cleopatra's feast already having been well barbered—that is, already having allowed himself to be unmanned. In the English Renaissance, as broached above, for a man to be said to have been barbered could convey his having been circumcised, or even castrated: or, less extremely, as his having been depilated so as to become appealing to those who preferred the appearance, and the company of, prepubescent (enforced) pathics. Enobarbus insinuates anachronistically, that, like an Englishman captured by Ottoman Turks, Antony has been forcibly shaved as to the beard on his face, but also as to the "beard" around his more intimate, private parts.[155] Simultaneously—and, again, anachronistically—Enobarbus implies that, like a

[154] The *Oxford English Dictionary* cites "barbered" in this passage as the first use of the verb "barber," rather than listing it under the adjective form of "barber": barber, v.". OED Online. June 2021. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/15424?redirectedFrom=barbered (accessed September 02, 2021).
[155] Parker, "Infidels, and Renegades."

native of the New World, Antony is naturally hairless and so lacks a beard.[156] As Will Fisher has observed, in the Renaissance, a beard was viewed as being of equal importance to male genitalia in indicating that an individual was, in fact, a man. Of these two indicators of virility, one was thought to amount to evidence of the other, as the hairs of the beard were believed to emerge from the face's pores as the residue of the heat created during the production of semen.[157]

That Enobarbus should remark with disapprobation on Antony's penchant for being barbered calls attention to his own name; for "Enobarbus" means "Red-Bearded." In the context of the play, his name in part suggests that he and his fellow Romans in this scene, by contrast with Antony, are constant in their upholding of Roman ideals of masculinity. This is the case, even though elite males of Triumviral Rome were typically clean-shaven; it was an older, and allegedly more manly, generation of Roman men that habitually wore beards. Yet, as Patricia Parker argues, the name "Enobarbus," or "Red-Bearded," also in part hints at Enobarbus' own failure in the matter of behaving as a faithful Roman military man should: like the red-haired Judas Iscariot, Enobarbus proved disloyal to his superior. Furthermore, as Parker notes, a red beard in an imperial, martial setting calls to mind Barbarossa, or "Red Beard," whose victorious battle against the Roman Emperor Charles V was touted in Shakespeare's day as a second Actium. Enobarbus, like Barbarossa, was a skilled naval leader.

---

[156] Elliott, Horowitz, "The New World and the Changing Face of Europe." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28:4 (1997): 1181-1201.
[157] Will Fisher, "The Renaissance Beard: Masculinity in Early Modern England," *Renaissance Quarterly*, 54 (2001): 174.

Enobarbus' remark about Antony's barbered state does not unequivocally either underscore or undermine Enobarbus' own masculinity, even as it simultaneously draws attention both to Antony's own disloyalty to his Roman confederates and also to his general failure to align himself with their prerogatives and values as Roman men: a feat which the latter-day "Red-Beard(ed) war-leader, Barbarossa, accomplished, on sea, with resounding success. Antony's perceived errancy with respect to his consistency in sustaining ideals of masculine behavior causes anxiety among his fellow Romans.[158] For it is a matter of considerable political import to Rome's quest to expand her territories. Antony's stance toward Cleopatra threatens Rome's ability, under Octavion, to conquer Egypt. The fact that, previously, two elite Roman men, Caesar and Pompey, also could not resist her erotic draw is a measure of the magnitude of the threat she poses. This generally felt anxiety is expressed with remarkable nuance and compression in Enobarbus' description of the state of Antony's hair.[159]

Margaret Pelling remarks on what she calls the "hybrid character" of human hair, including the beard. Although, as she notes, hair is not as simple to remove, discard, or alter as a piece of clothing, nevertheless, like clothing, it may be manipulated with an ease, and to an extent that, the body cannot be:

> In much of the recent literature, the body and its clothing have tended to be dealt with separately, partly because they attract the attention of rather different historical constituencies, and partly because they seem to represent different substances. Hair provides a possible bridge between the two. Hair grows with the body, and

[158] Parker, "Infidels, and Renegades."
[159] Parker"Infidels, and Renegades."

> reflects its age and state of health; it changes as the body changes, and is continuous with it. On the other hand, hair is detachable, and is almost as mutable, indeed as optional, and as subject to fashion, as clothing. In spite of possessing this interesting hybrid character, with its potential for revealing different aspects of a given society, until recently, among early modern historians at least, hair or rather beards have been of serious concern primarily to those writing about periods before 1500.[160]

Antony's being said to have submitted himself to a barber "ten times o'er" could be construed as meaning that he habitually and willingly transforms his body—at least, temporarily—into a youthful pathic's. Or it could mean that he has overprepared himself for the event of meeting Cleopatra in the flesh for the first time by undergoing excessive barbering so as to accommodate himself, in figurative terms, to Cleopatra's seemingly cyclical manner of inhabiting time.[161] According to this interpretation, the repeated cutting of his hair renews his youthfulness over and over (however long the intervals between cuttings), foreshadowing the recurring capturing of him with her perfume which Cleopatra implies she intends to (re-)enact upon her return to Cydnus "to meet Mark Antony" (*AC* V.2.197). Time is measured in the play in repetitions and returns, and Cleopatra's perfume is the agent of those repetitions and returns.

---

[160] Margaret Pelling, "'The Very Head and Front of My Offending': Beards, Portraiture and Self-Presentation in Early Modern England," *New Perspectives on the History of Facial Hair: Framing the Face,* ed. Jennifer Evans and Alun Withey (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018): 34-5.

[161] "[H]e has overprepared himself for the event" is a paraphrase of Ezra Pound's, "I had overprepared the event," from "Villanelle: The Psychological Hour," I.1, in *Selected Poems of Ezra Pound* (New York: New Directions, 1957); "…so as to accommodate himself to Cleopatra's seeming cyclical manner of inhabiting time" is inspired by lines from H.D.'s . "Tribute to the Angels", verse 27, in which her poetic persona recounts a vision of the Virgin Mary: "as if she had miraculously / related herself to time here," in *Trilogy* (New York: New Directions, 1973).

The "hybrid character," too, of the beard, generally speaking, assimilates Antony's beard, in particular, to the disembodied "flower-soft hands" which, on Cleopatra's barge, stroke the phallic tackle. In terms similar to those in which Margaret Pelling characterizes the hair and beard as "hybrid," or as existing in a liminal state, Sue Vincent refers to the human hand as "mediat(ing) between all opposites":

> The instrument of intimacy that yet acts in the world, the hand mediates between all opposites: secrecy and revelation, the body private and politic, mind and materiality.[162]

Vincent's discussion of the hand is part of a larger one centering on the glove as a garment that, being "associated with the hand, take[s] on the constant potential of this most privileged member."[163] Jacobean audiences of *Antony and Cleopatra* may have assumed that the "flower-soft hands" of Enobarbus' speech would have been encased in gloves. They at least would have held an awareness in their minds that a gentlewoman's—and, certainly, a female monarch's— hand typically, in public, in their own era and in the immediately preceding Elizabethan era, would have been clothed in a glove (or if unclothed, then would have been so for strategic, political and quasi-romantic reasons), and that it would have been remarkable if it were not so clothed.[164]

---

[162] Sue Vincent, "To Fashion a Self: Dressing in Seventeenth-Century England," *Fashion Theory: The Journal of Dress, Body & Culture* 3:2 (1999): 212.
[163] Vincent, "To Fashion a Self," 212.
[164] Stallybrass, Peter and Anne Rosalind Jones. "Fetishizing the Glove in Renaissance Europe," *Critical Inquiry* 28:1 (2001): 123-124.

Having been barbered, Antony, were he a Renaissance Englishman, would also likely have presented himself to Cleopatra at her banquet with perfume in his hair, since, as one of their routine practices, Renaissance barber-surgeons perfumed their clients.[165] If one imagines Antony's hair as scented with perfume, then his self-presentation before Cleopatra can be construed as a mirroring of her own self-presentation on the barge, for his benefit, as portrayed by Enobarbus in the barge speech.

In Enobarbus' speech, the presumably—and anachronistically—perfumed hands stroking the tackle and the anachronistically barbered face, which may be read simultaneously as depilated private parts, together with the trimmed and perfumed hair imply an erotic mingling of Cleopatra's and Antony's scents, both their own bodily ones and those of their applied perfumes. Thus, Enobarbus' mediating, messenger-like speech suggests an erotic and potentially obscene mingling of bodily—and, in the form of perfumes, extra-bodily—savors. The erotic intimacy suggested between Cleopatra and Antony through the interplay of their scents is also maternal-infantile in its orientation in that Antony in his much-barbered state is unmanned and, thus, like an infant. It is as though he had groomed himself so as to resemble Horus or Horus' Roman counterparts, the Cupid-esque boys who fan Cleopatra. Hairdressing and fragrance both are

[165] Margaret Pelling, "Appearance and Reality: Barber-Surgeons, the Body, and Disease," in *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis,* ed. A.L.Beier and Roger Finlay (London: Longman, 1986): 94, mentions both "camphor," and "barbers (sic) water," but does not explain how or where they were applied, or what ingredients were present in "barbers (sic) water." On camphor's qualities, see above: Reinarz, *Past Scents,* 62.

emphasized in the episode within "Of Isis and Osiris" that takes places when Isis, while pregnant with her son Horus, wanders in search of the castrated corpse of Horus' father, the god Osiris. Thus, it is fitting for Antony, in his self-presentation before Cleopatra, to combine aspects of both Osiris, the lover, and Horus, the nursing child.

An Enfolded Reflection

In Antony's absence from her, Cleopatra imagines capturing not one, but several Antonys in the form of fishes:

> Give me mine angle. We'll to the river: There,
> My music playing far off, I will betray
> Tawny-finned fishes. My bended hook shall pierce,
> Their slimy jaws, and as I draw them up,
> I'll think them every one an Antony,
> And say, "Ah ha, you're caught!"
>
> *AC* II.5.10-15

From the perspective of the audience, Cleopatra seems to see her own "tawny" reflection, just as she seems, too, from the audience's perspective, to describe how she—on the Nile, rather than the Cydnus— has recapitulated Enobarbus' claim that, "upon the river of Cydnus" (*AC* II.2.198), she had captured Antony's heart. "Tawny" here is, in part, a linguistic "reflection," so to speak, in the form of a pun about re-capturing Antony. Philo's withering assessment of Antony's erotic

enslavement to Cleopatra with which the play opens suggests that Antony is transfixed by Cleopatra's "tawny" visage:

> Nay, but this dotage of our general's
> O'erflows the measure. Those his goodly eyes,
> That o'er the files and musters of the war
> Have glowed like plated Mars, now bend, now turn
> The office and devotion of their view
> Upon a tawny front…
>
> *AC* I.1.1-6

While Philo uses the word "tawny" to refer to the color of Cleopatra's skin, as his reference to her as a "gypsy" (*AC* I.1.10) a few lines later underscores, Cleopatra's own use of "tawny" refers not solely to the hypothetical fishes' coloration but also to the resemblance those fishes' scales bear to armor. "Tawny" was a variant spelling of "tenné," which, according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, is:

> a heraldic color[,] variously described as 'orange-brown' or 'bright chestnut'; in engraving represented by diagonal lines from sinister to dexter, crossed by others, according to some authors, vertically, according to others, horizontally."[166]

The "diagonal lines from sinister to dexter, crossed by others," whether vertically or horizontally, on a tawny heraldic shield, give the appearance of stylized fishes' scales—or of stylized armor. Bearing this in mind, it is as though Cleopatra saw, in the imaginary fishes, Antony in armor—not as Philo sneeringly speaks of him

[166] "tenné | tenny, adj. and n.". OED Online. September 2019. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed.com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/199136?redirectedFrom=tenne& (accessed November 24, 2019).'

in the play's opening lines, as someone whose eyes formerly "glowed like plated Mars" (I.1.4), but as Eros, with her own help, girds him for battle, as a reflection of her own "tawny" self. That she fantasizes about there being more than one fish-as-Antony perhaps has a temporal aspect: she will angle for several fish-as-Antonys, just as, at plays end, she announces her expectation of meeting Antony, all over again, at the site of a different river: not the Nile, but the Cydnus. The implication is that she intends to re-capture him, as though time were cyclical. Indeed, in Christian iconography, the fish is the sign of Christ re-born. While, in the Christian tradition, Christ's birth is viewed as a single, historical event, the liturgical calendar of the Christian church, being annual (or, rather, "perennial," like a flower that re-blooms every year) and cyclical, contains a sense of significant events as repeating.

Cleopatra's hoisting of the dying Antony up to her monument as a prélude to her own suicide is a variation on her fantasy of angling for him-as-fishes and drawing him up, out of the water.[167] Ensconced with his corpse in her monument, she-addresses the asps as though they were not one, but two Antonys:

> Peace, peace!
> Dost thou not see my baby at my breast,
> That sucks the nurse asleep?

[167] See also, Barbara J. Bono, *Literary Transvaluation: From Vergilian Epic to Shakespearean Tragicomedy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 212. Bono comments thusly upon Cleopatra's imagined and staged gestures of raising up Antony:

> In the last scene, Cleopatra transforms "angling" for Antony (II.5.10) into elevating him, transforms sexuality into immortality, and transforms the barge at Cydnus into the celestial boat of the moon-goddess…
> (In Bono the line number is II.5.16.)

…
As sweet as balm, as soft as air, as gentle.
O Antony! I will take thee, too!
AC V.2.307-11

One commentator suggests that Cleopatra addresses the second asp as Antony.[168] If, however, Cleopatra once imagined Antony as multiple fishes, why should she not also figure him as plural asps? Just as the several fishes of her fantasy arguably suggest renewal and recurrence, so, too, do the pair of asps. In part, the asps' plurality suggests recurrence by analogy with the fishes. The asps may be thought of, too, as offspring of Cleopatra as "[Antony's] serpent of old Nile" (*AC* I.5.26) as she says Antony calls her when she imagines him as missing her in his absence from her. Viewed as her creaturely children, the asps are symbols of renewal. Snakes were also attributes of Isis as the Earth, source of both recurrence and renewal.[169] The "balm" to which Cleopatra refers, moreover, has overtones of embalming, through which process the Egyptians believed the dead might attain an afterlife.[170] Historically, the city, Tarsus, in which Antony would have sat while Cleopatra progressed in her barge down the River of Cydnus was associated in Shakespeare's time with the Magus who brought myrrh, an embalming agent, as an offering for the newly born Christ Child.[171]

[168] Weis, in Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet,* ed. René Weis, V.2, n. 311, notes that the commentator Theobalds suggests that Cleopatra addresses the second asp.
[169] Adelman, *The Common Liar,* 64.
[170] Park, "Discandying Cleopatra," 626.
[171] Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume*, 20.

Shakespeare's reiterated imagery of Cleopatra raising water-dwelling, or (quasi)amphibious creatures upwards, out of their watery homes in, or on the margins of, water is suggestive of the raising up of an infant, newly emerged from the waters of the womb, to the maternal breast. Imagery of Cleopatra's (figurative) raising up of water-dwelling creatures may also be found in her blazon of Antony, in which she characterizes his manner of transcending his own reveling in pleasure as a mode of living simultaneously both in water and in air:

> His delights
> Were dolphin-like: they showed his back above
> The element they lived in.
>
> *AC* V.2.87-89

In this image of dolphins breaching the water's surface, we may recall both Cleopatra's fantasy of angling for fishes and her drawing up of Antony to her monument. In her imagination's re-rebirthing of him, his "delights" (*AC* V.2.87) emerge from the waters of the womb in the form given them by her perfumed words. With its connotation of sexual pleasure, Cleopatra's choice of word, "delights," lends to the figurative dolphins a phallic quality.[172] Indeed, the dolphins' breaching, or penetrating of the water's surface is further suggestive of their phallicism. Not only, then, are they infant-like, but they are as the phallus of a lover: Osiris, say, whose body Cleopatra-as-Isis cyclically renews. Here, again, the plurality of the water-dwelling creature, the figurative dolphin, suggests that

[172] "delight, n.". OED Online. September 2022. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/49382?rskey=1Wgaua&result=1&isAdvanced=false (accessed November 16, 2022), 1; 2.

time is cyclical (like, in fact, the distinctive circular motion dolphins make when they breach the water).

