

1-1-2018

Gender, Geography, And Alterity In Shakespeare

Elizabeth Valdez Acosta
Wayne State University,

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/oa_dissertations



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Acosta, Elizabeth Valdez, "Gender, Geography, And Alterity In Shakespeare" (2018). *Wayne State University Dissertations*. 2085.
https://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/oa_dissertations/2085

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in Wayne State University Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

GENDER, GEOGRAPHY, AND ALTERITY IN SHAKESPEARE

by

ELIZABETH VALDEZ ACOSTA

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2018

MAJOR: ENGLISH

Approved By:

Advisor

Date

DEDICATION

Because and for my daughter Mackenzie.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My entire graduate education would not have been possible without the support of my family and friends, most especially my daughter, Mackenzie. When she was 9-years-old, I packed her up and the two of us moved to Michigan from the southwest so that I can continue my studies in early modern literature. Without complaint, she endured the compromises I made to raise her and to complete my graduate degree. While studying for my comprehensive exams, for example, her “goodnight” stories were those from my reading list. Through her fortitude I was able to concentrate on my academic career and I will always be grateful for that.

One of the reasons I applied to Wayne State University was to have the opportunity to work with Dr. Ken Jackson, an opportunity for which I am incredibly grateful. As my dissertation director, he guided me throughout my graduate studies and the dissertation process. Invaluable to me also are my other committee members: Simone Chess, Jaime Goodrich, and Anne Duggan. They patiently read through drafts of my dissertation and they encouraged me to have a stronger voice. Their advice and support has not only informed my dissertation but has shaped who I am in my professional career. Funding from the Kings-Chavez-Parks Fellowship and from Dr. Joseph Dunbar, advisor for the AGEP / KCP working group at Wayne, allowed me the opportunities to present my work at conferences, which provided feedback on drafts and valuable experience in the field. In addition to my mentors, I am especially grateful for my friends and student colleagues from Wayne who served as sounding boards for my ideas, provided feedback on several drafts, and just continually encouraged me throughout my graduate work—thank you, Dr. Laura Estill, Dr. Andie Silva, and Dr. Renuka Gusain.

And I’m thankful to my parents—Henry and Dora Acosta and my sister, Beverly Acosta for their continued encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1 – Open Doors, Secure Borders: The Paradoxical Immigration Policy of Belmont in <i>The Merchant of Venice</i>	6
Chapter 2 – “Here in the skirts of the forest, like fringe upon a petticoat”: Phoebe and Ecofeminism Along the Edge in <i>As You Like It</i>	34
Chapter 3 – ‘I play the man I am’: Gender, Geography, and Labor in <i>Coriolanus</i>	65
Chapter 4 – Violent Landscape: Exile, Gender, and the Rhetoric of Rape in <i>Cymbeline</i>	87
References.....	121
Abstract.....	134
Autobiographical Statement.....	136

INTRODUCTION

“The menace of repetition is nowhere else as well organized as in the theater” (Derrida 247). Often, when people, especially undergraduate students, hear Shakespeare, they tend to conjure an image of an old white guy writing in an incomprehensible language. “I have absolutely nothing in common with Shakespeare,” many believe. Guiding this project is the idea that we, in the 21st century, do, in fact, share commonalities with Shakespeare and with the early modern period, particularly with “the menace of repetition.” Identity and identity formation as they relate to gender and geography—borders, literal and figurative, are themes explored in the following chapters. As I will show with close readings of four of Shakespeare’s plays, repetition is fundamental in maintaining traditional ways of thinking. These normative ways of thinking about gender, for instance, are not “old ideas” as “Shakespeare is an old white guy;” they are contemporary issues that have been repeated throughout generations. The purpose of this project is to highlight overlooked characters or plays in Shakespeare, to show the commonalities between Shakespeare and contemporary audiences, and also to illustrate that current ideas of identity and gender are historically situated. Seeing these connections can help us to reconceive these constructs of being and behaving.

SCHOLARSHIP AND METHODOLOGY

While Shakespeare is a leading playwright from the early modern period with much, much scholarship focused on him and his works, some of his lesser-known plays and lesser-known characters are often overlooked in the critical tradition. This dissertation contributes to the wealth of scholarship in Shakespeare by focusing on some of those lesser-known plays and lesser-known or marginalized characters through a feminist lens. Who is ignored, why are they overlooked, and how are the responses to these questions relevant today? This project examines these questions by

offering a close reading of four of Shakespeare's plays: *The Merchant of Venice*, *As You Like It*, *Coriolanus*, and *Cymbeline*.

Through these close readings of the plays, this dissertation also adds to current scholarship in the field by using emerging methodological approaches in early modern studies. For example, I interrogate the ideas of metaphorical and literal geographic borders in all four chapters. Emily Detmer-Goebel says that, "while border metaphors are not new to Shakespeare Studies, they are not as common as they are in American Studies, especially Chicana / o writing, where border theory and border literature have become key ideas to engage issues of nation, culture, gender, and sexuality" (2). In their seminal and groundbreaking work, *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare's Histories*, Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin investigate such ideas about geography and its relationship to gender. They claim, "As critics of nationalism have repeatedly shown, the fictive unity of a nation is often created by insisting on the utter difference between those who are designated as belonging to the nation and those, whether inside or outside the nation's boundaries, who are seen as alien on the basis of religion, complexion, or customs" (13). Adding to their assessment, this project focuses on non-history plays that may not have the obvious borders that are found in the history plays. The two comedies, one romance, and one (Roman) tragedy examined in this dissertation all add to current scholarship on gender and geography because they are not the typical genres usually analyzed with these emphases.¹

In addition to investigating geographical spaces as they relate to gender and otherness, I also explore one of the comedies (*As You Like It*) through an eco-feminist lens. While eco-criticism has established itself as a lens of study in early modern texts, ecofeminism is a bit newer. Greta

¹ While Howard and Rackin focus on history plays, Linda McJanet adds, "With exception of *The Tempests*, the romances have not been seen as prime texts in which to examine Shakespeare's handling of geography, history, or other markers of cultural otherness" (86).

Gaard's and Patrick D. Murphy define ecofeminism this way: "Ecofeminism is a practical movement for social change arising out of the struggles of women to sustain themselves, their families, and their communities. These struggles are waged against the 'maldevelopment' and environmental degradation caused by patriarchal societies, multinational corporations, and global capitalism" (2). Noel Sturgeon adds, "Most simply put, ecofeminism is a movement that makes connections between environmentalisms and feminisms; more precisely, it articulates the theory that the ideologies that authorize injustices based on gender, race, and class are related to the ideologies that sanction the exploitation and degradation of the environment" (23). Ecofeminism lends itself perfectly to the geographical investigation of this dissertation. What this project shows is that gender, geography, and alterity are closely intertwined, for, as Linda McDowell says, "The specific aim of feminist geography is to investigate, make visible and challenge the relationships between gender divisions and spatial divisions to uncover their mutual constitution and problematize their apparent naturalness" (12). The close readings of the four plays in this dissertation problematizes social constructions of naturalness as they relate gender, identity, and place in both the early modern and contemporary time periods.

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

My first chapter is especially concerned with and informed by current events. Specifically, I analyze the events of *The Merchant of Venice* as it relates to the Diversity Visa (DV) Immigration Program. The DV Program is a lottery system that was instituted in order to correct to previous discriminatory immigration policies. Despite such measures, however, this program ultimately reinforces an anti-immigration stance and promotes cultural similitude. With the political ramifications of current immigration policy in mind, this essay examines how the issue of immigration in Shakespeare's work offers us a better understanding of the way immigration

stratagems often purport an opportunity for inclusion while moving toward exclusion of those deemed too foreign or strange. Like the lottery system in the United States, the one in Belmont from Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* is something akin to a national origins based system, less random and fair than implied, but instead exclusionary, prejudicial, and indicative of a foundational principle that favors cultural homogeneity.

The focus of my second chapter is on lesser-known but exceptionally rich character, Phoebe from *As You Like It*. Often, scholarship resides with Rosalind since she is the main female character. Through an ecofeminist reading of the play, I argue that Rosalind, contrary to most scholarship about her, is a perpetuator of patriarchal ideology who contaminates the Forest of Ardenne. Rosalind disrupts the green space of the Forest and, in so doing, she also victimizes Phoebe. Furthermore, I argue, before Rosalind's intrusion, Phoebe has demonstrated a strength that is usually attributed to Rosalind within much feminist scholarship. While Rosalind does show agency at moments throughout the play, it occurs only after she is disguised as a man and after she has entered into Ardenne. Phoebe, on the other hand, is a strong, female character, whose strength is largely connected to her environment. By the end of the play, however, Phoebe's world has drastically changed, in large part due to Rosalind's machinations. Phoebe is stuck in a relationship with someone whom she does not love, who does not have land to work, and who has been tutored in the ways of patriarchy by Rosalind.

For the third chapter of the dissertation, I examine Shakespeare's last Roman play, a tragedy, *Coriolanus*. And while the focus of the chapter is on the main character, Coriolanus, I still offer an argument based on feminist studies. This chapter acknowledges an awareness that gendered ideas are socially constructed—a core feminist theory—and that it is important to understand and make visible the processes that inform these constructions. As one of

Shakespeare's most hyper-masculine men, Coriolanus serves as the perfect subject for this type of feminist study. I argue that, while the play is explicitly political, it implicitly challenges conventional ideals of gender. Coriolanus lacks any true self, real identity, as he has tried to identify with competing conceptions of masculinity. Rather than affirm he is the man he is, he says he *plays* the part of a man, like the boy actor playing the part of the woman. Thus, Coriolanus' ultimate tragedy, his death, can be seen also as an escape or the only solution to an impossible situation.

The final chapter of this project investigates one of Shakespeare's romances, *Cymbeline*. As with the first chapter on *The Merchant of Venice*, this one is also informed by specific current events. In this case, the chapter is framed by commentary on the Brock Turner—Stanford University rape case. In 2016, Stanford student, Brock Turner, was found raping an unconscious woman behind a dumpster. He was arrested and went to trial where he was found guilty of the crime. The shocker in the case was his sentence: the Stanford educated judge presiding over the case sentenced Turner to only six months in the county jail. Not only are there similar circumstances in the play, but the rhetorical language used in the play that castigates Innogen is also used to justify Turner's behavior. The geographic rhetorical language of the play allows for the figurative rape of Innogen by Giacomo and for her near literal rape by Cloten. Heavily influencing this chapter is Teema Ruskola's "Raping Like a State." Though not centered on early modern studies, Ruskola analyzes "international legal rhetoric to illustrate the normative masculinity that is attributed to sovereign states" (1477). My argument is that the prevalence of rape culture is historically situated yet currently significant as seen via *Cymbeline*.

CHAPTER 1: OPEN DOORS, SECURE BORDERS: THE PARADOXICAL IMMIGRATION POLICY OF BELMONT IN *THE MERCHANT OF VENICE*

According to Charles Hirschman, “the image of the United States as a land of opportunity and refuge has become its preeminent national identity at home and abroad” (596). Despite efforts to idealize American hospitality, though, the history of US immigration policies contradicts such an ideology, and exposes a dark side of American nation-building and national identity. Recently, concern lies with the passing into law of Senate Bill 1070 in Arizona on April 23, 2010.² This bill continues a long history of discriminatory immigration policy. As Charles J. Ogletree, Jr. says, “Congress began passing substantive laws restricting immigration in the late nineteenth century” (758). In 1882, the Chinese Exclusion Act³ was instituted and it was followed by: the Expatriation Act of 1907,⁴ the Gentleman’s Agreement of 1907,⁵ the Immigration Act of 1917,⁶ the National Origins Act and the Oriental Exclusion Act of 1924,⁷ and the Bracero Program of 1942.⁸ Opposite

² As Paul Lai and Lindsey Claire Smith argue, the bill “reauthorize[es] local and state officials not only to act on behalf of the federal Department of Homeland Security in detaining suspected ‘illegal immigrants’ but to declare in no uncertain language that such detention is necessary and must be pursued even in the absence of suspected major criminal activity” (413). Lai and Smith suggest that Senate Bill 1070 encourages and promotes racial profiling.

³ According to Charles J. Ogletree, Jr., “The Chinese Exclusion Act effectively barred Chinese immigration, prohibited naturalization for those already in the country, and provided deportation procedures for illegal immigrants” (759).

⁴ Priscilla Yamin states that the Expatriation Law of 1907 asserted that “any American woman who marries a foreigner shall take the nationality of her husband’ and thereby forfeited her American citizenship” (109).

⁵ According to Kornel Chang, the Gentleman Agreement was a contract instituted between the United States and Canada with Japan that set numerical limits on immigrants coming from Japan in an attempt to quell social unrest on the west coast (684).