The perfume from Cleopatra's barge is "invisible" (*AC* II.2.222), as Enobarbus memorably intones in his barge speech. Jonathan Gil Harris contends that, in Enobarbus' description of her on her barge, Cleopatra, too, is all-but invisible. Harris observes that although, in his speech, Enobarbus "presents a wealth of detail" about the setting of Cleopatra's progress, including sounds and scents, he nevertheless is "remarkably vague" about Cleopatra's own appearance.[173] Harris' overarching argument is formulated as a rebuttal to those who have posited that Cleopatra is an embodiment of the "Ur-female"; Harris suggests rather that she is "misrecognized" by the play's Narcissus-like Roman males as their own mirror image, which image, from their mistaken perspective, replaces her own flesh-and-blood image.[174] Harris, furthermore, characterizes Enobarbus' detailed portrayal of Cleopatra's setting as the frame of a rococo mirror. This is a striking metaphor, well-suited to Harris' focus on that which is visible. Yet, as Crane and Dugan have said in response to Harris, not only does Enobarbus' speech evoke synaesthetic sensory reactions—and, in fact, as Crane notes, Harris himself acknowledges that Enobarbus' description is "profoundly

[173] Jonathan Gil Harris. "'Narcissus in Thy Face': Roman Desire and The Difference It Fakes in *Antony and Cleopatra.*" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45: 4 (1994): 418.
[174] On certain other scholars' portrayals of Cleopatra as "the quintessentially female object," or "Ur-female," see Harris, "'Narcissus in Thy Face,'" 408-411; on Roman males' misrecognition of Cleopatra: see Harris, "'Narcissus in Thy Face,'" e.g. 414; 416; 421-422; on Roman males' replacement of her image with their own, as if, when looking at her, they looked in a mirror, see Harris, "'Narcissus in Thy Face,'" 418.

synaesthetic,"—but it also is primarily concerned with one sense: not sight, but scent.[175] I concur with Crane and Dugan. Moreover, I would argue that the details which Harris consigns to the metaphorical frame of Enobarbus' portrait of Cleopatra are themselves elements—albeit displaced—of Cleopatra's "own person" (*AC* II.2.207). Rather than treating these details of scent and sound (and I would include touch and pressure, although Harris fails to mention them) as merely decorative, I consider them, as much as, or more than, her visual appearance, to be constitutive of Cleopatra's "own person."

I would like to proffer two variations on Harris' intriguing reading—firstly, that Enobarbus describes the barge rather as though it were not itself but its own reflection of a certain kind. Water is capable not only of yielding what we currently think of as a "mirror-image"—that is, an image answering to notions of realism,— but also of repeating across its surface shapes and colors, wavering and blurry, although oftentimes having discernible referents in the "real" world.[176] At

---

[175] Crane, 11; Dugan, *The Ephemeral History of Perfume*, 20; Harris, "'Narcissus in Thy Face,'" 418.

[176] Having sailed in the Pacific Northwest, including in southwestern British Columbia, I have in mind in writing about the images on the water's surface my own observations of those northern waters, as well as something I read in Jonathan Raban's book about sailing to Alaska from Seattle, *Passage to Juneau: A Sea and Its Meanings* (New York: Random House, 1999), 24-25. He writes about the stylized patterns with which Pacific Northwest coastal Native peoples depict elements of the natural world, comparing those patterns to repeating imagery on the surface of the water of the Pacific Ocean and its inland passages:

> The most arresting formal feature of coastal Indian art, its habit of dismembering creatures and scattering their parts into different quarters of a large design, perfectly mimicked the way in which a slight ripple will smash a reflection into an abstract of fragmentary images. No maritime art I knew went half as far as this in transforming events in the water itself into constituent elements of design.

times, looking into the water, one may see one's own reflection and realize that no features of one's face are imprinted, so to speak, on the water's surface, although one's face's general, blurry shape is reproduced, even if prone to distortion, like an image in a fun-house mirror. I have in mind this sort of wavering reflection of bars of color in which shapes are repeated severally across the water's surface. Such a reflection might yield, for example, such images as several (blurry, wavering) cupid-like boys, where we would expect just one Cupid, that one being Venus' son; severally repeating fans appearing like wings; severally repeating gentlewomen one of whom, in the figure of the helmswomen, seem to merge with Cleopatra herself; the banks of oars which severally thresh the water, disturbing and re-disturbing the patterns on its surface—or should I say "forming and re-forming them" into swirls, illustrating the bewildering effects of Cleopatra's self-presentation. It is a distorted reflection, prompting one to ask, Whose "flower-soft hands"? How many attendants? How many oars penetrating the water's skin? How many Cupid-esque boys, repeated how many times on the yielding water (how many have already been swallowed up in the glove-like, redolent water?)—and how legibly, so to speak, are they present(ed), as though the blurred, colored splotches on the water were writing, or ingredients in a perfume that seemed now to have their own individual presences, now to blur together into one seamless assemblage?

That there are several cupid-like boys, and oars, and gentlewomen, just as, in Cleopatra's fantasy of angling for Antony as though he were a fish, there are

several fishes, also hints at the several after-lives Antony will undergo (or already has undergone) when revived through Cleopatra's blazoning of him. In short, the multiplicity of the images in the barge speech, as in the plurality of fishes in Cleopatra's fantasy, exemplify recurrence in time.

Secondly, in response to Harris' elegant theory that Roman male characters and some male critics of the play, in general, impose their own faces upon "the effective 'gap'" where Cleopatra's would be, I propose a variation:[177] that Antony, in particular, presents himself for her benefit, at her banquet, in a way that figuratively reflects Cleopatra's own self-presentation for his benefit, on her barge. Unmanned, as though having been turned younger, even Cupid-like, scented, with hair trimmed, or plucked, he arrives as her tawny-finned fishes, for which at a future—or rather, recurring—time she angles: ready for her restorative attentions.

In her report of her dream-vision of Antony, Cleopatra transforms him from infantile, tawny-finned fish(es) into the universe's sovereign. Blazoning Antony, Cleopatra recalls "his pocket" as containing kingdoms and islands over which he implicitly has mastery:

> …realms and islands were
> As plates dropp'd from his pocket.
>
> *AC* V.2.90-1

[177] Harris, "Narcissus in Thy Face," 418.

To her figurative purse, as mentioned in Enobarbus' barge speech, I wish to suggest that the "perfect(ed)" Antony, perfected by her, reflects back, so to speak, a pocket of his own. Rebecca Unsworth remarks that John Florio's English dictionary of 1598 reveals there to have been an overlap in the senses of the word "pocket" and "purse."[178] There was, furthermore, a merging of the uses to which a pocket and codpiece were put. Fisher cites an anonymous seventeenth-century writer on the subject of how a commodious enough codpiece might also be employed as a pocket:

> '[T]his large and ample Codpiss (sic) supplied the want of Pockets,' for when the points were 'unknit,' they 'made way to the Linnen bags tyed to the inside between the Shirt and Codpiss, these Bags held every thing they carried about them.[179]

In Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra,* "purse," as embedded in the term "pursed up," suggests an acquisitive impulse. At the same time, Cleopatra's figurative purse is both a receptacle, and a source of perfume. Cleopatra's reference to Antony's "pocket" is, similarly, to an enclosed space that holds kingdoms he acquisitively has taken under his authority as well as islands whose "qualities" (to use Caliban's term) are (as yet) unrevealed; indeed, perhaps, as yet

---

[178] Rebecca Unsworth, "Hands Deep in History: Pockets in Men and Women's Dress in Western Europe, c. 1480-1630." *Costume* 51:2 (2017): 158.

[179] Will Fisher, "'Had It a Codpiece, 'Twere a Man Indeed': The Codpiece as Constitutive Accessory in Early Modern English Culture," in *Ornamentalism: The Art of Renaissance Accessories,*102-129, ed. Bella Mirabella (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2011, 103. Fisher quotes from *Englands Vanity, or the Voice of God Against the Monstrous Sin of Pride, in Dress and Apparel (*London 1683), 123, while noting (124, n. 1) that that which he quotes is "almost a verbatim repetition of a description of a much earlier source…, *The Treasure of ancient and modern Times* (London, 1613), 317." The date of the latter source is close in time to the year of the first recorded performance of *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606).

unperfected.[180] In other words, there is potentiality within Antony's pocket. This is underscored by Cleopatra's likening of the "realms and islands" to "plates." The "plates," or coins, are reminiscent of Jupiter's disguise as a golden downpouring of rain, in which form he accesses Danaë, in her tower and impregnates her. [181] We may suppose that Antony's "pocket," holding such coinage, shows him, in the world of the play, to be as potentially generative as is Cleopatra with her implied "purse." He is as virile in Cleopatra's telling as the king of gods and men himself, but Antony's generative potential is contained in, and continually renewed by, her own.

[180] "And then I loved thee / And showed thee all the qualities o' th' isle: / The fresh springs, brine pits, barren place and fertile" (*TT* I.2.337-339) in William Shakespeare, *The Tempest, ed.* Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 1999); Cleopatra's image in her blazon of Antony of "realms and islands" falling like coins from his pocket seems to find an echo in a remark of Sebastien's in *The Tempest*: "I think he (Gonzalo) will carry this island home in his pocket and give it his son for an apple" (*TT* II.1.91-92).
[181] P. Ovidius Naso, *The XV Books of P. Ovidius Naso, Entytuled Metamorphosis,* Book II. Translated by Arthur Golding (London: By Willyem Seres, 1567). Accessed through Early English Book Online; in Terence, *The Eunuch* (Loeb Classical Library Online, 2021), III.5.585, a girl is described as looking at a painting of Jupiter descending on Danaë in the form of a shower of gold.

III. THE MERCIFUL WEIGHT OF MARIANA'S TEAR-DISTILLED MEMORY

Mariana as Figurative Distiller of (a) Bastard

Left without a dowry or a protector among her kin, slandered and abandoned by Angelo, her fiancé, Mariana in Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* lives in double sequestration. Not only does she live enclosed within the precincts of a religious establishment, St. Luke's, but she also lives further enclosed by water; for the grounds of St. Luke's contain an artificial island—a "moated grange" (*MM* III.1.247-248)—on which Mariana resides. The doubly enclosed nature of her home arguably most obviously underscores—and, indeed, stages—both her virginal condition and her consequent need in the world of the play, as a young woman without father, brother, or husband, for protection. By way of protection, the water surrounding her island and the precincts of St. Luke's together doubly isolate her from the secular world of Vienna. At the same time, however, as much as the doubled nature of her enclosure and the water, together, disconnect her from the rest of the city, they also connect her to it, both through the play's motif of doubling and through its references to assorted liquids—various permutations of water, including tears; wine, and distilled wine, or "bastard"; implied blood; and that which was understood in Shakespeare's time to be transmuted blood: milk. In the lay world of Vienna, Mariana at length is seen to exert unexpected

authority—authority that is founded in her continual fostering of her memory of Angelo.

It is through weeping, I suggest, that Mariana sustains her memory of Angelo. Bereft of him for five years, Mariana, we are told, continues to weep copious tears for him.[182] As the Duke reports, Angelo "[l]eft [Mariana] in her tears, and dried not one of them" (*MM* III.1.214). While it is true that, at Mariana's first appearance on stage, she is not crying but instead is listening to a song which a boy sings to her, when she realizes the Duke is present, she self-consciously assures him, as though aware of the dolorous image of her which the Duke has presented, that the music "pleased [her] woe" (*MM* IV.1.13). This glimpse of her listening to music—although not her efforts to excuse herself for doing so—are at odds with the other reports and intimations we receive of her character. Her listening to a boy play music points toward at least two, quite divergent, possibilities. It could be meant to suggest that Mariana is, or could become, a prostitute. Jeanelle McKenzie Vennekotter notes that in Elizabethan and Jacobean times, bawds would advertise the availability of prostitutes by staging one or more of them in a window, in revealing clothes, as a minstrel played music.[183] While in her chapter on *Measure for Measure* Vennekotter argues that the Duke is a bawd, she does not suggest that Mariana's first

[182] Angelo, not realizing that he has had sexual intercourse not with Isabella but with Mariana in his garden house, states that he has not had any dealings with Mariana since he broke his word to marry her five years before (*MM* V.1.214-22). This will be addressed further, later in this chapter.
[183] Jeanelle McKenzie Vennekotter, "Sanctified and Pious Bawds: The Bawd as a Figure of Subversion in Sixteenth-Century English Drama" (Ph.D. diss., University of California at Riverside, 1994), 1-2.

appearance in the play, in the company of a boy playing music, is an advertisement that she is a prostitute; however, Vennekotter's own discussion of contemporary staging of women as merchandise is relevant to the manner in which Mariana initially is presented in the flesh to the audience. Indeed, the staging of Mariana's initial appearance in the play has simultaneously proleptic and hypothetical force. The circumstances of her initial appearance, by which she could be construed as a prostitute, points forward to the Duke's actual act of bawdry, in which he acts as go-between for her and Angelo. That Mariana resides in a religious establishment may, furthermore, remind us that the term "nunnery" was used in Shakespeare's time to mean both a place where nuns lived and a place where women were offered for sale as prostitutes.[184] It shows, too, that Mariana may, hypothetically, wholly unexpectedly to herself, become a prostitute. After all, this fate very nearly, and wholly unexpectedly, befell the novitiate, Isabella, on the very day before she had planned to fulfill what she herself considered to be her life's purpose by entering a religious order, when Angelo demanded that she use her body as ransom for her brother's life.[185]

The fact that, in her first appearance on stage, Mariana is portrayed as listening to music also introduces her, I believe, as an agent of alchemical

---

[184] Hanna H. Scolinov, "Chastity, Prostitution, and Pornography in *Measure for Measure,*" *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* 134 (1998): 69, makes this point—not about Mariana, however, but rather about the novitiate, Isabella.

[185] Scolinov, "Chastity, Prostitution, and Pornography," 70; 72-3, contends that the men of *Measure for Measure* generally view the women of the play as potentially available for "pornographic" purposes, including prostitution, even if an individual woman, as Isabella, has, out of her own volition and desire, intended to take a vow of life-long celibacy.

transmutation. In a discussion of *The Tempest*, in which she argues persuasively for a reading in which Prospero figures as an alchemist who brings about civilizing societal change through magic—including through the magical use of music—Peggy Muñoz Simonds states that "alchemy was often referred to [in the Renaissance] as 'the musical art' since it relied on time and measure as much as did music."[186] In Simonds' reading of *The Tempest*, Prospero is intent upon attaining a common aim of Renaissance alchemists—the regeneration of time for the purpose of a return to the Golden Age.[187] I suggest that Mariana is shown in *Measure for Measure* as taking part in figurative alchemical distillation, in the form of weeping, through which she creates unadulterated mercy with respect to Angelo. It is "unadulterated" in that, through her distilling tears, it has been purified of any impulse to exact vengeance upon Angelo. In Mariana's own retreat to an island, moreover, her relationship to time is at odds with linear progression in terms of her familiarity with the Duke-as-Friar. Inexplicably, her relationship with him apparently pre-dates the Duke's taking on of his Friar's disguise. It is as though the moated island on which he visited her existed within, so to speak, an eddy of time (*MM* IV.2), its temporal quality portrayed in spatial terms as a place which is set apart and (we gather) unfrequented. It is a set-apart temporality and spatiality, as if a representation of a memory that she continually revisits: even, in a sense, dwells in, or with. At length, at play's end, despite her

[186] Simonds, "'My Charms Crack Not,'" 558
[187] Simonds, "'My Charms Crack Not,'" 539.

remove from secular life, Mariana's unlooked-for puissance is seen to influence with forgiving mercy the government of Vienna, a place that, throughout most of the play, is portrayed as at a remove from the moated grange. Mariana's attention to the boy's music in her isolated abode parallels—indeed illustrates outwardly—her inwardly fixed attention upon, indeed fostering of, her grief: her attention is revealed to be not passive but restorative.

Simonds further explains how music is related to alchemy: "[t]he calming and therapeutic effects of music were understood to be beneficial to all aspects of the spagyric art, although, in particular, alchemists used music to achieve ultimately a wresting of materials from Saturn's [i.e. Time's] domination and the achievement of purity in a state of grace."[188] As I shall elaborate upon in this chapter, Mariana, in her eddy of time, is indeed engaged in attaining purity of mercy through her tearful, distilling remembering of Angelo. This is illustrated, as I shall argue, through her figurative pregnancy with (a) "bastard." The term "bastard" in the play signifies both a liquor of mixed pedigree, so to speak, formed of wine and fortified wine, and a child whose mother is not married to its father. Mariana is shown figuratively to give birth to (a) "bastard" who has been transformed through her weeping into pure mercy. Having achieved this, Mariana does exist "in a state of grace" in that, imbued with her memories of Angelo, who has wronged her, she nevertheless chooses to act toward him not with vengefulness but with mercy.

[188] Ibid., 559. As noted earlier, Simonds states that alchemy is concerned with the renewal of time.

The contrasting roles suggested for Mariana by the presence of the boy singing to her—that of a prostitute, who would have been understood in the world of the play as impure, or that of a learned alchemist, intent on purifying raw material for the sake of the renewal of the world—may seem irreconcilable. But these jarringly contrasting, alternate versions of what manner of woman Mariana may be are in accord with the fabric of *Measure for Measure,* in which a character's virtue is often threatened or disputed by others. It is often difficult for an audience or reader of the play to determine who may be telling the truth about whom. What exactly is the Duke's rather mysterious relationship with Mariana, which appears not to take place in normal time; for, as noted above, it seems to have begun both while the Duke has been disguised as a friar and, simultaneously, before he adopted this disguise? And does the Duke, as Lucio claims, consort with prostitutes (*MM* III.2.104-5; 108; 110-12)? Does Elbow's wife really enter the establishment, the "Bunch of Grapes" (*MM* II.1.104), "longing […] for stewed prunes" (*MM* II.1.81-2), as Pompey testifies? And, if so, does she do so in a professional capacity, as a prostitute, as Pompey seems to insinuate? Does Mariana weep more or less constantly, even though it has been five years since her fiancé has cast her off, lying—the other characters seem to assume—about her virtue? Although Mariana is not crying, but instead is listening to music when the Duke enters her place of retreat, her behavior, I would argue, generally indicates that she does cultivate her sorrow through regular weeping. Her turn of phrase in describing the effect of the boy's music upon her—it "pleased [her] woe" (*MM*

IV.1.3), she says—indicates that she fosters her sorrow; even, that to some extent her cultivation of it may be self-conscious. It is as though, in effect, she knew she were a character from the various interconnected texts from which Shakespeare crafts his portrait of her.