⁶ The Immigration Act of 1917 “imposed a literacy test on new arrivals” (Mochling and Piehl 740).

⁷ Both Acts were implemented with the Immigration Act of 1924, whose “legislation set quotas for immigrants from the eastern hemisphere...and specifically barred virtually all immigration from Asia” (Ogletree, Jr. 2000). Ogletree, Jr. adds, “The effect and intent of this policy was to ensure that Northern and Western Europeans would constitute a greater proportion of immigrants at the expense of newer immigrant groups” (760). Marta Tienda states, “the National Origins Act set the first numerical limits on immigration” (590).

⁸ The Bracero Program, which, according to Susan Rose and Robert Shaw, was “a U.S.-Mexico migrant worker program that addressed perceived labor shortages in the United States,” was implemented in 1942 (82). Mexican

to the “American identity [that] is rooted in the welcoming of strangers” (Hirschman 595), these policies illuminate a xenophobic trend in American immigration policy.

Attempts to ameliorate some of the exclusionary practices of previous immigration policies include such measures as the Immigration Act of 1965, which repealed origin-based quotas, the Immigration Act of 1990 and the Diversity Visa (DV) Immigration Program implemented within this Act, which purportedly serves as a corrective to previous discriminatory immigration policies. Despite such measures, these policies ultimately reinforce an anti-immigration stance and promote cultural similitude. With the political ramifications of current immigration policy in mind, this essay examines how the issue of immigration in Shakespeare’s work offers us a better understanding of the way immigration stratagems often purport an opportunity for inclusion while moving toward exclusion of those deemed too foreign/strange. Like the lottery system in the United States, the one in Belmont from Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice* is something akin to a national origins based system, less random and fair than implied, but instead exclusionary, prejudicial, and indicative of a foundational principle that favors cultural homogeneity.

U.S. Immigration

According to the US Department of State, a service of the Bureau of Consular Affairs, “We welcome the millions of foreign visitors and immigrants who come to the U.S. each year. They add greatly to our nation's cultural, educational, and economic life. In addition to open doors, we also believe in secure borders to keep us all safe.” Of these millions of foreign visitors and immigrants, approximately 50,000 immigrants are provided with conditional visas to enter into the United States annually through the DV Immigration program, also known as the “green card

citizens were allowed to enter the US to work, but could not live in the US permanently, nor could they receive benefits.

lottery.”⁹ As the name implies, the DV Immigration program is meant to diversify the pool of US-bound immigrants by making diversity visas “available to persons from countries with low immigration rates to the United States” (“Instructions for the 2011 Diversity Immigrant Visa Program” 1). The program’s stated intention is to provide opportunities for permanent residency in the US to those who might not be eligible through other, more traditional means of immigration, such as through family-based sponsorship or employment. Victor C. Romero says the process is “unlike other forms of immigration that require one demonstrate requisite family or employment ties to the United States” (382). While the program’s intent is to diversify the pool of immigrants entering the US, what statistics show is that most diversity visas are issued to Europeans.¹⁰ This evidence is at odds with the stated purpose (to diversify) and methodology (random selections) of the green card lottery.

Though discussions on what is now called the Diversity Visa Immigration program began in the early 1980s, the Immigration Act of 1965 is considered the springboard from which the DV

⁹ According to the “Instructions for the 2011 Diversity Immigrant Visa Program:

Section 131 of the Immigration Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-649) amended INA 203 and provides for a class of immigrants known as diversity immigrants. Section 203(c) of the INA provides a maximum of 55,000 Diversity Visas (DVs) each fiscal year to be made available to persons from countries with low rates of immigration to the United States. The visas are distributed among six geographic regions, with a greater number of visas going to regions with lower rates of immigration, and with no visas going to nationals of countries sending more than 50,000 immigrants to the United States over the period of the past five years. (1).

Of these 55,000 DV’s, 5,000 are allocated to the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act (NACARA), leaving 50,000 available for the DV lottery. The NACARA, “passed by Congress in November 1997 stipulates that beginning as early as DV-1999, and for as long as necessary, up to 5,000 of the 55,000 annually-allocated DVs will be made available for use under the NACARA program. The actual reduction of the limit by up to 5,000 DVs began with DV-2000 and is likely to remain in effect through the DV-2011 program” (“Instructions...” 7).

¹⁰ Walter P. Jacob argues, “Not only will most of [the Diversity Immigrant program] visas go to Europe and Africa for the foreseeable future, but twice as many visas will go to Irish immigrants as to immigrants of any other nation under the program” (300). Charles W. Ogletree, Jr. states, “The original intent of the diversity visa lottery was to benefit certain European groups” (763), and later adds, “Congress created a list of thirty-six countries whose nationals could participate in the lottery—a list that was disproportionately European” (764). Victor C. Romero states that many of the 50,000 annual diversity visas are allocated to European nations (383).

program came into existence. Anna O. Law argues, “the chain of unanticipated consequences emanating from the 1965 Act led to the creation of the diversity lottery” (3). One “unanticipated consequence,” Law pinpoints, was the large increase of Latin American and Asian immigrants—unanticipated because “architects of the 1965 Act expected Europeans to be the main beneficiaries of the new preference system” (5). Similarly, Walter P. Jacob also suggests that the increase of Latin American and Asian immigration, resulting from the 1965 Act, led to increased anxiety and alarm within the US in general, and in the political arena in particular. According to Jacob:

Between 1931 and 1960, Latin American immigrants represented an average of fifteen percent of all immigrants to the U.S. Immigrants from Europe represented roughly eighty-one percent of the total. Between 1961 and 1970, however, Latin American immigration shot up to thirty-nine percent of total U.S. immigration. Following the passage of the 1965 Act, Asian immigration immediately increased to thirteen percent total. By 1981, over thirty-three percent of all immigrants were coming from Asia. (303)¹¹

Based on these statistics, it seems as though the Act of 1965 was fulfilling its mission: allowing access to those who had been discriminated against based on race, ethnicity, and origin.

Yet, these same statistics became areas of concern for policy makers, motivating them to implement legislation that would counter these “unanticipated consequences.” From these motivations, the misleadingly named DV immigration program came into being. Addressing the argument for assimilation made by Senator Alan Simpson, a member of the 1981 Commission and Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee’s Subcommittee on Immigration and Refugee Policy,¹² Jacob concludes, “the problem was not to make the United States more accessible to

¹¹ Anna O. Law notes, “the 1965 Act led to a modest increase in Eastern and Southern immigration, but an explosion in immigration from Asia and Latin America. By 1975, immigrants from Asia and Latin America accounted for about two thirds of the immigration to the United States” (5).