If it is oftentimes difficult in *Measure for Measure* to determine who may be telling the truth about whom at any given time, this indeterminacy is part of the play's atmosphere and texture. The mood of combined mistrust, threatened degradation, and accelerating dread is in part created by the play's sustained references to, and contrasts with, texts outside of itself: books of the Bible, or sermons or apocrypha drawing on those books. Where Mariana is concerned, the textual references are, primarily, to the New Testament Book of Luke and the Old Testament Song of Songs. In the Gospel of Luke, with which, significantly, Mariana's place of retreat, St. Luke's, shares a name, we are presented with events and claims of a miraculous nature, which some figures in the text are portrayed as doubting. We are shown, too, in Luke, how authority figures—the Pharisees and Caesar's representatives—insist upon their right to decree what is true: that, for example, Christ is a criminal (we may see a partial reflection of him in, e.g., Claudio, who is led publicly to prison); that he is not who he claims to be (we may see a partial reflection of him in various characters, as, e.g., the hypocritical Angelo and the disguised Duke).

The Song of Song's resonances with Mariana's condition have to do both with her yearning for her absent beloved as well as with her presence within

enclosed gardens. Mariana inhabits St. Luke's moated farm, or kitchen garden, while her assignation with Angelo (during which he believes her to be Isabella) is staged inside his walled garden. Since the Middle Ages, the Virgin Mary had been depicted in images of the Annunciation within an enclosed garden, a pictorial representation of her intact, yet fecund virginity. Similarly, Mariana's own (initially) virginal status, yet inner resourcefulness, is implied by the enclosed gardens in which she appears. Yet whether Mariana in fact is a virgin, or generally chaste in her conduct, is contested: at least, in Angelo's self-serving accounts of her. Mariana, in fact, also bears similarities to another Biblical "Mary," Mary Magdalène, whose (not necessarily deserved) reputation for fast living was in glaring contrast to the Virgin Mary's irreproachable respectability. The Magdalène herself is associated with a garden: the one in which Christ's tomb was located in the Gospel of John (Jn 20:1-18). Her connection with this garden, however, does not suggest an extraordinary, life-long sexual continence on her part, such as distinguishes the Virgin Mary. Rather, Mary Magdalène's being situated in the garden indicates her figurative rebirth; for in the garden the recently crucified, but now re-born, Christ appears to her.[189]

[189] Mary Magdalène at first mistakes Christ for a gardener (John 20:15).

Mariana Incorporates Aspects of Both Mary Magdalène and the Virgin Mary

In her protracted nurturing of her sorrow, Mariana is akin to two complementary Biblical figures, conspicuous in the Gospel of Luke, and known in Shakespeare's day for their sorrowing and weeping: the putatively "impure" Mary Magdalène and the preternaturally "pure" Virgin Mary. In keeping with an image of her current since at least the third century A.D., and only recently refuted by Roman Catholic decree, Mary Magdalène was conflated in Shakespeare's day with the unnamed woman in Luke, the alleged "sinner," who wept tears of penitential sorrow upon Christ's feet, when he was a guest in a Pharisee's house.[190]

> And one of the Pharifes defired him that he would eat with him: and he went into the Pharise's house, and fate down at table.
>
> And beholde, a womã in the city, which was a finner, when she knew that Iesus fate at table in the Pharises house, fhe brought a box of ointment.
>
> And fhe ftode at his fete behinde him weping, and began to wafh his fete with teares, and did wipe them with the heeres of her head, & kiffed his fete, & anointed them with the ointment.
>
> Now when the Pharife which bade him, fawe it, he fpake within him felf, faying, If this man were a Prophet, he wolde furely have known who, and what manner of woman this is which toucheth him: for fhe is a sinner.

[190] Michelle A. Erhardt, and Amy M. Morris, "Introduction," 1-18, in *Mary Magdalène: Iconographic Studies from the Middle Ages to the Baroque,* ed. Michelle A. Erhardt and Amy M. Morris (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 5; Susan Haskins, *Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1994), 16. This conflation had become the official Church stance after Pope Gregory the Great gave a sermon in 591 in which he claimed that this woman who washed Christ's feet with her tears and Mary Magdalène were one and the same. See Erhardt and Morris, *Mary Magdalène*, 5; Haskins, *Mary Magdalen,* 16.

Luke: 7:36-39

The sin of which the weeping woman, supposed in Shakespeare's day to be Mary Magdalène, was presumed to be guilty was that of prostitution.[191] The Duke's introductory words about Mariana are suggestive of this supposed penitent prostitute who approached Jesus, washing his feet with her tears, and drying her tears with her hair. Angelo, says the Duke,

> [l]eft [Mariana] in her tears, and dried not one of them with his comfort;…in few, bestowed her on her own lamentation, which she yet wears for his sake; and he, a marble to her tears, is washed with them, but relents not.
>
> *MM* III.1.214-18

In an image reminiscent of Mary Magdalène's washing of Christ's feet with her tears, the Duke describes Angelo as "washed" (*MM* III.1.218) with Mariana's tears. Yet, unlike Christ in Luke's account, Angelo is as unmoved with compassion as though he were a statue, or "marble" (*MM* III.1.217), incapable of feeling anything, at all. Rather than Mariana herself, figured as Mary Magdalène, however, it is Angelo whom the Duke recounts as "dry[ing] not one of" (*MM* III.1.214) Mariana's tears. In this way, Shakespeare emphasizes, through the Duke's report, that Angelo himself is a "sinner" (Luke 7:39). Moreover, Shakespeare seems to say, Angelo, as a sinner, is not contrite; for he neither

[191] Haskins, 18-19. [N.B. Jacobus de Voragine. *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints,* trans. William G. Ryan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), does not refer to Mary Magdalène as a (reformed) prostitute, but does talk about her as a rich, beautiful woman habituated to living in a dissolute manner. It should be noted, too, that it is not clear that Bernard of Clairvaux, whom I shall discuss at later points in this chapter, believed that Mary was one and the same as these reputedly sinful women. See Saint Bernard de Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs I, Volume Two,* trans. Kilian Walsh (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 1979), 12:6, n. 42.

weeps openly over his own wrongdoings, acknowledging them, while aiming to make amends, nor does he commiserate with Mariana in her sorrow out of what, in fact, would be "Marian" compassion for her. Thus, Angelo is contrasted to the "other" Mary to whom Mariana bears resemblances: the Virgin Mary, mother and fosterer of Christ, whom Luke reports to have urged his followers: "Be merciful, as your father is merciful" (Luke 6:36). The Virgin Mary herself, in a sequence within Luke which is referred to as the Magnificat, praises God in what seems to be an overflowing of joy at being pregnant with her son:

> Then Mary said, My soul magnifieth the Lord,
>
> And my spirit rejoiceth in God my Savior.
>
> For he hath looked on the poor degree of his servant: for behold, from henceforth shall all ages call me blessed,
>
> Because he that is mighty hath done for me great things, and holy is his Name.
>
> And his mercy is from generation to generation on them that fear him.
>
> He that showed strength with his arm: he hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts.
>
> He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree.
>
> He hath filled the hungry with good things, and sent away the rich empty.
>
> He hath upholden Israel his servant to be mindful of his mercy,

(As he hath spoken to our fathers, to wit, to Abraham and his seed) forever.

Luke 1:46-55

The Virgin Mary not only extols God for his "mercy" (Luke 1:50; 54), thus memorializing within the Book of Luke God's merciful actions, but she also recalls that his singular act of mercy— that is, his sending of his son as a sacrifice for humanity's sake— is itself an act of remembrance of his own prior acts of mercy to Israel. Thus, with the Virgin Mary in Luke, as with Mariana in *Measure for Measure*, we find that memory and mercy are linked together as generative of further acts of mercy, which have the potential to institute a new world order. Angelo's lack of compassion for Mariana, as related by the Duke, places him (Angelo) in contrast to the Mar-y/i[ana] who remembers Angelo, and distills out of her longing for him compassionate mercy.

By the mid-eleventh century, a conception of the Virgin Mary as *Mater dolorosa* ("Mother full of sorrows") became current in the West.[192] Her compassionate lamenting over her son's sufferings was believed to have been foretold in Luke. In Christ's infancy, when Joseph and Mary have brought the Christ child to the temple to be circumcised, the priest Simeon prophesies a kind of cutting for Mary, too. Simeon tells the Virgin Mary that, with respect to her son's suffering, "Yea and a sword shall pierce through thy soul" (Luke 2:35). This

[192] Stephen J. Shoemaker, "Mary at the Cross, East and West: Maternal Compassion and Affective Piety in the Earliest Life of the Virgin and the High Middle Ages," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, NS, 62, Pt 2, (2011): 570-574. Shoemaker suggests that this conception of her may have arisen in Byzantium in the seventh century.

was later interpreted as a reference to Christ's agony on the cross, in particular to the Roman soldier's piercing of his (Christ's) side with a spear.[193] The metaphorical cutting predicted for Mary's soul was represented iconographically by portrayals of Mary as *Mater dolorosa* sorrowing at the foot of the cross where she was understood to share in Christ's sufferings.[194] In late medieval religious writings, too, the compassionate tears which the Virgin Mary shed at the foot of the Cross were objects of devotion, believed to have curative power.[195]

The Gospel of Luke is sometimes referred to rather as the "Gospel of Mary."[196] The Virgin Mary's prominent place in Luke centers on the Annunciation, which is related only in that gospel.[197] While Luke does not specify the location in which the Annunciation took place, beyond saying that Mary was in the city of Nazareth and that the angel Gabriel "went in unto her" (Luke 1:28), in iconography, by Shakespeare's lifetime, the angel Gabriel's visitation of her had been portrayed for two centuries as taking place in an enclosed garden.[198]

---

[193] Shoemaker, "Mary at the Cross," 579-583
[194] Ibid., e.g., 573.
[195] Kukita Naoë Yoshikawa, "Holy Medicine and Diseases of the Soul: Henry of Lancaster and *Le Livre de Seyntz Medicines*." *Medical History* 53 (2009): 405.
[196] Nicholas Ayo, *The Hail Mary: A Verbal Icon of Mary* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 13.
[197] Laura Saetveit Miles, *The Virgin Mary's Book at the Annunciation: Reading, Interpretation and Devotion in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2000), 1; Matthew could be said to provide an account of the Annunciation; however, the announcement is to Mary's husband, Joseph (see Ayo, *The Hail Mary,* 14).
[198] Brian E. Daley, "Late Medieval Iconography of Mary," in *Medieval Gardens,* 253-278, ed. Elisabeth B. MacDougall (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1986), 274, states that the "first rather hesitant attempt to use the enclosed garden specifically as the setting for an Annunciation scene seems to be an illumination in the Prayer Book of Countess Maria of Geldern, now in Berlin, dating from about 1415."

Mariana, moreover, bears some likeness to Elizabeth I, who, in turn, had assumed for herself certain attributes of the Virgin Mary—among those being the cultivation of an association with enclosed gardens as emblematic of her official persona as Virgin Queen.[199] In *Measure for Measure,* the similarities between Mariana and Elizabeth I in part have the effect of establishing, in turn, Mariana's similarities to the Virgin Mary, including a miraculous pregnancy. For Mariana's fostering of her memory of Angelo, I wish to suggest, amounts to her being pregnant with—or, in the play's phrasing, "pregnant in" (*MM* I.1.11)—her memory of Angelo. Mysteriously, miraculously, the unwed Mariana is figuratively in the very condition that is at the heart of the play's plot: she is figuratively pregnant with an illegitimate child, or "bastard," to use a term that occurs in the play (*MM* III.2.3; III.2.103). Thus, she is in the very condition that so endangers the play's women—Julietta, of course, but also Kate Keepdown, and potentially Isabella, and, indeed, by play's end, potentially Marianna herself—with respect to their reputations as well as their associated ability to stay alive without enduring imprisonment, or a life of prostitution. Indeed, too, Mariana's figurative unborn child, is indeed illegitimate, or "bastard," in that, like the alcoholic beverage called "bastard," to which the constable Elbow makes reference, it is "adulterated," being, so to speak, part undistilled and part distilled.

[199] Roy Strong, *The Renaissance Garden in England* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1979), 49; Jones, "Some Versions of the *Hortus Conclusus,"* 360.

Yet, having been wholly distilled in the form of tears, I wish to propose, Mariana's "bastard" is born as unadulterated mercy.

"Pregnant In" Memory and the Distillation of "Bastard"

Although what I frame as Mariana's distillation of her figurative child takes place within the confines of a monastery rather than in the secular world, its presence in the play may be owing partly to the contemporary, relative popularity of distillation, as well as the familiarity, among learned playgoers and readers, of alchemical processes, of which distillation was one.[200]

There is a pun inherent in the notion that the distilled part of Mariana's figurative child takes the form of tears. "Distill," at its Latin root, means "to drip down," or, as the *Oxford English Dictionary* defines it, "[t]to trickle down or fall in minute drops, as… tears."[201] In the late middle ages and Renaissance, "distill" was used both in this sense and in the sense "to distract the essence of a plant, transform or convert by distillation, to perform a distillation, to extract the

[200] Simonds, "'My Charms Crack Not,'" 538, remarks on the familiarity with alchemy which one could probably assume the learned among contemporary playgoers to have possessed; Penny Bayer, "Lady Margaret Clifford's Alchemical Receipt Book and the John Dee Circle," *Ambix* 52:3 (2005): 281, acknowledges that "Charles Webster has argued that the educated classes had little difficulty accessing medieval alchemical writings in Latin, or manuscripts in circulation…"; see the Introduction to this dissertation, within the section entitled "Distillation as Poetic Creation" for additional details about distillation as an alchemical process.

[201] Forbes, *Art of Distillation,* 70; "distil | distill, v.". OED Online. December 2022. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/55653?rskey=6gCClc&result=2 (accessed December 09, 2022), 1a.

quintessence of, to drive volatile constituents off."[202] Furthermore, Lyndy Abraham reports in *A Dictionary of Alchemical Imagery*, that "[t]he beads of liquid which accumulate on the sides of the vessel during distillation are referred to as 'sweat' or 'tears.'"[203] "Distil," thus, is a word suited to Mariana's weeping of tears with purifying or distilling effect. If it should seem odd to speak of distilling a child, even a figurative one, allow me to explain that one of the instances of the word "bastard" in the play is a literal reference to the alcoholic drink (referred to in passing above) designated by the word "bastard" (III.2.3). As an alcoholic drink, bastard is a mixture of two distinct kinds of beverage: grape-wine, which is a product of fermented grapes, and fortified grape-wine, which is formed from already fermented wine that has been distilled, or purified.

Admittedly, the word "distill" does not appear in any form (e.g., "distilled," "distillation," etc.) in *Measure for Measure.* Yet certain stages in the process of alchemical distillation figure in the play, even if in obscured or displaced form. Mariana's drowned brother Frederick, for instance, may be portrayed as undergoing the alchemical stage of marination.[204] Simonds quotes a sixteenth-century compilation of alchemical texts as stating that, in the alchemical stage of marination, "The [alchemical] vessel with the ingredients should be immersed in saltwater, and then the divine water will be perfected. It is, so to

---

[202] Forbes, *Art of Distillation,* 70.
[203] Abraham, *A Dictionary of Alchemical Imagery*, "distillation and sublimation," 56. Abraham provides examples of the drops of liquid arising from distillation figured as tears from English literature ranging chronologically from Chaucer to Milton.
[204] Simonds, "'My Charms Crack Not,'" 542; 544-547.

speak, gestated in the womb of the sea-water."[205] Yet, this marination in fact does not seem to attach itself clearly to Frederick as its object; for we are not subsequently made aware of his re-emergence from the sea, in renewed form. Rather, it is Angelo who ultimately seems reformed, even if while under duress. And it is, I argue, Mariana who is the agent of Angelo's re- or trans-formation.

In Sonnet 119, Shakespeare figures "tears" as the "distilled" emanation of wombs figured as "limbecks" (alembics):

> What potions have I drunk of siren *tears*,
> *Distilled* from *limbecks foul as hell within*,
> Applying fears to hopes and hopes to fears,
> Still losing when I saw myself to win?
> What wretched errors hath my heart committed,
> Whilst it hath thought itself so blessed never?
> How have mine eyes out of their sphere been fitted
> In the distraction of this madding fever?
> *O benefit of ill: now I find true*
> *That better is by evil still made better,*
> *And ruined love, when it is built anew,*
> *Grows fairer than at first, more strong, far greater.*
> So I return rebuked to my content
> And gain by ill thrice more than I have spent.
>
> Sonnet 119[206] (italics mine)

Shakespeare portrays both the "siren tears" in Sonnet 119 and Mariana's tears in *Measure for Measure* as products of distillation, albeit the "siren tears" overtly, but Mariana's tears indirectly.