¹² Walter P. Jacob quotes Simpson, who says, “If immigration is continued at a high level and yet a substantial portion of the newcomers and their descendants do not assimilate, they may create in America some of the social, political and economic problems which existed in the country which they have chosen to depart. If linguistic and cultural separatism rise above a certain level, the unity and political stability of the nation will in time be seriously eroded” (303).

diverse peoples who wished to enter: It was to limit the number of people who were entering, and to encourage the immigration of more people who would assimilate easily into American society” (304). Similarly, Law argues, “the diversity lottery in the 1990s was partially a response to the claim that Asians and Latinos have a ‘lock’ on the family-based preferences” (17). As a result, 19 countries, mostly Latin American and Asian countries, are ineligible to participate in the most recent DV lottery.¹³

In the name of diversity, the green card lottery has the effect of exclusion without being obviously exclusionary. While proponents of the DV lottery emphasize the “ease of the system” (Patterson 7) for all eligible people, the stipulations of the program show it to be a wealth and class based preference program. For instance, those potential diversity immigrants with a clear understanding of English have a distinct advantage in participating in and winning the lottery.¹⁴ Though the Diversity Visa Lottery homepage offers links to the instructions languages other than English, it emphasizes that these are “unofficial translations” (Bureau of Consular Affairs...). It also stresses: “The English language version of the DV-2011 Lottery Instructions is the only official version” (Bureau of Consular Affairs...). There are 178 countries, with a vast array of languages, whose citizens are eligible to participate in the DV lottery, but only 18 (unofficial) foreign translations are made available on the website.¹⁵

¹³ According to the “Instructions for the 2011 Diversity Visa Immigrant Program,” these ineligible countries include: “Brazil, Canada, China (mainland-born), Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Jamaica, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, South Korea, United Kingdom (except Northern Ireland), and Vietnam” (1).

¹⁴ As an example, “Consular officers in Dhaka said that many of their DV applicants could not read western script; if given the chance to review their entry form, they could not tell whether visa consultants had filled in their biographic information correctly” (Ford et al. 19).

¹⁵ As of 14 August 2010, the “Instructions for the 2011 Diversity Immigration Visa Program” defines the term “country” to “include countries, economies, and other jurisdictions explicitly listed at the end of these instructions”

English literacy is obviously advantageous, especially given the detailed and specific nature of the DV lottery instructions. In an article tailored for immigration lawyers, attorneys Bernard P. Wolfsdorf and Naveen Rahman both outline and stress the importance of the specifics of the DV program. They emphasize that the lottery is “fraught with ill-defined rules requiring counsel to have an intimate knowledge of strategies and regulations and to pay close attention to the potential legal vulnerabilities of applicants” (20). The ambiguous language of the lottery’s guidelines was the impetus for their article, but what is striking is that the authors’ audience consists of English-speaking experts in immigration law. In order to navigate through the DV lottery process, one must have a superior understanding of the English language because any application that does not fully comply with the program’s instructions is disqualified from the “random” drawing.¹⁶

Creating even more disparity of access for eligible DV lottery participants is the dependence on technology. The DV registration system is now entirely electronic (“Instructions” 1).¹⁷ This change limits participation in the lottery for those potential diversity immigrants without easy, or any, access to the Internet.¹⁸ As with the language barrier, the necessity for easy Internet

(1). Additionally, these “Instructions...” claim that there were 178 countries whose citizens were eligible to participate in the lottery (13-16).

¹⁶ “A computer-generated, random lottery drawing chooses selectees for DVs” and “The computer will randomly select individuals from among all qualified entries” (“Instructions...” 1, 5).

¹⁷ The “Department implemented an entirely electronic registration system called E-DV for the DV-2005 lottery” (Patterson 7). “As of August 2003, registrants may only register electronically, via the Internet, for the diversity visa lottery” (Newton 1055). Since lottery registration occurs two years prior to the lottery year, electronic registration for the 2005 DV lottery took place in 2003.

¹⁸ When coupled with the necessary requirements and short time frame provided for registration, the electronic system, initiated “in order to make the DV process more efficient and secure” (“Instructions...” 1), actually creates conditions that presume easy Internet access for all diversity immigrants. The time frame to fill in and submit a completed application is relatively short, a little less than two months. For 2011, applications had to be submitted “between noon, Eastern Daylight Time (EDT) (GMT-4), Friday, October 2, 2009, and noon, Eastern Standard Time (EST) (GMT-5), Monday, November 30, 2009” (“Instructions...” 1).

access creates more obstacles for the socioeconomically disadvantaged, while providing greater opportunities for a smaller, more elite group. As a result, those who are socioeconomically disadvantaged typically seek visa agents, and this often leads to fraud and disqualification of the application.¹⁹

In one study that consisted of fieldwork, interviews, and data research, the United States Government Accountability Office (GOA) determined that “the DV program has significant risks for fraud” (Ford et al. 7), most notably at the hands of what they call “visa agents.” Visa agents are intermediaries utilized by DV applicants in the application process, but the use of these agents is not a DV program requirement. There are a number of reasons why DV applicants turn to visa agents, but most often the reasons include a language barrier and/or limited or no access to the Internet.²⁰ The GOA discovered that DV applicants using an intercessor “are sometimes extorted for large sums of money or coerced into sham marriages by unscrupulous entities in the [visa] industry” (Ford et al. 16). Thus, in gaining control over the DV application and applicant, corrupt visa agents make immigration to the US for many eligible applicants nearly impossible. Those few who do not need to go through intermediaries or visa agents are most often from the privileged class.

Historically, Ogletree, Jr. says, “wealth-based criteria such as literacy and the amount of money in an alien’s possession became factors to be considered in determining admissibility” (759). Though speaking more broadly towards American immigration policy, Ogletree’s assessment also applies to the structure of the DV lottery, which denies entry to those who cannot

¹⁹ “Consular officers in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nepal, Nigeria, and Ukraine estimated that the majority of DV applicants at their posts sought assistance from this visa industry to enter the DV lottery. They cited the lack of personal computers and internet savvy as among the reasons for this” (Ford et al. 17).

²⁰ “Consular officers have reported that the majority of DV applicants, lacking access to a computer or internet savvy, seek assistance from ‘visa agents’ or ‘visa consultants’ to enter the lottery” (Ford et al. 3)

rely on their own financial resources. According to the “Instructions for the 2011 Diversity Immigrant Visa Program,” if a potential immigrant is “selected to apply for a [Diversity Visa], [she or he] will be required to provide evidence that [she or he] will not become a public charge in the United States before being issued a visa” (12). Thus, selected winners will have to prove that they are self-supporting, or will have employment or family support upon arriving to the United States. Yet, this idea belies the program’s intended purpose, given that the DV lottery was instituted to provide opportunities to those who do not have access through employment or family sponsorship. Accordingly, “many DV winners have no pre-arranged employment or family ties in the United States” (Wolfsdorf and Rahman 16), and this renders them ineligible for a visa unless they can show that they are self-supporting. According to Wolfsdorf and Rahman, however, “With 2004 Poverty Income Guidelines at \$23,562 for a family of four, DV winners have quite a high standard to meet. In many countries only a small percentage of the population earns over \$23,562 annually. For example, Bangladesh, which had 5,126 registrants for DV-2004 program, had a GDP capita income of \$1,610 and an adult literacy rate of 59.4 percent” (16). Thus, “only the wealthiest sector of Bangladeshi society can overcome these stipulations” (Wolfsford and Rahman 16). This shows that “wealth based criteria such as literacy and the amount of money in an alien’s possession” are still factors used to determine admissibility to the US. As a result, not only are the majority of diversity immigrants from a privileged class—according to results from a 2003 demographic study of DV recipients conducted by the Department of State, “the typical DV recipient was a male professional, aged 26-30, holding a university degree” (Ford et al. 15)—but they also implicitly represent the people “whose presence is encouraged and valued” in the United States (Harty 26). This obviously belies the DV program’s stated goal: promoting diversity.²¹

²¹ While the DV lottery can be classified as a wealth and class based preference program through its implicit qualification factors, there have been movements using explicit language that would qualify the DV program as such

Exclusionary Measures in *The Merchant of Venice*

Although Shakespeare could not have anticipated American immigration practice, ambivalent attitudes about foreigners and the undercurrent of desired similitude imbue both the 20-year-old US green card lottery system and the casket test Portia's father devises in *The Merchant of Venice* with more than a hint of hypocrisy. When we approach *The Merchant of Venice* with current-day immigration policies in mind, we find that, like the American green card lottery, the riddle Portia's father imposes is a game of chance, a "lottery" (1.2.25, 2.1.15), in which the winner seemingly relies on luck.²² Yet, for both immigrants seeking US citizenship and foreigners seeking Portia's hand, winners are not chosen based on random luck, but rather through calculated measures, in which the criterion is similitude. On an imaginary gradation scale, potential immigrants ranking closest to "least foreign" are provided better access to the hosting nation—European to US and Venetian to Belmont. The US and Belmontian lotteries each actively stress welcoming hospitality through their open doors policies, but the results of such policies demonstrate their emphasis on secure borders.²³ The assumption is that anyone may participate in the lottery in *The Merchant*: Bassanio tells Antonio, "For the four winds blow in from every coast, / Renowned suitors" (1.1.171-72).²⁴ Still, as we see by Act 5, all of Belmont's immigrants, including the winner of the casket lottery, are from Venice, a native-Italian community. In this

a preference program. For instance, at the 2008 meeting of the 110th Congress, Senator Judd Gregg proposed bill S. 2868. Bill S.2868 sought to "replace the diversity visa lottery program with a program that issues visas to aliens with advanced degrees" (1). More specifically, only "aliens who hold an advanced degree in science, mathematics, technology, or engineering" (2) would be eligible under such an amendment. This bill never became law.

²² In the play, Morocco says, "blind Fortune leading me" (2.1.37) and "Good fortune, then, / To make me blest or cursed'st among men" (2.1.48-49). All quotations from *The Merchant of Venice* are taken from *The Norton Critical Edition* edited by Leah Marcus.

²³ I have in mind, here, Derrida's notion of hospitality in *Of Hospitality* (2000).

²⁴ Morocco adds, "All the world desires her; / From the four corners of the earth they come / To kiss this shrine, this mortal breathing saint" (2.7.38-40).

way, then, the play's attention to desired homogeneity offers present-day audiences a means of considering how perceived safety and the comfort of community are often wrought through fraudulence and unscrupulous exclusionary practices—practices that speak directly to the urgent issue of immigration in our day.

In Belmont, the “winner” of the casket lottery is Bassanio, a “young Venetian” (2.9.88), and there is evidence that Portia knows him, or, at least, of him, before the time when he comes to take his chance at the riddle.²⁵ In a significant moment, after passionately outlining her distaste for other suitors, Portia hints that she favors Bassanio when she tells Nerissa, “I remember him worthy of thy praise” (1.2.103-04). This is important to note as Bassanio, out of all of the suitors, is the one who succeeds in procuring permanent residence on the island. After he wins, Portia tells Bassanio:

I was the lord
Of this fair mansion, master of my servants,
Queen o'er myself; and even now, but now,
This house, these servants, and this same myself
Are yours, my lord's. (3.2.170-74)²⁶

Later, Bassanio's permanent residency in Belmont is underscored when Portia tells him, “You are welcome home, my lord” (5.1.143).²⁷ Bassanio wins access to Portia and to Belmont despite the lottery system's tailored prevention of keeping those with undesirable traits, such as the ones embodied by Bassanio, out.

²⁵ Nerissa asks Portia: “Do you not remember, lady, in your father's time, a Venetian—a scholar and a soldier that came hither in company of the Marquess of Montferrat?” (1.2.97-99), to which Portia responds: “Yes, yes—it was Bassanio” (1.2.100).

²⁶ According to Karen Newman, Portia offers her love to Bassanio in this speech that epitomizes the Elizabethan sex/gender system (24).

²⁷ Alice N. Benston argues, “Freed from her contract with her father, Portia freely ‘confirms,’ ‘signs over,’ all that she freely reigned over as ‘queen’: ‘this house, these servants, and this same myself’” (372). Susan Oldrieve adds, Portia “places her entire life and living into her husband's hands” (91).