---

[205] Simonds, "'My Charms Crack Not,'" 544.
[206] William Shakespeare, *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones, (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2010); see also Margaret Healy, *Shakespeare, Alchemy and the Creative Imagination: The Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint* (New York: Cambridge University Press), 75-76, on the alchemical allusions in this sonnet. Healy states, "'Tears' are literally the drops of moisture that condense at the top of the still and rain down upon the blackened body lying at the bottom of the alembic, cleaning it of its impurities" (76).

The claim of Shakespeare's persona in Sonnet 119 that "now I find true / That better is by evil still made better" (9-10) calls to mind Mariana's enigmatic lines to the Duke about her preference for Angelo:

> Oh, my dear lord,
> I crave no other, nor no better man.
> …
> They say best men are moulded out of faults
> And for the most become much more the better
> For being a little bad: so may my husband.
>
> V.1. 418-419; 432-434

"Faults" (*MM* V.1. 452) is a pun that refers to a woman's vagina[207] Read together with Sonnet 119, in which Shakespeare plainly figures wombs as "limbecks" (alembics), the vessels used for the process of distilling in alchemical experiments, Mariana's use of "faults" in this line points toward a figuration of her womb as an alembic. According to this metaphor, her plentiful tears of sorrow are distilled within her "alembic": not, however, into a "potion of Siren tears," as in Sonnet 119, but, as I propose above, from "bastard" into pure mercy.

The word "bastard" is used in *Measure for Measure* to mean a figurative child whose mixed parentage results in that figurative child's being, so to speak, adulterated (*MM* III.2.253).[208] "Bastard" in the play also may refer to a child whose parents are deemed by civic authorities to be unmarried, making the child

[207] In Chapter 2, I discuss Shakespeare's usage of "fault" in this same sense in *King Lear*, in which it is used in a crudely joking manner.

[208] "bastard, n., adj., and adv.". OED Online. December 2022. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/16044?rskey=YzJ5Cn&result=1 (accessed December 09, 2022), II, and "bastard, n., adj., and adv.". OED Online. December 2022. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/16044?rskey=YzJ5Cn&result=1 (accessed December 09, 2022), *OED* A.I.1.a.

officially illegitimate (*MM* III.2.103). One might point out that, by these definitions, Christ could be considered—dare one say—a bastard.[209] It is my contention that Shakespeare does subtly imply this. In so doing, he invites his audience and readers to reflect upon his play's title, drawn from the Book of Matthew (like Luke, one of the synoptic gospels):

> Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged, and with what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again.
>
> Matt. 7:1-2

Although the Roman Catholic doctrine of Shakespeare's fictional Vienna would have deemed Christ to be both fully human and fully divine, it is nevertheless the case that the Virgin Mary was not married to Christ's father. Nor, according to Roman Catholic dogma, was she of the same kind, he being a divinity and she a mortal, even if an exceptional mortal. If Nazareth, or Bethlehem were like the Vienna of the play, Shakespeare invites us to think, the Virgin Mary might have been in similarly precarious positions as are Julietta, Kate Keepdown, Isabella, and, even, Mariana.

The words "pregnant" and "bastard," as they appear in the play, are not obviously relevant to Mariana. They more evidently have to do with the play's main plot, which revolves around the punishment of Claudio and Julietta for the

[209] It may be significant, too, that Elizabeth I was declared a bastard by her father, Henry VIII. Mariana's name contains the name of Elizabeth I's mother, Anne Boleyn; Healy, *"Shakespeare, Alchemy, and the Creative Imagination,* 57, argues that Shakespeare wrote the Sonnets and *A Lover's Complaint* in a cultural context in which "sex and the sacred could share the same poetic bed."

crime of fornication. This is a crime which the couple cannot now hide from the civic authorities' view, since Julietta's swelling womb advertises both what they have done and that the result of their actions will be an illegitimate child: Julietta is literally pregnant with a "bastard." Yet, as I hope to show, partly by way of counterpoint to Julietta's sufferings, both words—"pregnant" and "bastard"—accrue to Mariana in her weeping.

The English word "pregnant" is derived from the Latin "praegnans," made up of a prefix "pr(a)e-," "probably," the *Oxford English Dictionary* ("*OED")* states, the "pr(a)e" that means "before," and "gnans," "being born." The *OED* further reports that "pregnant" appeared first in English, however, in figurative senses. While, in Tudor and Jacobean times, "pregnant," in English, could have the meaning "having offspring developing in the uterus" (*OED* II.3.a), as the *OED* phrases it, Shakespeare, by the *OED*'s reckoning, does not typically use the word in his *oeuvre* in its literal sense. Instead, by "pregnant," he most often means a state or disposition that is "[e]asily influenced; receptive; inclined, ready" (*OED* A.I.2.b).[210] In *Measure for Measure,* the Duke could be thought of as using "pregnant" in this sense when, in the play's opening lines, he describes Escalus as

[210] "pregnant, adj.1 and n.". OED Online. December 2022. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/150085?rskey=sjEIG2&result=1 (accessed December 09, 2022), A.I.2.b. In the 1598 edition of John Florio's *Worlde of Wordes, or Most Copious, and Exact Dictionarie in Italian and English* (London: By Arnold Hatfield for Edw. Blount, 1598), Accessed through Early English Book Online, 209, Florio lists the following Italian forms: "pregna," "pregnante," "pregnanza," "pregnare," "pregneuole,""pregnare," "pregnezza," "pregno." Florio defines all of these terms as relating to the holding of offspring within the womb of a woman or other female animal; the impregnating of a woman, wolf, or horse; or the condition of being "fruitful," without specification as to what or whom this fruitfulness might apply.

being "pregnant in" (*MM* I.1.11) Vienna's customs and the administering of its laws.[211] Escalus is primed to act in compliance with what he has received into his own, impressionable memory: namely, a familiarity with how the city's legal bureaucracy is run under the auspices of the Duke. Indeed, as Stephen Spiess proposes, in a discussion that centers on the play's portrayal of the Duke's own memory as the official one in terms of civic laws and procedures, in *Measure for Measure,* "to be pregnant in" a thing means "to remember" it.[212] As Spiess convincingly argues, the Duke, in pointing out Escalus' fitness to rule over Vienna in his stead, uses the word "pregnant" of Escalus to mean that he is "a repository of state memory, embodying critical interrelations with power and authority in Vienna."[213] What is more, Spiess notes, the Duke points out that his own memory is synonymous with state memory, telling Escalus:

> The nature of our people,
> Our city's institutions and the terms
> For common justice, you're as *pregnant in*
> As art and practice hath enriched any
> *That we remember*.[214]
>
> I.1.9-13 (Italics mine)

The Duke's preoccupation in the play's opening lines with official, state memory and his referring to a person's facility and compliance with that memory as being

[211] In its definition of "pregnant" as, "Easily influenced; receptive; inclined , ready" (*OED* A.I.2.b), the *OED* cites John Donne in a phrase in which he refers to memory as "that pregnant faculty": "Christ places the comfort of this Comforter, the Holy Ghost, in this, that he shall work upon that pregnant faculty, the Memory."
[212] Stephen Spiess, "The Measure of Sexual Memory," *Shakespeare Survey,* ed. Peter Holland. (2014): 313.
[213] Spiess, "The Measure of Sexual Memory," 313.
[214] Ibid., quoted, and italics, in Spiess.

"pregnant in" it sets the stage for Mariana's act, which outweighs his official memory: that is, her pleading for mercy for Angelo.

There is a connection, I would propose, between the Duke's use of the phrase "pregnant in" (I.1.11) to refer to Escalus as being—by the measure of the Duke's own exercising and assessment of his own memory—receptive to, and poised to act with apt memory of, Vienna's civic laws and customs and Angelo's description of himself as "unpregnant" (IV.4.18). In the course of a soliloquy in which Angelo eventually divulges his fear that, if he had not had Claudio put to death (as he believes has been carried out at his command), Claudio would kill him in revenge for having "dishonored" him (Claudio) by the manner in which he (Angelo) has spared his life—that is, by arranging with Isabella to be allowed to rape her—in a sense, to prostitute herself—in exchange for her brother's life:

> …He [i.e. Claudio] should have lived,
> Save that his riotous youth with dangerous sense
> Might in times to come have tane (sic) revenge:
> By so receiving a dishonored life
> With ransom of such shame.
>
> *MM* IV.4.218-32

The ambiguity of phrasing in Angelo's contention that it is Claudio who would have been "dishonored" (*MM* IV.4.229) indicates that Angelo is hiding something from himself—that it is he himself who has been "dishonored" (*MM* IV.4.229), and that he himself has been the agent of his own dishonoring. In his ambiguous, somewhat convoluted phrasing, through which he deflects blame from himself, Angelo demonstrates that he has begun, in his official capacity as the deputy ruler

of Vienna, to forget—to forget Isabella and his criminal actions toward her.[215] Yet, at least up to this point in the play, Angelo is not wholly unaware of his own machinations, as he uses the word "unpregnant" (IV.4.18) of his own state, linking it with his own forgetting of the role he has assumed in Vienna. Speaking of what he terms "this deed": that is, the deed which he supposes to have been his rape of Isabella but which was actually his coitus with the willing Mariana, he muses:

> This deed unshapes me quite and makes me unpregnant
> And dull to all proceedings. A deflowered maid,
> By an eminent body that enforced
> The law against it? But that her tender shame
> Will not proclaim against her maiden loss,
> How might she tongue me? Yet reason dares her no;
> For my authority bears of a credent bulk,
> That no particular scandal once can touch,
> But it confounds the breather. He should have lived.
> Save that his riotous youth with dangerous sense
> Might in times to come have tane (sic) revenge:
> By so receiving a dishonored life
> With ransom of such shame. Would yet he had lived.
> Alack, when once our grace we have forgot,
> Nothing goes right. We would, and we would not.
>
> *MM* IV.4.218-32

Angelo speaks as though his "deed" of rape acts upon him, as indeed his still-living, although moribund, memory of it seems to do. Yet he is not contrite. His concern is solely for himself and with reference to himself: how he has fallen from the "grace" (*MM* IV.4.231) not of God but of his self-righteous position as

[215] The Duke's act of willful forgetting finds a chilling analogue in the purposeful "amnesia" of the war criminal in Edna O'Brien's *The Little Red Chairs* (London: Faber and Faber, 2015), which I believe to be based upon the self-willed forgetting of Faust in Goethe's *Faust*. In all three works, it is women's bodies and psyches that "remember."

the Duke's deputy, by giving in to his own fear that Claudio might seek revenge on him for "dishonor[ing]" (*MM* IV.4.229) him by sparing his life only after Isabella—as Angelo believes—yielded to his assault of her. Within Angelo's soliloquy, however, we detect signs that he is worried that his assault of "Isabella" (who was really the willing Mariana) may have resulted in her conceiving a child. Should this be the case, her (that is, Isabella's— but actually Mariana's) pregnant womb and, indeed, subsequently, her baby, would memorialize his rape of her. Yet he could deny his part in any pregnancy. Indeed, he implicitly proposes to himself to do just that with respect to Isabella, when he tells himself that any accusations against him would rebound on the accuser, such is his clout and his determination to maintain his authority, even if in reality he has undermined his own authority with his own sexual incontinence and criminality.

The commentator Brian Gibbons observes that Angelo's diction in his soliloquy is subliminally sexualized. On the one hand, Gibbons remarks, it is as though Angelo were numbly describing his own post-coital body. On the other hand, he seems to (re-)enact his rape of Isabella verbally: both "enforced" and "deflowered maid" appear in adjacent line-endings, so that "enforced" seems to refer to what Angelo believes to be his forcing of Isabella (who actually was Mariana).[216] I would build upon Gibbons' close reading of Angelo's soliloquy by suggesting that Angelo equally expresses muffled anxiety about Isabella's potentially having conceived a child as the result of the rape of her that he

[216] Shakespeare, Gibbons, ed., IV.4, n. 18-32.

believes he has committed. If that were the case, her "body" would become an "eminent" (*MM* IV.4.220) one in the sense of "protruding" (*OED* I1b). His assurance to himself that "[his] authority bears of a credent bulk" (IV.4.224) conveys not only a sense of his own ability to misuse his power for the purpose of silencing Isabella, but also a sense of the young novitiate, Isabella, whose potential claim that he had raped her (as he believes he has done) would be "author[ized]" (*MM* IV.4.224) by the "credent bulk" of her growing womb in which she would "bear[…]" (*MM* IV.4.224) his illegitimate child. While seeming to talk about his own body, he talks as much about hers— not—to reiterate—out of concern for her, but out of fear that Isabella's belly, if increasing in bulk in pregnancy, would, so to say, speak about his crime. For, even if she did not "tongue [him]" (*MM* IV.4.23) (i.e., speak out against him), she would, rather, "belly" him, in this way refuting his own, self-doctored "memory."

Yet Angelo depicts himself as acted upon by his own "deed" (*MM* IV.4.218) of rape which, he says,"unshapes [him] quite" (*MM* IV.4.218) and "makes [him] unpregnant" (*MM* IV.4.218) At his speech's end, he laments that he has "forgot" (sic) (*MM* IV.4.231) the "grace" (*MM* IV.4.231) that is proper to his place in the city as the Duke's deputy, in this way, connecting his "unpregnant" state, which he asserts has been imposed upon him by the deed which he himself has enacted, with a failure of memory.

Berating himself for his own dissolution, Angelo gives voice to an associated fear: that Isabella and Claudio will be able to exercise their own

memories. Angelo's concern over Isabella's memory is to thwart any effort of Isabella's to shame him by disclosing publicly how he (he believes) has treated her. In the case of Claudio, Angelo imagines that he (Claudio) would feel "dishonor(ed)" if his life were spared at the cost of his sister's submitting to his (Angelo's) rape. Angelo further supposes that Claudio's supposed sense of dishonor would goad him to take vengeance on Angelo in the form of a revenge killing befitting a tragedy. This threat of vengeance connects thematically to Mariana and to how her own memory of Angelo ultimately gives rise not to vengeance but to mercy.

Perverted, Debased Biblical Imagery and Motifs

My discussion of biblical references as they both elucidate and form the portrayal of Mariana's authority focuses on two books of the Bible: Luke and the Song of Songs; however, it is augmented by references to imagery and ritual associated with Christ's transubstantiated blood in three additional books of the Bible: Matthew, 1 Corinthians and Isaiah. Both Luke and Matthew are synoptic gospels, although their accounts of Christ's life are not identical in detail. Unlike in Luke, in which Christ implies, but does not outright state, that his disciples should drink his blood by way of remembering him (Luke 22:15-20), in Matthew, as in 1 Corinthians, Christ's instructions to his disciples to drink the transubstantiated

wine that is his blood include his explicit statement that they should do so in order to remember him:

> For I have received of the Lord that which I also have delivered unto you, *to wit*, That the Lord Jesus in the night when he was betrayed, took bread.
>
> And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do ye in remembrance of me.
>
> After the same manner also *he took* the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.
>
> 1 Cor. 11:23-25[217]

The Old Testament Book of Isaiah 63:3, moreover, features God informing the prophet Isaiah that he has "trodden the grapes in the winepress alone" (Is. 63:3). By Shakespeare's day and well before, biblical exegetes viewed the grapes in the winepress as prophetic of, and a metaphor for, Christ's blood.[218] In Matthew (as, also, in Luke), Christ refers to the "new Testament that is in [his] blood," as though responding to the Old Testament prophecy of Christ's gift to humankind

---

[217] In Luke, the wording is as follows:

> And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among you:
>
> For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God be come.
>
> And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you: do this in the remembrance of me.
> Likewise also after supper *he took* the cup, saying, This cup is that new Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.
>
> Luke 22:17-20

[218] Yoshikawa, "Holy Medicine and Diseases of the Soul," 405-406.

of his blood-from-wine. Isaiah 63 is much concerned with vengeance and mercy—God's vengeance towards his enemies and his mercy towards Israel. By the end of *Measure for Measure*, Shakespeare is seen to have presented a cumulative portrait of Mariana as one who bestows mercy on Angelo, self-appointed enemy to her, in a way that contrasts with God's stated intention in the Old Testament Book of Isaiah 63 to mete out justice by treating his enemies with vengeance, while extending mercy to Israel. By her actions, Mariana embodies the more merciful, compassionate God of the New Testament.

These biblical allusions in *Measure for Measure* work through contrast: generally tending to present perverted, debased manifestations of events and motifs found in Luke or the Song of Songs (as well as in the descriptions of the Eucharist in Matthew and 1 Corinthians and of the pressing of grapes in Isaiah 63:3), relating especially to narratives about, or references to, pregnancy and fertility; expressions of erotic yearning; depictions of enclosed gardens; and references to the ingesting of alcoholic drinks, whether fermented drinks, as grape wine, or whether drinks that are a combination of fermented and distilled liquids, as "bastard,"—or, for that matter, whether the type of alcohol is left unspecified. All of these biblical allusions connect to what the play implies to be Mariana's role as a preserver of memory; memory through which she gives birth within herself to mercy.