The lottery system, consisting of “three chests of gold, silver, and lead” (1.2.26), is devised in such a manner to prevent fortune hunters from gaining anything more than temporary access to Belmont. Lynda E. Boose suggests, “In the riddle game the successful suitor will be the one who values Portia enough to choose not the gold or silver she brings with her as dowry but the lead casket that requires him to ‘give and hazard all’” (337). Craig Muldrew argues that the lottery of the three chests “is meant to ensure that [Portia] is not sought solely for the monetary value of her dowry, represented by the chests of gold and silver, but is rather trusted so that her wealth can be spent ethically” (116). The concept explicitly guiding the use of the three caskets, then, is that the man who chooses correctly is not motivated by financial gain but is instead driven by a high valuation of Portia. Nerissa tells Portia as much, saying, “Your father was ever virtuous, and holy men at their death have good inspirations; therefore the lottery that he hath devised in these three chests of gold, silver, and lead, whereof who chooses his meaning chooses you, will no doubt never be chosen by any rightly but one who you shall rightly love” (1.2.24-29). Nerissa’s assessment of Portia’s father’s will suggests that the riddle will succeed in finding Portia a marital relationship based on love by weeding out fortune hunters who are seeking Portia’s hand in marriage solely to elevate their financial status.

The scrolls attached to each casket illustrate Nerissa’s assessment. The inscription on the scroll found inside the casket of gold reads:

All that glisters is not gold.
 Often have you heard that told.
 Many a man his life hath sold
 But my outside to behold.
 Gilded timber do worms enfold. (2.7.66-70)

As a universal lesson, the scroll implies that treasure lies in areas typically not associated with wealth—“All that glisters is not gold” (2.7.66)—and that wealth and the wealthy are not immune

to the realities of life—“Gilded timber do worms enfold” (2.7.70). A more pointed lesson that the scroll illustrates is that those seeking their fortunes specifically in Belmont will not gain access—“Many a man his life hath sold / But my outside to behold” (2.7.68-69). The gold casket’s scroll reveals an impetus guiding the Belmontian lottery system: to keep fortune hunters out.

Despite this strategy, Bassanio, the man who embodies the undesirable characteristic as a fortune hunter, wins admission to Belmont, highlighting that its would-be immigration policy—the casket lottery—is flawed and open to manipulation. Of the three suitors who take their chances with the lottery, Morocco and Aragon are the two who are dismissed and immediately deported, even though they are the ones who demonstrate independent wealth. Both are socially elite princes (2.1.20, 2.7.61, 2.9.2, 2.9.4) from their respective countries, both arrive in Belmont leading large retinues (Stage Direction 2.1, 2.7, 2.9), and both have, presumably, independently financed their journey to Belmont. Bassanio, on the other hand, has the lower-ranking title of lord (1.1.71), first arrives to Belmont not leading his own retinue, but instead as a member of the Marquess of Montferrat’s train (1.2.99), and is admittedly financially impoverished and irresponsible. Earlier, appealing to Antonio for a loan, Bassanio confesses:

‘Tis not unknown to you, Antonio,
How much I have disabled mine estate
By something showing a more swelling port
Than my faint means would grant continuance. (1.1.125-28)

From this appeal, we also learn that Bassanio is already indebted to Antonio when he says, “To you, Antonio, / I owe the most in money and in love” (1.1.133-34). Even as he stands before Antonio, once again, borrowing money, Bassanio admits to his prodigality and his economic desperation. Despite this confession, though, Bassanio shows no promise of taking responsibility for his financial prodigality when he says, “Nor do I now make moan to be abridged / From such

a noble rate” (1.1.128-29). Bassanio’s impetus for borrowing money at this moment is to help him gain access to an even larger fortune—Portia’s.

At this point, it might be useful to discuss the Bassanio character in Shakespeare’s source text, Giovanni Fiorentino’s *Il Pecorone*, to consider how *The Merchant* re-imagines the role of fortune hunters. While Fiorentino’s Gianetto (the Bassanio character) and Shakespeare’s Bassanio share similar features, they and their circumstances are quite different. Bassanio, while amiable, is not the most honorable or responsible man. Gianetto, on the other hand, is not only amiable, but he is highly respected. On his deathbed, Gianetto’s father tells him, “there is no one living I hold dearer than you” (85). Additionally, those in Venice “regarded him as a youth of the greatest intelligence and most delightful manners, and courteous beyond measure” (86), while those in Belmonte “were mightily pleased with Gianetto’s manners and his polished and pleasant and affable presence” (87). While Bassanio shows himself to be selfish, Gianetto seems to be more selfless. For instance, when his two brothers offer to share their inheritance with Gianetto (who had received none from his deceased father), Gianetto says, “I thank you, my brothers, for what you offer, but I have made up my mind to seek my fortune in some other place” (85). While Gianetto admits his desire to seek a fortune elsewhere, he does not accept money from others. Bassanio, of course, is more than willing to take advantage of Antonio’s generosity.

Though both can be characterized as “fortune hunters” by their own admittance, only Bassanio intentionally targets Belmont. Gianetto comes upon Belmonte accidentally while on a voyage with some friends—a voyage where his intent is to “see the world” (86). Bassanio deliberately and eagerly makes his way to Belmont to seek a monetary fortune. The two distinct pathways that Gianetto and Bassanio take en route to Belmont(e) are critical when we consider the issue of immigration policy. To have the chance to become lord of Fiorentino’s Belmonte, one

must possess treasure and fortune, *first*, because the reaching of Belmonte is a much more difficult task than it is to reach Shakespeare's Belmont from Venice. Gianetto is able to have his captain maneuver the ship into Belmonte's port without his friends on their ships taking notice. Additionally, once Gianetto's ship is "lost" to the friends, they are unable to locate him, indicating that Belmonte is not only secluded but also, perhaps, isolated from any geographical categorization—that is, people may not know about it. Second, when those who attempt to become lord of Belmonte fail, they must "forfeit their ship and all that was therein" (88).