By implying that the mercy with which Mariana figuratively is pregnant is "bastard," Shakespeare invites us to cast censorious judgment not on Mariana but

rather on the (potential) fathers in the play: Angelo; the Duke; Lucio; and, even, Claudio. The constable Elbow may be an exception. Even if he is an exception, however, he is exposed to mockery for his naïveté in not recognizing that his wife is, or may be, a prostitute. Shakespeare appears, at least initially, to hold up for comparison to the play's high-status (potential) fathers the bumbling constable, Elbow, as a protective father-to-be, outraged at the insults to her person that his wife has endured in the bathhouse, the "Bunch of Grapes," at the hands of the inveterate bawd Pompey and his associate Froth. What exactly these improprieties were, we never learn, but might they have involved the "strange pick-lock" (III.2.14-15) of which Elbow relieves Pompey, an instrument designed for the unlocking of chastity-belts?[219] On the surface in this passage, "strange" means only "of a kind that is unfamiliar or rare; unusual, uncommon, exceptional, singular, out of the way" (*OED* A.8).[220] The word bears additional senses, however, which suggest that Elbow may fear that his wife's "lock" has been "pick[ed]" by men (Pompey and Froth) who, like Pompey's pick-lock, are "strange" in the sense that they are "belonging to others; not of one's own kin or family" (*OED* A.3). In short, they might be adulterating agents who would have created in Pompey's wife's womb a bastard. Perhaps, too Pompey harbors a fear

[219] William Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure,* ed. J.W. Lever. The Arden Shakespeare, 1965 (reprinted 2015), III.2, n. 16.
[220] "strange, adj. and n.". OED Online. December 2022. Oxford University Press. https://www-oed-com.oca.ucsc.edu/view/Entry/191244?rskey=SA2OH2&result=1 (accessed December 09, 2022).

that his own wife is a "strange woman" meaning a "harlot" (*OED* A.4), as her venturing into Pompey's realm indeed might lead one to suspect. Elbow's arguably only dimly sensed fear that his wife is gestating a bastard reveals that his attitude towards his wife may not be simply that of caring tendance, but may be informed, too, by possessiveness. This would seem to be suggested by the disapproving manner in which Elbow mentions the drink "bastard" to Pompey, as he arrests Pompey for bawdry, the very crime he may have practiced upon Elbow's wife:

> Nay, if there be no remedy for it, but that you [i.e. Pompey] will needs buy and sell men and women like beasts, we shall have all the world drink brown and white bastard.
>
> *MM* III.2.1-3

That in a later scene, Elbow uses the word "bastard" may indicate anxiety about the father of his wife's as-yet-unborn child. As Jennifer Panek notes, Pompey's claim that Elbow's wife entered the Bunch of Grapes with a yearning for stewed prunes may imply that she is a prostitute, since stewed prunes seem to have been associated with prostitution for reasons that are not wholly clear, but that may simply be owing to the fact that they apparently were a snack typically offered at brothels. There additionally appears to have been a connection in Renaissance medicine and literature between aphrodisiacs for women and purgatives, such as stewed prunes.[221] If Pompey's innuendo should be true, the parentage of Elbow's

[221] Jennifer Panek, "Why Were There Stewed Prunes in Shakespearean Brothels?" *English Language Notes* 42:3 (2005): 18-21.

wife's unborn child indeed would be uncertain. Whether Pompey's testimony should be accepted as reliable, however, is far from certain. At the same time, its truth or falsehood is not the primary point. Pompey's insinuations about Elbow's wife are in keeping with the manner in which all the women in the play are presented: that is, as actual or potential fornicators, if not prostitutes, whose chastity, as I have noted earlier, is held in dispute by others.

In notable contrast to the prevailing attitude towards pregnancy and birth in *Measure for Measure*, the New Testament Book of Luke celebrates two pregnancies, followed by births, as joyful, even miraculous. The aged Elizabeth's pregnancy with, and subsequent birth of, her son, John the Baptist, are extolled as precursors to the yet still greater marvel of the Virgin Mary's impregnation by God and the ensuing birth of Jesus, her wholly divine (and wholly human) son. In *Measure for Measure*, however, Angelo speaks about, and acts toward, children—whether hypothetical children (e.g., Angelo speaks of how he would treat a son, if he had one), potential children (e.g., Claudio's and Elbow's children are "potential" ones, Mariana—whom Angelo took to be Isabella—could potentially have become pregnant with a child), or real children (e.g., Lucio's illegitimate neglected child by Kate Keepdown)—murderously, or, at best, with malign indifference. As Angelo says to Isabella, when she attempts to dissuade him from having her brother Claudio put to death for having impregnated his betrothed, Julietta:

> Be you content, fair maid;
> It is the law, not I condemn your brother:

> Were he my kinsman, brother, or my son,
> It should be thus with him: he must die tomorrow.
>
> *MM* II.2.81-4

Angelo's behavior towards both Mariana and Isabella is duplicitous and self-serving; he casts them off, apparently unconcerned for their possible fates, which could be to have become pregnant by him (Isabella's fate might have been this, if she really had slept with him, and Mariana's fate, too, might be this, since she is the one who really did sleep with him)—a dire fate, indeed, in Vienna, for an unmarried woman who would give birth to a "bastard", or illegitimate child, especially, with Angelo himself in charge of the city.

The gentleman, Lucio, too, is negligent toward his own bastard child and treats his child's mother, Kate Keepdown, with contempt. If Lucio's remarks are to be taken seriously, moreover—and this is far from certain—then the Duke, too, may have fathered illegitimate children. As Lucio asserts:

> Why what a ruthless thing this is in [Angelo], for the rebellion of a codpiece to take away the life of a man! Would the Duke who is absent have done that? Ere he would have hanged a man for the getting of a hundred bastards, he would have paid for the nursing a thousand He had some feeling of the sport, and that instructed him to mercy.
>
> *MM* III.2.100-105

Lucio's assertion about the Duke's alleged propensity to "pa[y] for the nursing a thousand [illegitimate children]" (*MM* III.2.1-3-4) raises the unsettling suspicion that Lucio indirectly refers to the Duke's official wiping out of memory. Lucio may, in part, mean, that the Duke would have paid to gloss things over: that is, to

have the hypothetical thousand illegitimate babies—possibly including a few whom he had begotten—turned over to wet nurses, so that their mothers and their fathers—possibly including himself—could forget about them.[222] One also might recall the trials endured by Julietta, who is about to become a nursing mother: she and the child in her womb are imprisoned. Is the sort of nursing that Julietta, in Vienna's prison, would be able to provide to her child what Lucio has in mind in suggesting the Duke was so benevolent toward the children born of fornication that he would provide "nursing" for them? In his indecent manner, Lucio may well inadvertently draw attention to what Spiess refers to as Duke's insistence on fostering an official state memory, at the expense of versions of history such as the one to which Lucio intermittently gives voice when he slanders the Duke.[223]

If Elbow's indignation at the treatment to which his pregnant wife has been subjected at the hands of Pompey and his colleague in the bathhouse, "The Bunch of Grapes," at first seems to distinguish him among those who, as sexual predators or clients of prostitutes, might have fathered children in the play by his solicitous attitude toward the pregnant mother of his own child, Claudio too forms a partial exception to the general portrayal of the potential fathers in the play. For he, at least, has shown himself willing both to acknowledge and to care for his child and the mother of his child. Yet Claudio displays more concern for himself than for the fates of Julietta and his unborn child. While awaiting his execution in

[222] Note how, in *Romeo and Juliet*, Juliet's parents appear to have forgotten about her during the time that Nurse recalls weaning Juliet from nursing at her breast.
[223] Spiess, "The Measure of Sexual Memory," 310-26.

prison, he delivers a lengthy, despairing speech on the subject of himself and his fear of death for his own sake, rather than on account of what may become of his wife and unborn child (*MM* III.1.118-32). Claudio, too, requests of Lucio to present his (Claudio's) novitiate sister Isabella as a lure to Angelo in hopes she may persuade him through what Claudio suggestively terms Isabella's "prone and speechless dialect" (*MM* I.2.164) to relent in his (Angelo's) determination to put Claudio to death.[224] Thus, we see that Claudio is willing to turn Isabella into a woman in the same condition as his pregnant wife Julietta: an unmarried woman (at least, in Julietta's case, "unmarried," according to legal nicety), apparently without father or brother to protect her, who has fornicated, and who may become pregnant. That Claudio is willing to endanger his sister in the same way his betrothed Julietta has become endangered, implies a lack of compassion for both Isabella and Julietta. Moreover, as noted earlier, when accosted by Lucio as he (Claudio) is paraded through the street, Claudio likens the freedom to engage in sexual relations of which he and Julietta have availed themselves to rats' unrestrained guzzling down of rat poison:

> …Our natures do pursue
> Like rats that ravin down their proper bane
> A thirsty evil, and *when we drink we die*.
>
> *MM* I.2.110-12 (italics mine)

These words of Claudio's are hardly a caring or tender tribute to his betrothed, Julietta.

[224] Shakespeare, Gibbons, ed., I.2, n. 164.

Claudio's somber declaration "when we drink we die" (*MM* I.2.110-12) resounds with force throughout the play; for drink, and drinking are prominent in the play as means of achieving a gamut of things relating to (im)mortality, ranging from quasi-death to life everlasting: amnesia (a sort of death-in-life), in Barnardine's case; the nursing of infants with breast milk, the drinking of which should bring not death, as Claudio gloomily predicts of rat poison, but life; and the drinking of Christ's transubstantiated blood, which, the Christian tradition teaches, yields eternal life.

In the Lucan- and Song of Songs-inflected context of the play, the name of the establishment, "The Bunch of Grapes," where Pompey and company have, as Elbow claims, discomfited Elbow's pregnant wife, comically reflects Elbow's wife's pregnant state. The iconographic meaning of a bunch of grapes, when portrayed with images of the Madonna and Child was understood to be that of Christ, as Redeemer, the bunch of grapes representing Christ as the grapes, or "the fruit of [the Virgin Mary's] womb" (Luke 1:42), but also, as individual grapes, Mary's breasts, filled with milk for the infant Christ.[225] Indeed, in medieval and Renaissance times, people believed that milk was blood in transmuted form.[226]

---

[225] E. James Mundy, "Gerard David's 'Rest on the flight into Egypt'" Further Additions to Grape Symbolism." *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 12 (1981-1982): 216; Kukita Naoë Yoshikawa, "Holy Medicine and Diseases of the Soul: Henry of Lancaster and *Le Livre de Seyntz Medicines*." *Medical History* 53 (2009): 406, states that, in an interpretation that became widespread throughout Europe, Augustine interpreted the grapes in Isaiah 63:3 as a reference to Christ; Caroline Walker Bynum. *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982), 271-272, cited in Yoshikawa, "Holy Medicine and Diseases of the Soul," 405.

[226] On the medieval medical conception of milk as a form of blood: Deborah M. Valenze, *Milk: A Global and Local History* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 2011), 47-88.

Like the Virgin Mary's pregnancy in Luke, the wine that figures in Christ's last supper with his disciples in Luke (and in Matthew), too, is miraculous: No ordinary drink, it is Christ's own transubstantiated blood. In *Measure for Measure,* by contrast, alcoholic drink is associated not with miracles but with criminality. With respect to Mistress Overdone and Pompey, her procurer, who, with vulgar punning, calls himself "[her] tapster" (*MM* I.2.91), alcoholic drink is linked specifically with illicit, degraded sex. Wine in the Song of Songs, however, is spoken of in terms of eroticism joined with expressions of protective tendance. The Bride of the Song of Songs recalls of the bridegroom:

> He broght me into the wine celler, and loue was his banner over me.
>
> Song of Songs 2:4

The bridegroom, for his part, likens both wine and milk to the delights of his beloved's fragrant, garden-like body:

> I am come into my gardẽ, my fifter, my fpoufe: I gathered my myrrhe with my fpice: I ate mine honie cõbe with mine honie, I dranke my wine with my milke: eat, ô friends, drinke, and make you merry, ô wellbeloued.
>
> Song of Songs 5:1d

Isabella's description for Mariana's benefit of Angelo's garden, in which he has arranged to rape Isabella, is reminiscent of the Song of Songs in its imagery of vineyards and enclosed gardens, as well as its repeated references to gaining access to the beloved's body through a doorway or gateway:

> He hath a garden circummur'd with brick,
> Whose western side is with a vineyard back'd:
> And to that vineyard is a planched gate,
> That makes his opening with this bigger key.
> This other doth command a little door
> Which from the vineyard to the garden leads;
> There have I made my promise, upon the heavy
> Middle of the night to call upon him.
>
> *MM* IV.1.25-41

This lyrical passage about how to access Angelo's garden makes up some of the most beautiful lines in the play, and—one would say—the only sweetly erotic ones, if not for the fact that markedly absent from them is any mention of a beloved. Angelo's sadistic pining after Isabella and Isabella's unwillingness to yield up her virginity to Angelo are in striking contrast to the bride and bridegroom's wondering and tenderly expressed mutually felt erotic yearning for the other's body in the Song of Songs. Yet, the description of Angelo's garden could, through displacement from Isabella to Mariana and from The Song of Songs to *Measure for Measure*, represent something of Mariana's feelings for Angelo. There is an additional displacement, too: that of Mariana for Elizabeth I; for, as noted above, references in the Song of Songs to the beloved as an enclosed garden were appropriated by Elizabeth I and her propogandists as allusions to herself.[227]

[227] Strong, *The Renaissance Garden in England,* 48-49*;* Jones, "Some Versions of the *Hortus Conclusus*," 358-360.

Mariana's Emergent Spiritual and Secular Authority

Before we see Mariana, as she listens to music sung to her by a boy, we first hear about her in the Duke's report of her to Isabella, in which he refers in passing to the relatively contained body of water that is the moat encircling Mariana's artificial island. He repeatedly, too, associates Mariana with unbounded water—both with the "current" (*MM* III.1.228) that is a metaphor for Mariana's immoderate love for Angelo and to the sea that has swallowed Mariana's brother Frederick. The Duke's references to the moat and to the sea in his description of Mariana connect her to the gardens of certain Elizabethan great houses, in which a moat represented the sea, and an artificial island, such as the one on which Mariana dwells, might represent England. In this way, Shakespeare associates Mariana with monarchical and quasi-divine authority of the kind exercised by Elizabeth I.

To judge by the Duke's account to Isabella, moreover, water in the form of tears has become an attribute of Mariana's. The Duke informs Isabella that Angelo "[l]eft [Mariana] in her tears, and dried not one of them" (III.1.214). According to the Duke, so unremitting is Mariana's sorrow that her expression of her grief—her "lamentation" (*MM* III.1.216)— has become her habitual garment. Angelo, the Duke says, "has bestowed her on her own lamentation, which she yet wears for his sake" (*MM* III.1.217). And, as if Angelo were a statue in a great-house garden, the Duke says that Angelo is "a marble (a statue) to [Mariana's] tears" (*MM* III.1.217), and, her tears being exceedingly profuse, that this

figurative statue "is washed with [her tears], but relents not" (*MM* III.1.218). The excessive nature of Mariana's tears and the convergent nature of their alleged, metaphoric effects—they cover the bodies of both Mariana and Angelo, serving as a garment for Mariana herself and bath-water for him-as-metaphoric-statue—makes them, and the unyielding grief which they signify, vividly and peculiarly memorable. This is so even as Angelo, whom the Duke likens to a monument—that is, to a statue erected as a memorial—appears to have forgotten Mariana, who weeps while remembering him.

By the Duke's account, Angelo's capacity to forget is considerable. The Duke does not say only that Mariana's brother Frederick was "miscarried at sea" (*MM* III.1.201) or "wrecked at sea" (*MM* III.1.207) in a "perished vessel." When the Duke says that Angelo, "swallowed his vows (to Mariana) whole" (*MM* III.1.215), he also implicitly grants to Angelo the same power of obliteration that he (the Duke) attributes to the unbounded sea that has consumed Frederick, leaving on its surface no markers.

Mariana's weeping, however, is a memorial marker, of sorts. Yet, as far as one knows, it is Angelo, who has rejected her, rather than her deceased, devoted brother Frederick whom Mariana remembers through what the Duke characterizes as her continual glut of tears. Mariana's continual awareness of Angelo leads one to recognize her potential to wish for revenge against him for his repudiation of her. But as we recognize at the play's end, her remembering of him through tears instead gives rise to mercy for him on her own part—as well as on Isabella and

the Duke's, as though each of them, in according Angelo mercy, acted as Mariana's substitute, or double, within the secular sphere of Vienna.

Like the references to water in the form of tears, which potentially connect Mariana through vengeance or mercy to the city outside of St. Luke's, the double sequestration by which her living space is characterized also connects her metaphorically to the city beyond St. Luke's boundaries, where the doubled nature of her enclosure finds correspondences. For, just as Mariana is associated with water—including, notably, tears—she is also associated in various ways with doubling.

Mariana functions in part as a double of Isabella. This is the case during the bed-trick, when Mariana takes Isabella's place in Angelo's bed, within his garden-house. It is also the case at play's end, when Mariana promotes merciful judgment in the Duke by beseeching Isabella to importune the Duke to be merciful to Angelo**.** Additionally, a particular space—Isabella's locked convent—emphasizes Mariana's role as Isabella's double. Shakespeare reveals his detailed awareness of the history and customs of the order of which Isabella is a novitiate: the Order of St. Clare.[228] The key that Isabella uses, for example, to unlock the nunnery for Lucio would have reminded some audience members that a nunnery of that order would have been doubly locked and barricaded, since to be doubly locked behind a series of two gates was a characteristic of the convents of the

[228] G. K. Hunt, "Six Notes on *Measure for Measure*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 15, no. 3 (1964): 167-169, cited in Slights and Holmes 272, n. 33; Jessica Slights and Michael Morgan Holmes. "Isabella's Order: Religious Acts and Personal Desires in *Measure for Measure*." *Studies in Philology* 95, no. 3 (1998): 271-272.