Shakespeare's Belmont, on the other hand, is not only widely known, but also it is accessible to all, regardless of wealth and status. As the lottery is a game of chance, which (supposedly) measures the character of the suitors, wealth is not a prerequisite to participate in the game. Thus, while Bassanio seems to make a strong case for borrowing money from Antonio—he wants to impress Portia and have a better chance at "winning" her hand—the display of wealth is ultimately inessential. As a result, there is no valid reason for Bassanio to borrow money other than to continue living a lifestyle of indulgence, to which he has admitted enjoying.²⁸

²⁸ Gianetto's interest in Belmonte, at first, seems to be for the fact that his attention is piqued by the Lady's law and also because of the apparent ease of it. In essence, all he has to do is successfully sleep with the Lady. His failure at doing so, however, is his impetus for returning and trying again. While Bassanio's motivation for playing the lottery game is to win Portia's money, Gianetto's continued attempts at winning the Lady of Belmonte seem more to stem from his impotence—a mark of his masculinity. After his first failure, he feels "greatly ashamed" (88) and makes up a lie about being shipwrecked in order to avoid telling the story of his true venture. When he fails yet again, "he got up, covered with disgrace" and "full of shame" (90). Gianetto's continued attempts seem more to do with recovering his ego and masculinity than with the promised monetary rewards of the law. Interestingly, though, this illustrates the inhospitality of Belmonte, too. The Lady's trick not only strips men of their possessions but of their self-worth, which is inwardly damaging to each of them. While Portia is culpable for the inhospitality offered potential suitors, it is not to the same extent as the Lady's. We should remember, it is Portia's father who creates the will, and it is his rules by which all need to abide. Included within the rules is that any suitor who fails in choosing the correct casket must leave immediately and promise never to take a wife. Aragon says, "I am enjoined by oath to observe three things" (2.9.9), one of which, "if I fail / Of the right casket, never in my life / To woo a maid in a way of marriage" (2.9.11-13). Though in different ways, like the Lady's trick is extremely damaging to each individual who has failed, so is this particular stipulation of the lottery. Losers of the lottery can never have a legacy, a family to carry on the name, titles, and wealth.

Bassanio's deliberate attempt to gain fortune is apparent through his description of Portia; he says, "In Belmont is a lady richly left" (1.1.164), and later, "her seat of Belmont" is "Colchos' strand" (1.1.174). Clearly, Bassanio commodifies Portia by describing his valuation of her in terms of financial gain. Alice N. Benston argues, "both Portia and Jessica are sought as much for their money as for their beauty and goodness" (368). Bassanio's commodification of Portia and Belmont shows that the treasure that comes with Portia, and not Portia herself, is the "golden fleece" (1.1.173) that he hopes to secure. Unlike the Princes Morocco and Aragon, who can contribute to the economy of Belmont, the financially irresponsible and indebted Bassanio is the one who would benefit the most, economically, in choosing the correct chest. He is precisely the type of man the Belmontian lottery system purportedly attempts to deny entry, yet he is the one who wins the lottery and gains access. This contradiction, of course, reveals a failure of the system.

This systematic shortfall results from the lottery's susceptibility to manipulation and fraud, similar to the DV program's vulnerability to such susceptibility, as discussed earlier. Bassanio does not choose the correct casket so much as he is led by Portia to choose correctly. While Portia favors Bassanio, as per her earlier remark to Nerissa, Portia's motivations for guiding him are unclear. Unlike the definitive reasons she provides for her distaste in other suitors, Portia provides no such clarity for favoring Bassanio. In fact, Portia very clearly admits that her motivations are not guided by love. "There's something tells me (but it is not love)," Portia says, "I would not lose [Bassanio]" (3.2.4-5). Portia denies love as the driving force for choosing Bassanio, yet—as I discuss below—she decides to guide him to the correct chest.

Portia's culpability in Belmont's "immigration policy" is rather questionable, particularly since she manipulates the system. At the same time, though, she is also a victim of the system. Though she is the heiress of Belmont, she is also bound to the will of her dead father—a will that

essentially oppresses her status within her own land. Thus, her motivations for wanting Bassanio to choose correctly may have more to do with her own domestic status in Belmont, where she lacks ownership over her household and her body. She is afforded little liberty in her homeland. Instead, that ownership is transferred from her father to whomever chooses the correct casket, via the conditions stipulated by the will. Marginalized within the borders of Belmont, Portia is “scanted” (2.1.17) and “hedged” (2.1.18) by her father’s will. This shows that Portia’s decision in guiding Bassanio towards the correct casket may stem more from a desire to attain some agency over her household and body than it is in securing a husband. Her desire is not for any husband, it seems, but for a husband who can be manipulated in a way that allows Portia to have that agency and ownership she desires.²⁹

Bassanio’s qualities—thoughtlessness, selfishness, financial bankruptcy and irresponsibility—may not be attractive to a potential wife,³⁰ but they are the very qualities that can be manipulated by someone wanting to have or exert some control over her own position. As a result, Boose explains, Portia hints at the correct casket from the moment Bassanio arrives to Belmont (337). By the time Bassanio arrives to take his chance, Portia knows which is the correct casket because Morocco and Aragon have incorrectly chosen from the gold and silver chests, respectively. Still, in order to comply with the terms of her father’s will, Portia must employ clandestine methods when guiding Bassanio. Therefore, she provides rhetorical clues that correlate to the winning chest. Knowing that the inscription to the correct casket reads, “Who chooseth me

²⁹ Portia’s first words—“By my troth, Nerissa, my little body is a-weary of this great world” (1.2.1-2)—foreshadow such a craving for agency. In this same scene, Portia tells Nerissa exactly why her body is “a-weary,” stating, “But this reasoning is not in the fashion to choose me a husband. O me! The word ‘choose’! I may neither choose who I would nor refuse who I dislike; so is the will of a living daughter curbed by the will of a dead father. Is it not hard, Nerissa, that I cannot choose one, nor refuse none?” (1.2.18-23).

³⁰ Again, regardless of attraction or lack of attraction, Portia has no “choice” in choosing a husband.

must give and *hazard* all he hath” (2.7.9, italics mine), Portia opens by telling Bassanio, “pause a day or two / Before you *hazard*” (3.2.1-2, italics mine), sending him the subliminal message to choose the lead casket.

Given her strong desire to have Bassanio choose correctly, Portia reinforces the subliminal message through a song that she sings while he contemplates the three chests. Portia’s choice of song is strategic, as it contains a number of words that rhyme with “lead”—“bred,” “head,” “nourished,” “engend’red,” and “fed” (3.2.65-70).³¹ While Portia has not “actually disobeyed her father” (Boose 337), her machinations do constitute manipulation of the system. And although Bassanio does not qualify as an appropriate suitor/immigrant, he wins access to Belmont through her fraudulent means. Indeed, Portia’s role as Bassanio’s intermediary and her seemingly underhanded control of the casket lottery illustrate the flaws in the system and its easy susceptibility to manipulation. Whatever Portia’s motive for choosing Bassanio, her actions, in effect, deny permanent access to Belmont for otherwise qualified individuals, such as Morocco and Aragon.