Order of St. Clare.[229] Angelo's garden, which, like the nunnery of St. Clare, is doubly locked and barricaded, finds an echo in both Isabella's convent and the double sequestration of Mariana's dwelling place. Isabella, for whom Mariana serves as a double (and *vice versa*), wields the key, or keys, in both the religious space of the convent and the secular one of Angelo's garden.[230]

Religious and secular convergences are suggested, too, by Mariana's name, which is double in form. It is made up of "Mary," the name of the Virgin Mother of God in the Christian tradition and "Anne," which, according to apocryphal lore, is the name of Mary's own mother. One thinks, too, of the so-called "Virgin Queen," Elizabeth I, whose mother's name, like the Virgin Mary's, was Anne—Anne Boleyn. The name "Anne" suggests a maternal lineage and authority within both the secular and religious spheres. More generally, the instances of doubling in which Mariana is implicated are manifestations of the insistence of Mariana's memory. For memory is a kind of doubling, by which an originary event or person is reduplicated.

[229] Kimberly Reigle, "Staging the Convent as Resistance in *The Jew of Malta* and *Measure for Measure*." *Comparative Drama* 46, no. 4 (2012): 507-508; Angelo's key might also have reminded audiences of the "strange pick-lock" of which Elbow relieves Pompey.
[230] Of interest, too, is the following: Stanley Stewart, *The Enclosed Garden: The Tradition and the Image in Seventeenth-Century Poetry* (Madison; Milwaukee; London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966), 40-41, Figure 8, discusses a woodcut that appears in a ca.1465 edition of the *Canticum Canticorum* depicting the archangel Gabriel, who "holds a large key to the lock of the *porta clausa*" (41) securing a *hortus conclusus*.

Barnardine: Forgetful Counterweight to Mariana

Angelo's propensity to forget finds a near-monstrous echo in the character Barnardine, who would appear to be a veritable embodiment of a lack of memory. Thus, Barnardine, in his liminal location in the prison, among the denizens of the play's criminal class**,** might be said to exert a counterweight to Mariana in her seclusion within St. Luke's. The prison and Mariana's moated grange share something in common with the forest that typically serves as the refuge for outlaws and fugitives in Shakespearean comedies. Although not a wooded retreat, Barnardine's prison cell, which houses his intractable self, is a space outside the spatial center of civic power, while the moated grange is what Maurice Hunt terms "a reduced green world"—reduced, that is, in comparison with the forest in which Shakespearean outlaws usually congregate.[231] It is from such a "green world" that some Shakespearean fugitives re-emerge, to re-join, and perhaps renew, the civic sphere.

As if to signal that there is indeed something comparable about how Mariana and Barnardine function within the play, Shakespeare introduces both of them to the audience in the same way: a conventional authority figure within the play—the Duke and the provost of the prison, respectively—describes each one to another character, implicitly emphasizing a particular, excessive behavior in which each allegedly indulges. It seems that the Duke is accurate in his

[231] Maurice Hunt, "Comfort in Measure for Measure." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 27, no. 2, Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama, (1987): 219.

description. Even if we do not witness Mariana actually weeping, her actions otherwise conform to the Duke's characterization of her as continually mourning—or, at least, as being aware that that is the role allotted to her— "for [Angelo's] sake" (*MM* III.1.217). If Barnardine's actions appear to be in keeping with the Provost's portrayal of him as someone who is "[d]runk many times a day, if not many days entirely drunk" (*MM* IV.2.131-32), it is, however, not clear that the Provost is correct in asserting that Barnardine "apprehends death no more dreadfully but as a drunken sleep: careless, reckless and fearless of what's past, present, or to come" (*MM* IV.2.125-27.). For, apparently for nine years, Barnardine has resisted being putting to death. It would seem, moreover, that it is not death, but life, that Barnardine "apprehends […] as a drunken sleep" (*MM* IV.2.125).

Regardless of how accurate the Provost's portrayal of Barnardine is in all particulars, the degree and frequency of Barnardine's drunkenness as depicted by the Provost does sound extreme. The excessive behavior in which both Mariana and Barnardine are said—and indeed appear—to indulge creates mutually contrasting effects. Mariana's excessive weeping prolongs her memory of the love she once shared with Angelo. Barnardine's excessive drinking makes him "sleepy" (IV.3.25) and seemingly full of forgetting of a kind that entails the virtual obliteration of waking, mundane, sober reality. When the Provost comes to inform Claudio and Barnardine that they are both to be executed within the next twenty-four hours, Claudio advises the Provost that Barnardine is:

> As fast locked up in sleep as guiltless labour
> When it lies starkly in the traveller's bones.
> He will not wake.
>
> *MM* IV.2.53-55

The implication of Claudio's words is that Barnardine has forgotten that he is guilty of murder. The Provost assures the Duke that Barnardine does not deny (*MM* IV.2.122) having committed the murder for which he (the Provost) and the executioner are trying to put him to death, but, although Barnardine may not deny having committed the murder, we do not know whether Barnardine so much as remembers whether or not he has committed it.

Barnardine as Bernard of Clairvaux

As to his own verbalized recollection of his own past, Barnardine is unknowable to us. The prison's Provost speaks for Barnardine, in effect, informing the Duke that, although born in Bohemia, Barnardine was "nursed up here" (*MM* IV.2.113). Whether the Provost's meaning is that Barnardine was "nursed up" in the prison itself, or in the city of Vienna in its entirety is ambiguous. I interpret "here" to mean both the city of Vienna and, latterly, the prison. "Nursed up" in this passage, moreover, has at least partially the figurative sense "schooled." Friar Ludowick earlier has used the word "nursed" in a similar sense. In his unctuous speech to Claudio in which he advises him on the fit way in which to prepare himself for his impending death by execution, he exhorts:

> Be absolute for death: either death or life
> Shall thereby be the sweeter. Reason thus with life:
> If I do lose thee, I do lose a thing

> That none but fools would keep. A breath thou art,
> Servile to all the skyey influences,
> That does this habitation where thou keep'st
> Hourly afflict: merely, thou art death's fool;
> For him thou labour'st by thy flight to shun
> And yet runn'st toward him still. Thou art not noble;
> For all the accomodations that thou bear'st
> Are *nursed* by baseness.
>
> *MM* III.1.5-15 (italics mine)

It is in a parallel scene to the one in which the Duke-as-Friar coaches Claudio on how to face his own execution that the Provost remarks on where Barnardine was "nursed up"; for that scene touches upon the Duke(as-Friar)'s notions of how Barnardine should approach his own death. According to the Provost, Barnardine is well-connected enough—and therefore, one assumes, well-to-do enough—to have friends able to support his repeated efforts to forestall his death sentence. If Barnardine has been figuratively "nursed up" in Vienna, then we might legitimately surmise that his habits are, or were, like those of the other well-connected, well-off male characters we have encountered thus far in the play: he may have been a fornicator, like Angelo and, technically, at least, like Claudio. He may have been a disrespectful client of prostitutes, like Lucio and, possibly—if Lucio is to be believed—like the Duke. Like Lucio, Barnardine could potentially be the father of at least one illegitimate child for whom he has never provided. This is the sort of conduct in which, generally speaking, Vienna seems to "nurse up" its men. I wish to propose, however, that, as a prisoner, Barnardine has received nursing up of a different kind, albeit from a temporal and spatial

remove, from none other than Mariana in the moated grange, whom Shakespeare likens to the Virgin Mary in a *hortus conclusus*.

Barnardine, unlike Claudio, is not amenable to the Duke-as-Friar's proffered guidance on the topic of how to prepare himself for a good death.[232] The Duke-as-Friar informs Barnardine:

> Sir, induced by my charity, and hearing how hastily you are to depart [i.e. how soon you are to be executed], I am come to advise you, comfort you, and pray with you.
>
> *MM* IV.3.43-44

Barnardine flatly refuses the Duke-as-Friar's program. The Provost characterizes Barnardine to the Duke-as-Friar as unconcerned with the life hereafter, but, as above, I would propose that the Provost is incorrect. Rather Barnardine is forgetful of the work-a-day world, the one in which he allegedly has murdered someone and, hypothetically, has at one time or another in the past been sober. Forgetful of the quotidian world, thanks to his habitual drinking, and all but perpetually drunk, Shakespeare's character Barnardine calls to mind Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, the twelfth-century Cistercian abbot, renowned for his devotion to the Virgin Mary. Bernard's initial biographer, William de Thierry, deems the saint's life notable for the fact of his noble mother's breastfeeding him, rather than relegating his suckling to a wet nurse.[233] Moreover, a story eventually accrued to Bernard that, as an adult, he underwent a vision in which a statue of the

---

[232] The advice that the Duke-as-Friar succeeds in giving to Claudio and attempts to give to Barnardine is in the tradition of *memento mori*, a preoccupation in Shakespeare's time.
[233] William de Thierry, Arnold of Bonneval, and Geoffrey of Auxerre. *The First Life of Bernard of Clairvaux*. Translated by Hilary Costello, OCSO. Liturgical Press, 2015, 4.

Virgin Mary fed him with her breast milk and thus made him eloquent.[234] Mariana swears an oath to the Duke to the effect that, if she should turn out to be lying to him about having become Angelo's legal wife, owing to the trick that the Duke himself (when disguised as Friar Ludowick) arranged for her to play on Angelo, she will call down on herself the fate of being "for ever […] confixed here / A marble monument" (*MM* V.1.233-234). The punishment she envisions for herself in her oath—to be transformed into a statue—suggests her affinity with the manifestation of the Virgin Mary in statue form from which Bernard, in a vision, received breast milk and, through that milk, eloquence. It might reasonably be pointed out, of course, that there are no direct indications in the play that Barnardine is eloquent. I would argue, however, that Shakespeare subtly implies that Barnardine, so to speak, "writes" Mariana as an avatar of super-human compassion. In this way, Barnardine displays his Bernard-like eloquence. Barnardine, then, has not just a counter-poised function in the play with respect to Mariana, but also a symbiotic one, by which she has "nursed [him] up" and he has, so to say, written her. In saying that Barnardine writes Mariana, I do not mean that he has authority over her, but that, through his exegetical efforts, he reveals her import as a figure of emergent influence in Vienna.

Bernard of Clairvaux was well regarded among Protestants and Roman Catholics alike in Shakespeare's lifetime for his writings, including his *Sermons*

[234] Melanie Holcomb, "The Hungry Monk: Bernard of Clairvaux in a Trans-corporeal Landscape," Postmedieval: *A Journal of Medieval Cultural Studies* 11-1 (2020): 81-82; James France, *Medieval Images of Saint Bernard of Clairvaux* (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 2007), 207-208; 215.

on the Song of Songs.[235] In his *Sermons* Bernard draws upon the work of earlier exegetes, such as Origen, who had decreed that the startlingly erotic language of the Song of Songs was allegorical, with a "bride" character representing the Church or, alternately, an individual soul and a "bridegroom" character standing for God. In a modification of this schema, Bernard generally treats the "bridegroom" in the Song of Songs as Christ and the "bride" as the Virgin Mary, figured, moreover, as the "mother-bride" of Christ.[236] Bernard dwells on the breasts of both the bride and bridegroom, and their propensity for yielding wine or milk. The Song of Songs itself, with its "many references to the breasts of the two lovers," as James E. Mundy notes, could be said to invite such a preoccupation.[237] Mundy traces the allegorical interpretations of the bride's breasts and the liquid they exude, demonstrating how in the centuries from Origen to Bernard, the bride's breasts, taken partitively, were equated with the Church, or, as a variation on that, with the Old and New Testaments (one breast representing one testament, respectively). The liquid the bride's breasts were assumed to produce was to some degree viewed relatively straightforwardly as the fortifying milk of the Church's

---

[235] Shaw, "Such Fire is Love," 535-356.
[236] Anne W. Astell, *The Song of Songs in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), Introduction (1-24); E. James Mundy, "Gerard David's 'Rest on the flight into Egypt': Further Additions to Grape Symbolism." *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 12 (1981-1982): 216.
[237] Mundy, 216. Mundy states the emphasis on the breasts of the bride and bridegroom is particularly significant to a consideration of the Virgin Mary and her breasts with relation to grapes, wine, and milk in chapter 7, sections 7 and 8 (7:7 and 7:8), of the Song of Songs—a chapter that Bernard did not reach in his Sermons. So assiduously and painstakingly did Bernard "milk," so to speak, the text for every drop of meaning that he made very slow, although in-depth, progress through only part of the Song of Songs in the eighteen years during which he wrote his *Sermons*.

teachings; however, because the bride's breasts were thought of as grapes, her breasts were also supposed to give forth wine. In particular passages within his *Sermons*, Bernard to some degree conflates wine and milk, in that he ascribes to grapes the same nurturing qualities as a mother's breasts.[238]

> The soul does not deny that it is *inebriated* but with love, not wine.
> Sermon 49:1[239] (italics mine)

Mariana's weeping, with its echoes of the Virgin Mary's sorrowing over Christ's execution on the Cross, connects Mariana "as" the Virgin Mary with the condemned prisoner Barnardine through allusions not just to the Roman Catholic historical figure Bernard of Clairvaux but also to the Jesuit martyr Robert Southwell. Like Bernard, Southwell was a devotee of the Virgin Mary. Scholars have argued that Southwell, who was executed for treason during Elizabeth I's reign, wrote in a Bernardine style. Before his execution, Southwell was

---

[238] Mundy, 216-218: Mundy, 216, states "[S]ince the biblical love poem known as the *Song of Songs* was written, a substantial amount of exegetical literature was produced regarding the metaphor "a cluster of grapes"—a "Bunch of Grapes," in the parlance of *Measure for Measure*—"for the breasts of both the Bride and Bridegroom of the poem."

[239] Bernard de Clairvaux, Sermon 49:1, cited by Kilian Walsh in Saint Bernard de Clairvaux, *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux, Volume II: On the Song of Songs, I, trans. Kilian Walsh,* OCSO, xxiii. Consider also the following from Bernard de Clairvaux, *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux, Volume Three: On the Song of Songs, II*, trans. Kilian Walsh, OCSO. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 1983, Sermon 23, which calls to mind Mariana's entering into Angelo's garden house, or "banqueting house":

> He has brought me into the chamber stored with the wine of his love…I have entered there alone, but not for my utility alone: Each step I take is yours as well; it is for you that I advance. All that I may obtain in abundance from the divine liberality I share with you.
> Bernard of Clairvaux, Sermon 23:2

imprisoned in the Tower, where he received the attentions of the notorious torturer-rapist Richard Topcliffe, who may be a partial model for Angelo. While interred in the Tower, Southwell had with him a *Bible* as well as writings of Bernard.[240] In Shakespeare's time, both Bernard and Southwell were highly esteemed as writers, even by Protestants.[241] Southwell's *Marie Magdalen's Funeral Tears,* an early example of so-called "tear literature"—was generally popular when it was published in England in 1591.[242] Thomas Lodge, in a somewhat later example of this genre, "Prosopopoeia Containing the Teares of the Holy, Blessed, and Sanctified Marie, the Mother of God," published in 1596, represents the Virgin Mary as referring to her tears over Christ's wounded corpse as breast milk-like:

> [A]s I weep on his face, let him sucke up my teares.[243]

Lodge presents the Virgin Mary's tears, like a mother's milk, as life-preserving. Mariana's tears similarly preserve her beloved Angelo in memory: her weeping

---

[240] Shaw, "Such Fire Is Love," 333-334.
[241] Shaw, "Such Fire Is Love," 333; 335.
[242] Ibid., 350, n. 5, citing Franz Posset, "The Elder Luther on Bernard." *Benedictine Review* 42:1 (1991): 37, who reports that Martin Luther loved the writing of Bernard of Clairvaux. My point is that Protestants generally during Southwell's lifetime might therefore also be supposed to be disposed to look favorably on Bernard's works.
[243] Thomas Lodge, *Prosopopeia: The Teares of the Holy, Blessed, and Sanctified Marie, the Mother of God* (London: Printed [by T. Scarlet] for Edward White, and to be sold at the little North doore of Paules, 1596). Accessed through Early English Book Online.

keeps him "alive" in her memory, while her tears distill her memory, rendering it as pure mercy, cleansed of the impulse to exact vengeance.

While it is not clear whether Shakespeare had read any account of Bernard's lactation vision, he is known to have been familiar with Jacobus de Voragine's *Golden Legends* concerning lives of various saints. Thus, Shakespeare presumably could have read in de Voragine's "Life of St. Bernard" of how Bernard's mother had insisted upon nursing him herself, believing that in this way she would infuse him with her own goodness and love for God. Shakespeare's knowledge of images of Bernard's lactation vision is also uncertain. It was a popular image among the various conventional images of Bernard.[244] Yet, while numerous examples of iconographic representations of Bernard's vision dating from the late middle ages exist throughout continental Europe, only one such image is known to be extant in England. [245] Given that the image was particularly popular, one might presume that likely there were more of them within England on public, or semi-public display, or held in private homes, before the iconoclasm born of the English Reformation led to widespread destruction (or concealment) of Roman Catholic ritual objects. Thus, one may only speculate as to whether Shakespeare saw such an image, just as one may only speculate as to whether he had read any account of Bernard's vision. Yet, even if Shakespeare did not know of Bernard's apocryphal vision of receiving milk from the Virgin Mary's breast,

[244] France, *Medieval Images of Saint Bernard,* 205.
[245] France, *Medieval Images of Saint Bernard,* 221.

Bernard's own writings on the Song of Songs, should Shakespeare have read them, would have amply revealed to the playwright Bernard's devotion to the Virgin together with his figuring of her own tendance of him as the spiritual feeding of him with her intoxicating breast milk. Her spiritual nurturing of him with sweet emissions from her body is an instance of the spiritual united with the bodily: or, perhaps more accurately, the bodily giving rise to the spiritual.

The Bohemian Barnardine and the Renewing Power of Music

By way of responding to the Duke-as-Friar's inquiry about Barnardine's background, the Provost imparts the information that Barnardine is "[a] Bohemian born" (*MM* IV.2 113) "Bohemian" is a loaded word. During much of Shakespeare's lifetime, the Kingdom of Bohemia was ruled by the Holy Roman Emperor, Rudolph II. Rudolph was well known for his interests in alchemy and in furthering a society in which people of all religions might live together in peace.[246] In *The Winter's Tale,* composed approximately seven years after *Measure for Measure,* Bohemia figures far more prominently than in *Measure for*

[246] Frances Yates, *Rosicrucian Enlightenment (*London; Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), 16-17.

Measure. Shakespeare's characterization of Bohemia in *The Winter's Tale,* however, is reminiscent of many facets of *Measure for Measure* that stem from Mariana and Barnardine's mysterious connection and presences. There are thematic echoes, too, of *Measure for Measure* in *The Winter's Tale*: for instance, *The Winter's Tale* has a marked bipartite structure, in which the first half of the play, which transpires in Sicilia, revolves around withering anger and suspicion, while the second half—which takes place largely in Bohemia—centers on the renewal and resurgence of life. I would suggest that the play's bipartite structure is anticipated in latent form in *Measure for Measure.* Mariana and Barnardine do not figure in the play until the beginning of Act III, scene 1, and Act IV, scene 2, respectively, but they inform the ending of the play with merciful judgment and, through Barnardine's still-living presence, hope for life without end, a goal of both Christians and alchemists. Their roles are obscured, to be sure, but none the less revitalizing.

In both plays, too, a shipwreck is the vehicle by which the bipartite element is introduced: a shipwreck that is a paradoxical source of rebirth or renewal. In *The Winter's Tale* Shakespeare has expanded upon and developed further threads that are present in *Measure for Measure*, allowing us to read backwards, so to speak, finding meaning in *Measure for Measure* through our reading of *The Winter's Tale*. This is the case as regards breast feeding and music as promoting flourishing, harmonious life. In *The Winter's Tale*, Perdita, as a newborn infant, wrested from her mother, appears to require no nursing

whatsoever. Her temporary custodian Antigonous, bearer of a name with the threatening-sounding meaning "against life," proves not only to pose no threat to Perdita, but also to possess the miraculous power to keep her alive, despite having no means of nursing her. Moreover, he is able to keep himself alive just long enough to deliver her via shipwreck to the fantastical land of Bohemia. Perhaps Perdita requires no breast milk at this juncture, owing to the circumstance that the ship upon which Antigonous conveys her to safety functions as a second womb. Therefore, one would not expect her to suckle until she had been reborn in Bohemia, a place which Shakespeare characterizes as burgeoning with spring growth and abundance.

Through her successful translation to Bohemia, Perdita provides a contrast to her hapless elder brother Mamillius, who promptly dies upon being denied his imprisoned mother Hermione's breast and breast milk. Like many another character from *The Winter's Tale*, Mamillius is the bearer of a significant name. "Mamillius" sounds like the first parts of both the English word "mamma" and the Latin word "mamilla," meaning "breast" or "teat."[247] Thus, Mamillius' name reflects his affinity for—indeed his utter reliance upon—his mother's breast milk. Although "Perdita" means "utterly lost" in Latin, it is Mamillius who becomes lost beyond recall. Perdita is not lost with respect to Bohemia: for there the foundling is cherished. Her flowering there into adulthood coincides with the

[247] "Mamma," of course, is the young child's word for addressing its mother, but, in Latin, it also means "a breast, esp. of females."

blossoming of the daffodils, as announced by a song sung by the Bohemian thief Autolycus:

> When daffodils begin to peer
> With heigh the doxy over the dale,
> Why then comes in the sweet o'the year.
>
> *WT* IV.3.1-3[248]

Distinguished as the son of two fathers, Mercury, who promotes exchanges (theft; buying and selling) and Apollo, the god of music, Autolycus roves the countryside of Bohemia, a land characterized by spring, in which his singing, as much as the first daffodils, are a harbinger of renewed life.

Music serves, too, in *The Winter's Tale* to bring renewal and restoration to Sicilia. In Sicilia at the play's end, the character Paulina, in keeping with the ability of Apollo's bard Orpheus to animate the dead, calls for music in order to bring the statue of Perdita's dead mother Hermione to life (*WT* V.3.98). As is often remarked, it remains ambiguous as to whether Hermione really is dead, and whether the statue of her really is a statue. Regardless, she has been subjected to psychic and social death through her husband's repudiation of her and her egregious loss of her son to death and her newborn daughter to an unknown fate. In these respects, Hermione is not unlike Mariana in her moated grange.

It seems to me that there is Bernardine connection between Barnardine who indirectly is seen to "write" Mariana and Paulina who restores Hermione.[249]

---

[248] The text referenced is: William Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale,* ed., John Pitcher (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2010).

[249] Three diminutive names in Shakespeare—Rosaline (in *RJ*); Barnardine (in *MM*); and Paulina (in *WT*)—designate characters who are stand-ins for another: Rosaline is a stand-in for an aspect

In Bernard's *Sermons on the Song of Songs*, he refers to the Apostle Paul as a figure who, like himself, seeks to interpret the nature of the Virgin Mary's breasts as an ever-renewing source, while also suggesting that Paul, like the "bride" (the Virgin Mary), possesses an inexhaustible "fountain":

> But the mouth of Paul is a mighty and unfailing fountain, ever open to us all; and as I have often done before, so now too I draw from its resources in my attempt to interpret the breasts of the bride.
>
> Sermon 10:1[250]

Of the Virgin Mary's breasts Bernard effuses, for example:

> For when these have been drained dry they are replenished again from the maternal fount within, and offered to all who will drink. Here is a further reason why I insist that the breasts of the bride are superior to worldly or carnal love;[251] the numbers who drink of them, however great, cannot exhaust their content; their flow is never suspended, for they draw unceasingly from the inward fountains of charity. Out of her heart shall flow rivers of water, there will be a spring inside her, welling up to eternal life. The accumulating praises of the breasts come to a climax in the perfume of the ointments, because they not only feed us with the choice food of doctrine, but shed around them like a pleasing aroma the repute of good deeds.
>
> Sermon 9:10

One of Paulina's "good deeds" is the invoking of music to (re-)animate the statue of Hermione. Paulina's resort to music returns us to our first glimpse of Mariana in *Measure for Measure*, at which she listens to a boy play music and sing. The presence of music alone is suggestive of alchemical renewal. This is made

---

of Romeo, as I suggest in Chapter 2; Barnardine is a version of Bernard of Clairvaux; Paulina is, in her turn, a version of the Apostle Paul.

[250] The translation referenced for Sermons 1-20 is: Saint Bernard de Clairvaux, *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux, Volume Two: On the Song of Songs, I,* trans. Kilian Walsh, OCSO.

[251] As noted above, Healy argues in *Shakespeare Alchemy, and the Creative Imagination*, 6, that Shakespeare was like John Donne in engaging in a poetics that sought to reconcile bodily and spiritual love.

explicit through the role of music in *The Winter's Tale,* and becomes apparent at the end of *Measure for Measure*, even if less obviously than in *The Winter's Tale*. Within the context of the whole *Measure for Measure*, the lyrics of the boy's song, too, may be understood as signifying the possibility of renewal:

> Take, oh take those lips away
> That so sweetly were foresworn,
> And those eyes, the break of day,
> Lights that do mislead the morn;
> But my kisses bring again, bring again,
> Seals of love, but sealed in vain, sealed in vain.
>
> *MM* IV.1.1-6

The lyrics point toward the source of which Bernard speaks in his extolling of the Apostle Paul and the Virgin Mary, the "sealed fountain" of the Song of Songs:

> My fifter my fpouse is as a garden inclosed, as a fpring fhut up, and a fountaine fealed up.
>
> Song of Songs 4:12

In the boy's song, it is Angelo—or, as it may be, some similar, "fictional," faithless lover—whose "seals" formed of his kisses, have been broken by means of his own perjury. Mariana "as" the Virgin Mary has the authority to re-seal Angelo's lips, by which—to paraphrase some of Mariana's own lines—she "mould[s]" him anew from out of his "faults" (*MM* V.1.452).

The Duke stipulates that Angelo is to intercept him at the "consecrated fount" (*MM* IV.3.89) outside of Vienna upon his feigned return to the city (for, in truth, he has not left the city, as he had claimed he would do, but, instead, has lurked on its fringes, disguised as a friar, and availing himself of a friar's

privileges). Thus, the Duke and Angelo convene first at the fount outside the city. Then, within the streets of Vienna, they convene around Mariana, who "as" the Blessed Virgin Mary "is" the fountain of the Song of Songs. Fittingly, in *Measure for Measure,* Mariana is associated with water, whether the water of St. Luke's moat, or whether that of her own distilling, transformative tears.

The Weight of Mariana's Tear-Fostered Memory

It is Mariana's memory that both allows her to give birth to mercy, as though giving birth to Christ, who is mercy incarnate and, through that mercy, to influence Isabella and the Duke, so that, at play's end, the Duke pardons Angelo. Bernard of Clairvaux links mercy to memory:

> But let us go back to the ointments of the bride. Do you not see how that ointment of merciful love…is to be preferred to the others? …Better by far is the ointment of devotion, distilled from the memory of God's beneficence…
>
> Sermon 12:10

Angelo does not harm only Mariana herself. He also extorts Isabella, a circumstance of which Mariana is made aware unavoidably when the Duke and Isabella beseech her to sleep with Angelo in lieu of Isabella. Such is the extent of Mariana's humility, however, that it enables her to forgive Angelo, extending mercy to him. Her propensity to forgive is of the same magnitude as certain

biblical figures praised by Bernard for their "great humility for all in all that they did" (Sermon 12:5): Samuel, for example, who

> …mourned for…the man who was intent on killing him; his heart grew warm with the fire of charity, his spirit melted within him, and love made him weep. And because his *reputation* was diffused abroad like perfume, Scripture tells of him that 'all Israel from Dan to Beersheba came to know that Samuel was accredited as a prophet of the Lord.'
>
> Sermon 12:4 (italics mine)

It would not be entirely inaccurate to say that Angelo is "intent on killing" (Sermon 12:4) Mariana. At least, he is willing to ruin her reputation, a deed that, in the world of Vienna, could force Mariana into prostitution, with all the dangers that would entail, including, potentially, death through criminal violence at the hands of a client; venereal disease; starvation; lack of shelter; and complications of an illegitimate pregnancy. Not realizing that he himself has been duped and that, as a result, he has had sexual intercourse not with Isabella but with Mariana in his garden house, Angelo states that he has not had any dealings with Mariana since he spurned her five years before.

> I must confess I know this woman,
> And for five years since there was some speech of marriage
> Betwixt myself and her, which was broke off,
> Partly for that her promised proportions
> Came short of composition, but in chief
> For that her *reputation* was disvalued
> In levity. Since which time of five years
> I never spoke with her, saw her, nor heard from her,
> Upon my faith and honor.
>
> *MM* V.1.214-22 (italics mine)

Angelo deceitfully blames his failure to honor his word to marry her primarily upon her own supposedly compromised "reputation" (*MM* V.1.219), which, as far as one can tell, has been "disvalued / In levity" (*MM* V.1.219-220) by no one but himself.

Transcending Angelo's machinations, however, Mariana is revealed as "a prophet of the Lord" (Sermon 12:4). As shown in her forgiveness of Angelo and her wish to preserve him from death by execution, the staggering degree of Mariana's humility, like that of biblical figures such as Joseph and Samuel to love even those who have wronged them, augments her reputation, just as their actions have magnified theirs.[252] These biblical figures' charitable deeds have made them memorable, says Bernard, "their good odor a perfume in the memory" (Sermon12:5). Moreover, he avers, such figures' own memory is the source of the deeds from which arise their reputations:[253]

> Quite rightly then did I say that the man whose [inner] resources are poor is not called upon to prepare this ointment [in his breast, through meditation], for this is the work of one who can draw on the memory of divine favors.
>
> Sermon 10:9

---

[252] In William Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure.* Directed by Tyne Rafaeli, Santa Cruz Shakespeare, July 21, 2017, The Audrey Stanley Grove, Santa Cruz, California, Annie Francisco Worden, the actor who played Mariana, embodied Mariana's humility in an astonishing, revelatory performance that informs my engagement with Bernard of Clairvaux's words about humility. I served as the dramaturg for that production, so had the opportunity to observe many of Worden's performances, both at rehearsals and at public performances: all of them were remarkably fine. In retrospect, it seems to me that Worden's gestures and posture were similar to those of the Virgin Mary in certain late medieval and Renaissance era paintings of the Annunciation, in which the Virgin turns her body obliquely, with one forearm held across her breast.

[253] Bernard of Clairvaux, accords special status to "three faculties: the reason, the will, the memory, and these three may be said to be identified with the soul itself" (Sermon 11:5).

Angelo's repudiation of Mariana over her supposedly cheapened "reputation"—cheapened, as he hopes, by himself—shows him as being willfully forgetful of Mariana's true nature. Angelo, thus, is a model for Barnardine in his strictly secular guise of monstrous, worldly, forgetful drunkard, who is drunk on literal alcohol, rather than on the spiritual love that, as Bernard declares, "is wine" (Sermon 49:1).[254] Such wine is proffered by the bridegroom to the bride in the "wine-cellar" into which he has led the bride in the Song of Songs (2:4)—a place of recreation most unlike Angelo's analogous garden house.

If the weightiness of the power Mariana wields at play's end is surprising, this is owing to her power having been masked by its implicitly being attributed to others—to Elizabeth I and to the Virgin Mary, as well as to the Virgin's complement, Mary Magdalène. Mariana may seem to exist only in marginal spaces. By means of the play's liquid imagery together with its deployment of the motif of doubling, however, those seemingly marginal spaces suggest correspondences between Mariana and certain political and religious personages—namely, Elizabeth I and the Virgin Mary, whose personage is augmented by way of association with Mary Magdalène—that add weight to Mariana's judgment about Angelo's worth. In this way, Mariana's judgment bears theological and political import to a degree that it otherwise would not.

[254] The translation referenced for Sermons 47-66 is: Saint Bernard de Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs, III,* trans., Kilian Walsh OCSO and Irene M. Edmonds. (Cistercian Publications, 1979.)

A paragon of a self-effacing exuder of mercy Mariana at first appears as insignificant as the Virgin Mary seemed, before the archangel Gabriel came to her with the news that God had chosen her, as it says in the New Testament Book of Luke, as if the "St. Luke's" in which Mariana lived were a book for us to read that tells us of potential worlds. Contemporary, Western iconography oftentimes shows the Virgin Mary as reading a book when the archangel Gabriel appears to her.[255] As the twentieth-century poet H.D. says of the Virgin Mary, as depicted by medieval and Renaissance painters:

> …[S]he carries a book but it is not
> the tome of the ancient wisdom,
> the pages, I imagine, are the blank pages
> of the unwritten volume of the new.
>
> "Tribute to the Angels,"
> 38:9-12[256]

For I do not propose that Mariana is meant to represent, in strictly allegorical fashion, Mary Magdalène; the Magdalène's complement, the Virgin Mary; or the Virgin's secular counterpart, Elizabeth I, but rather that Mariana's presence, or displaced presence, in certain enclosed garden-spaces is meant to elicit something subtler—nostalgic yearnings for made-up pasts and potential futures, when a female authority figure was, or would be, merciful to all in the manner of an ideal mother of all. Shakespeare even seems to leave open the possibility that it is not

[255] Miles, 1-2; David M. Robb, "The Iconography of the Annunciation in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," *The Art Bulletin* 18: 4 (1936): 480-526.
[256] H.D. *Trilogy* (New York: New Directions, 1973).

his oblique assimilating of Mariana to the Virgin Mary and to Elizabeth I that lends her (Mariana's) merciful judgment weight; but, rather, that it is the contrast that Mariana provides to those two personages, as a mere girl who nevertheless possesses merciful faculty of judgment.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Anonymous, *The Book of Common Prayer, and Adminystracion of the Sacramentes, and Other Rites and Ceremonies inf the Churche of Englande*. London: in Officina Edovardi Whitchurche, 1553.

Bernard de Clairvaux, Saint. *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux, Volume Two: On the Song of Songs, I.* Translated by Kilian Walsh OCSO. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 1971.

———. *The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux, Volume Three: On the Song of Songs, II*. Translated by Kilian Walsh OCSO. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 1983.

———. *On the Song of Songs, III.* Translated by Kilian Walsh, OCSO and Irene M. Edmonds. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 1979.

de Voragine, Jacobus. *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints.* Translated by William G Ryan. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Eliot, T.S. *Collected Poems: 1909-1935.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1936.

Florio, John. *Worlde of Wordes, or Most Copious, and Exact Dictionarie in Italian and English.* London: By Arnold Hatfield for Edw. Blount, 1598. Accessed through Early English Book Online.

Gerard, John. *The Herball or Generall Historie of Plants.* London,1597. Published in facsimile by Walter J. Johnson, Inc., Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, Ltd., Amsterdam; Norwood, N.J., 1974.

H.D. *Trilogy.* New York: New Directions, 1973.

Lodge, Thomas. *Prosopopeia: The Teares of the Holy, Blessed, and Sanctified Marie, the Mother of God.* London: Printed [by T. Scarlet] for Edward White, and to be sold at the little North doore of Paules, 1596. Accessed through Early English Book Online.

O'Brien, Edna. *The Little Red Chairs*. London: Faber and Faber, 2015.

P. Ovidius Naso. *The XV Books of P. Ovidius Naso, Entytuled Metamorphosis.* Translated by Arthur Golding. London: By Willyem Seres, 1567. Accessed through Early English Book Online.

Parkinson, John. *Paradisi in Sole Paradisus Terrestris.* London: Printed by Humfrey Lownes and Robert Young, 1629.

Plutarch. The *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes compared together by that grave learned philosopher and historiographer, Plutarke of Chæronea; translated out of Greek into French by James Amyot; and out of French into Englishe, by Thomas North.* London: Printed by Thomas Vautroullier and John Wight, 1579. Accessed through Early English Book Online.

———. *Moralia.* Translated by Philemon Holland. London: Printed by Arnold Hatfield, 1603. Accessed through Early English Books Online.

Pound, Ezra. *Selected Poems of Ezra Pound.* New York: New Directions, 1957.

Raban, Jonathan. *Passage to Juneau: A Sea and Its Meanings*. New York: Random House, 1999.

Shakespeare, William. *Anthony* (sic) *and Cleopatra.* Edited by Michael Neill. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

———. *Antony and Cleopatra.* Edited by John Wilders. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2018.

———. *King Lear.* Edited by R.A. Foakes. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2017.

———. *Measure for Measure.* Edited by Brian Gibbons. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

———. *Measure for Measure.* Edited by J.W. Lever. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2015.

———. *Richard II.* Edited by Charles R. Forker. London: The Arden Shakespeare. 2002.

———. *Romeo and Juliet.* Edited by Jill L. Levenson. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. *Romeo and Juliet.* Edited by René Weis. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2012.

———. *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* Edited by Katherine Duncan-Jones. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2010.

———. *The Tempest.* Edited by Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden T. Vaughan. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 1999.

———. *The Winter's Tale.* Edited by John Pitcher. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2010.

Shirley, James, *A Lady of Pleasure* (1637). Edited by Marilyn J. Thorssen. New York: Garland Publishing, 1980.

Terence, *The Eunuch*. Loeb Classical Library Online, 2021.

The Geneva Bible, A Fascimile of the 1560 Edition. Edited by William Whittingham. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

Thomkis, Thomas. *Lingua, or The Combat of the Tongue and the Five Sense for Superiority, A Pleasant Comœdy.* London: Printed by G. Eld for Simon Waterson, 1607.

William de Thierry, Arnold of Bonneval, and Geoffrey of Auxerre. *The First Life of Bernard of Clairvaux*. Translated by Hilary Costello, OCSO. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2015.

Secondary Sources

Abraham, Lyndy. *A Dictionary of Alchemical Imagery.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Adelman, Janet. *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays.* New York; London: Routledge 1992.

———. *The Common Liar.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.

Aftel, Mandy. *Essence and Alchemy: A Natural History of Perfume*. Layton, Utah: Gibbs Smith, 2008.

Astington, John H. "'Fault' in Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 36:3 (1985): 330-334

Andrews, Martin. "Theobalds Palace: The Gardens and Park." *Garden History* 21, no. 2 (1993): 129-49.

Astell, Anne W. *The Song of Songs in the Middle Ages.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Ayo, Nicholas. *The Hail Mary: A Verbal Icon of Mary.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

Bassi, Karen. Note to author, 7 January 2020.

Bate, A. Jonathan. "An Herb by Any Other Name: *Romeo and Juliet,* IV.iv.5-6." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33:3 (1982) 336.

Bayer, Penny. "Lady Margaret Clifford's Alchemical Receipt Book and the John Dee Circle," *Ambix* 52:3 (2005): 271-284.

Bono, Barbara J. *Literary Transvaluation: From Vergilian Epic to Shakespearean Tragicomedy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages.* Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982.

Classen, Constance, David Howes, and Anthony Synnott. *Aroma: The Cultural History of Smell.* London; New York: Routledge, 1994.

Crane, Mary Thomas. "Roman World, Egyptian Earth: Cognitive Difference and Empire in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*." *Comparative Drama* 43:1 (2009): 1-17.

Daley, Brian E. "Late Medieval Iconography of Mary." In *Medieval Gardens,* 253-278*,* edited by Elisabeth B. MacDougall. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1986.

De Grazia, Margareta. "Homonynms Before and After Lexical Standardization," *Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft West*, *Jahrbuch* (1990): 143-156.

Dugan, Holly. *The Ephemeral History of Perfume: Scent and Sense in Early Modern England.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008.

Duncan-Jones, Katherine. "Deep-Dyed Canker Blooms: Botanical Reference in Shakespeare's Sonnet 54." *The Review of English Studies* 46:184 (1995): 521-525.

Emmerich, Sharon. "Traversing Monstrosity: Perilous Women and Powerful Men upon Shakespeare's Roads," in *Reading the Road, from Shakespeare's Crossways to Bunyan's Highways,* edited by Lisa Hopkins and Bill Angus. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2019.

Enterline, Lynn. *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.

Erhardt, Michelle A. and Amy M. Morris. Introduction to *Mary Magdalène: Iconographic Studies from the Middle Ages to the* Baroque, edited by Michelle A. Erhardt and Amy M. Morris. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Ferguson, Liane and Paul Yachnin. "The Name of Juliet's Nurse." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 32:1 (1981): 95-96.

Fine, Susanna Greer. "Verona's Summer Flower: The 'Virtues' of Herb Paris in *Romeo and Juliet*." *ANQ* 8:4 (1995): 5-8.

Fisher, Will. "The Renaissance Beard: Masculinity in Early Modern England," *Renaissance Quarterly*, 54 (2001), 155-87.

———. "'Had It a Codpiece, 'Twere a Man Indeed': The Codpiece as Constitutive Accessory in Early Modern English Culture," in *Ornamentalism: The Art of Renaissance Accessories,*102-129. Edited and with an Introduction by Bella Mirabella. The University of Michigan Press, 2011.

Forbes, R.J. *A Short History of the Art of Distillation: From the Beginning up to the Death of Celius Blumenthal.* Leiden: Brill, 1948.

France, James. *Medieval Images of Bernard of Clairvaux*. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 2007.

Gertsman, Elina. *Worlds Within: Opening the Medieval Shrine Madonna*. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015.

Goldstein, Darra. *The Oxford Companion to Sugar and Sweets.* Oxford; New York Oxford University Press, 2015.

Grieve, Mrs. M. *A Modern Herbal,* Volumes I and II. New York: Dover Publications, 1971.

Griffiths, Mark and Edward Wilson. “Sweet Musk Roses: Botany and Lexis in Shakespeare.” *Notes and Queries* 65:1 (2018): 53-67.

Harris, Jonathan Gil. “‘Narcissus in Thy Face’: Roman Desire and The Difference It Fakes in *Antony and Cleopatra.*” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45: 4 (1994): 408-425.

Harrison, Thomas P., Jr. “Hang up Philosophy.” *Shakespeare Association Bulletin* 22 (1947): 203-209.

Haskins, Susan. *Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor*. City: Harcourt Brace (originally published by Harper Collins), 1993.

Healy, Margaret. *“Shakespeare, Alchemy, and the Creative Imagination: The Sonnets and A Lover’s Complaint.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Henderson, Paula. *The Tudor House and Garden.* New Haven: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University Press, 2005.

———. “The Architecture of the Tudor Garden,” *Garden History* 27: 1, Tudor Gardens (1999): 54-72.

Holcomb, Melanie. “The Hungry Monk: Bernard of Clairvaux in a Trans-corporeal Landscape.” Postmedieval: *A Journal of Medieval Cultural Studies* 11-1 (2020): 80-90.

Hopkins, Lisa. “Herb Paris, *Romeo and Juliet,* and Thomas Hasketh.” *Notes and Queries* 65:4 (2018): 530-533.

Horowitz, Elliott. “The New World and the Changing Face of Europe.” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 28:4 (1997): 1181-1201.

Hunt, G. K. “Six Notes on *Measure for Measure*.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 15, no. 3 (1964): 167-72.

Hunt, Maurice. "Comfort in Measure for Measure." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 27, no. 2, Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama (1987): 212-32.

Jacobson, Miriam. *Barbarous Antiquity: Representing the Past in the Poetry of Early Modern England.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.

Mark Jones, "Some Versions of the *Hortus Conclusus* in Elizabethan Landscape and Literature," *Literature Compass* 6:2 (2009), 349-361.

Kahn, Coppélia. "Coming of Age in Verona." *Modern Language Studies* 8: 1 (1977-1978): 5-22.

Kennedy, Colleen. "'Do You Smell A Fault?': Detecting and Deodorizing King Lear's Distinctly Feminine Odor." *Appositions: Studies in Renaissance / Early Modern Literature & Culture* 3 (2010). http://appositions.blogspot.com/2010/05/colleen-kennedy-deodorizing-king-lear.html (accessed Aug. 21, 2021).

Levin, Richard. "Grumio's 'Rope-Tricks' and the Nurse's 'Ropery.'" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 22:1 (1971): 82-86.

Liddiard, Robert. *Landscape of Lordship: Norman Castles and the Countryside in Medieval Norfolk; 1066-1200.* Oxford: BAR Publishing, 2000.

Linden, Stanton . *The Alchemy Reader: From Hermes Trismegistus to Isaac Newton*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Mahood, M.M. *Shakespeare's Wordplay.* London: Methuen, 1957

Maxwell-Stuart, G. *Chemical Choir: A History of Alchemy.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2012.

McCann, John. "An Historical Enquiry into the Design and Use of Dovecotes." *Transactions of the Ancient Monuments Society* 35, 1991.

McLean, Teresa. *Medieval English Gardens*. London: Collins, 1981.

Miles, Saetveit Laura. *The Virgin Mary's Book at the Annunciation: Reading, Interpretation and Devotion in Medieval England*. Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2020.

Muchembled, Robert. *Smells: A Cultural History of Odours in Early Modern Times.* Translated by Susan Pickford. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2020.

Mundy, E. James. "Gerard David's 'Rest on the Flight into Egypt'" Further Additions to Grape Symbolism." *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 12 (1981-1982): 211-222.

Nagler, Danielle. "Towards the Smell of Mortality: Shakespeare and the Ideas of Smell 1588-1625." *The Cambridge Quarterly* 26:1 (1997): 42-58.

Newman, Paula and George Walton Williams. “Paris: The Mirror of Romeo.” *Renaissance Papers, 1981* (1982): 13-19.

Palmer, Richard. “In Bad Odour: Smell and its Significance in Medicine from Antiquity to the Seventeenth Century.” In *Medicine and the Five Senses,* 63-38, edited by W.F. Bynum and Roy Porter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Panek, Jennifer. “Why Were There Stewed Prunes in Shakespearean Brothels?” *English Language Notes* 42:3 (2005): 18-21.

Park, Jennifer. “Discandying Cleopatra: Preserving Cleopatra’s Infinite Variety in Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra.*” *Studies in Philology* 113:3 (2016): 595-633.

Parker, Patricia. “Infidels, and Renegades: Antony and Cleopatra” in *Center or Margin: Revisions of the English Renaissance in Honor or Leeds Barroll.* Selinsgrove, Pennsylvania:Susquehanna University Press. Rprtd. In. *Shakespeare Criticism* 110, 2006.

Paster, Gail Kern *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Pelling, Margaret. “Appearance and Reality: Barber-Surgeons, the Body, and Disease.” In *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis,* 82-112*,* edited by A.L. Beier and Roger Finlay. London: Longman, 1986.

———. “‘The Very Head and Front of My Offending’: Beards, Portraiture and Self-Presentation in Early Modern England.” *New Perspectives on the History of Facial Hair: Framing the Face,* edited by Jennifer Evans and Alun Withey. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018.

Pollard, Tanya. *Drugs and Theater in Early Modern England.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Posset, Franz. “The Elder Luther on Bernard.” *Benedictine Review* 42:1 (1991): 22-52.

Potter, Ursula. “Greensickness in *Romeo and Juliet: Considerations on a Sixteenth-Century Disease of Virgins:* In *The Premodern Teenager: Youth in Society 1150*-1650, edited by Konrad Eisenbichler, 271-291. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2002.

———. "Navigating the Dangers of Female Puberty in Renaissance Drama," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 53:2 (2013): 421-439.

———. *The Unruly Womb.* Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, University of Western Michigan, 2019.

Reigle, Kimberly. "Staging the Convent as Resistance in *The Jew of Malta* and *Measure for Measure*." *Comparative Drama* 46, no. 4 (2012): 497-516.

Reinarz , Jonathan. *Past Scents: Historical Perspectives on Smell.* Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2014.

Robb, David M. "The Iconography of the Annunciation in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," *The Art Bulletin* 18: 4 (1936): 480-526.

Scolinov, Hanna H. "Chastity, Prostitution, and Pornography in *Measure for Measure," Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* 134 (1998): 68-81.

Slights, Jessica and Michael Morgan Holmes. "Isabella's Order: Religious Acts and Personal Desires in *Measure for Measure.*" *Studies in Philology* 95, no. 3 (1998): 263-92.

Shaw, Diane Marie. "Such Fire Is Love: The Bernardine Poetry of Robert Southwell, S.J." *Christianity and Literature* 62: 3 (2013): 333-354.

Shoemaker, Stephen. "Mary at the Cross, East and West: Maternal Compassion and Affective Piety in the Earliest Life of the Virgin and the High Middle Ages," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, NS, 62, Pt 2, (2011): 570-606.

Simonds, Peggy Munoz. "My Charms Crack Not": The Alchemical Structure of *The Tempest," Comparative Drama* 31: 4 (1997-98): 538-570.

Spiess, Stephen. "The Measure of Sexual Memory." *Shakespeare Survey,* edited by Peter Holland. (2014): 310-326.

Stallybrass, Peter and Anne Rosalind Jones. "Fetishizing the Glove in Renaissance Europe," *Critical Inquiry* 28:1 (2001): 114-32.

Stewart, Stanley. *The Enclosed Garden: The Tradition and the Image in Seventeenth-Century Poetry*. Madison; Milwaukee; London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1966.

Strong, Roy. *The Renaissance Garden in England*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1979.

Unsworth, Rebecca. “Hands Deep in History: Pockets in Men and Women’s Dress in Western Europe, c. 1480-1630.” *Costume* 51:2 (2017): 148-70.

Valenze, Deborah M. *Milk: A Global and Local History.* New Haven: Yale University Press. 2011.

Vennekotter, Jeanelle McKenzie. “Sanctified and Pious Bawds: The Bawd as a Figure of Subversion in Sixteenth-Century English Drama*.”* Ph.D Dissertation: University of California at Riverside, 1994.

Vincent, Sue. “To Fashion a Self: Dressing in Seventeenth-Century England.” *Fashion Theory: The Journal of Dress, Body & Culture* 3:2 (1999): 197-218.

Wall, Wendy. *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Welch, Evelyn. “Scented Buttons and Perfumed Gloves.” in *Ornamentalism: The Art of Renaissance Accessories,* 13-39. Edited and with an Introduction by Bella Mirabella. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2011.

Wentersdorf, Karl P. “The Marriage Contracts in *Measure for Measure*: A Reconsideration.” *Shakespeare Survey 32* (1979): 129-144.

Wheeler, Jo. *Renaissance Secrets, Recipes, and Formulas.* London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2009.

Whittier, Gayle. “The Sonnet’s Body and the Body Sonnetized in *Romeo and Juliet*.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40:1 (1989): 27-41.

Williams, Philip. “The Rosemary Theme in *Romeo and Juliet*.” *Modern Language Notes* 68:6 (1953): 400-403.

Yates, Frances. *Rosicrucian Enlightenment.* London; Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.

Yoshikawa, Kukita Naoë. “Holy Medicine and Diseases of the Soul: Henry of Lancaster and *Le Livre de Seyntz Medicines*.” *Medical History* 53 (2009): 397–414.