To my mind, the exclusion of those better-qualified suitors is a key focal point for a present-day audience. That is to say, the play’s attention to the facile manipulation of the lottery system, the insider information that Bassanio receives, and the “sham marriage” that ensues (again, Portia clearly states, “it is not [for] love” (3.2.4) that she would choose Bassanio) are all reminiscent of the various problems confronting diversity immigrants today, and thus the exclusion of worthy individuals is critical to consider. In essence, and like Morocco and Aragon, present-day immigrants are offered a chance, but that opportunity is foreclosed upon by the flawed system that

³¹ Hunt (1979), Berger (1981), Boose (1982), and Engle (1986) view Portia’s song as purposefully influencing Bassanio’s decision.

privileges certain desirable immigrants. Focusing on this particular policy and its exclusionary measures, then, allows a contemporary audience to see how a play like *The Merchant* is rich with significance where the issue of immigration policy is concerned. Although the play is often touted for its attention to Christian hypocrisy, the hypocritical nature of nation building is equally significant. The play lays bare the attitudes and the deceitful dealings surrounding those undesirable others who desire access to a new community, and—through this transparency—the audience sees that the promise of homogeneity is valued above diversity, even when those of diverse backgrounds seem to have more to offer.

Open Doors in *The Merchant of Venice* and in Our Time

More significant than the susceptibility to fraud and manipulation is that the fundamental principles regulating both lottery systems pervert hospitality. Not true hospitality, but rather conditional hospitality, is offered to foreigners.³² The invitations to participate in the DV and Belmontian lotteries suggest a dissipation of borders: “open doors.” These invitations, however, are deceptive in that they are not truly welcoming. As Jan Ting points out, “The [DV] lottery is incomprehensibly complicated...and a cruel deception of the overwhelming majority of the millions of would-be immigrants who apply for it each year” (13). In addition to raising the issue of false hope, Ting’s analysis points to the complexity surrounding the lottery system. In fact, one of the biggest misconceptions potential diversity immigrants have is this: winning the lottery does not equate to winning a visa. This type of misunderstanding is corroborated by research conducted by the GAO on the DV program, which determined that “[s]ome applicants did not understand that

³² According to Derrida, true, absolute hospitality is unconditional, “to give the new arrival all of one’s home and oneself, to give him or her one’s own, our own, without asking a name, or compensation, or the fulfillment of even the smallest condition” (77).

‘winning’ the lottery did not guarantee them a visa, but rather provided them with an opportunity to apply for one” (Ford et al. 18).³³ Lottery winners still need to go through a selection process and must prove their eligibility to gain access into the United States.³⁴ Through this process, there are multiple levels of screening, and, in the end, the lottery serves as much, or more, to keep people out than to allow people in.

Belmont’s “open door” is similarly deceptive, inviting foreigners to enter but very quickly denying them permanent access. The suitors do have access to Belmont, but only in a very limited way. Aragon makes this clear by reiterating the conditions of participating in the lottery: “If I do fail in my fortune of my choice, / Immediately to leave you and be gone” (2.9.14-15). Any suitor who participates in the lottery and chooses incorrectly experiences only a temporary visit to Belmont. Further highlighting the perversion of hospitality offered by the lottery and its conditions is the fact that only one suitor, the one who chooses the correct casket, will ever be welcome in Belmont. The rest of the suitors all risk a very damaging deportation, possibly all the more so because they are unaware of the conditions associated with the will until they arrive in Belmont. Only after he arrives in Belmont does Portia make clear to Morocco that she has no control in the

³³ “The random lottery selects approximately 90,000-110,000 winners each year. Being a lottery winner, however, does not guarantee future possession of an immigrant visa. Rather, it merely permits lottery registrants to apply for a diversity visa once they have been notified of ‘winning’ a space in the lottery. The lottery winners then proceed to apply for the diversity visa. Through this process, the 90,000-110,000 lottery winners selected each year yield the approximately 50,000 diversity visas permitted by the statute” (Newton 1054).

³⁴ There are many requirements that need to be included within the DV application. Just one requirement is the necessity of digital photographs, which can either be taken with a digital camera or scanned to a computer. Digital photographs of the applicant and every family member included on the application are required. Just a few of the many guidelines regarding photographs are: “The head height or facial region size (measured from the top of the head, including the hair, to the bottom of the chin) must be between 50 percent and 69 percent of the image's total height. The eye height (measured from the bottom of the image to the level of the eyes) should be between 56 percent and 69 percent of the image's height,” “color photographs in 24-bit color depth are required,” and photographs must be saved as a JPEG file, no larger than 240 kilobytes (“Instructions...” 2009: 2-3). Once applications are processed and DVs approved, winners must still adhere to precise requirements, or risk losing the DV. One such requirement is this: “Aliens who are granted a diversity visa have 6 months from the date of issuance to proceed to a U.S. port of entry to apply for admission into the United States” (Ford et al. 11).

choosing of a husband. She tells him that she must be won “by that means I told you” (2.1.19). While we do not know for sure how the news of Portia’s father’s will circulates, we can assume from the conversation between Portia and Morocco that the conditions are clarified only after the suitors arrive in Belmont. As with the DV lottery, the ambiguity surrounding the Belmontian lottery collapses the hospitality offered, as ultimate access is massively limited.

Indeed, deportation is not reserved merely for those who fail in their attempt to guess the correct casket, but also for those who decide not to participate at all, such as Falconbridge and Monsieur Le Bon, among others. Nerissa explains to Portia that these suitors who decide against participating in the lottery feel the urge to “return to their home” (1.2.89) “unless [she] may be won by some other sort than [her] father’s imposition” (1.2.90-91). This is significant because the inhospitality of Belmont, emphasized by the word “imposition,” is underscored by the suitors’ urgency to return home.

While the Belmontian lottery is both vulnerable to manipulation and ineffective in executing its intended purpose—keeping fortune hunters, such as Bassanio, out—the lottery system as a whole is flawed on a much larger scale. Even though the lottery is seemingly open to all, it really privileges the socioeconomically advantaged. In addition to the Princes Morocco and Aragon, the suitors include the Neapolitan prince (1.2.34), the “County Palatine” (1.2.39), a “French lord, Monsieur Le Bon” (1.2.47), “Falconbridge, the young baron of England” (1.2.56-57), a “Scottish lord” (1.2.67), and a German nephew to the “Duke of Saxony” (1.2.72-73). Access to Belmont is severely limited to those who can afford to make the journey.

Bassanio, on the other hand, is financially destitute, but he is still a member of the elite that is innately preferred by the lottery. Because of his social standing, he is able to find sponsorship for his venture, though the necessity for the loan has less to do with the journey to Belmont (as he

is from the nearby city of Venice) and more to do with giving the expected appearance of the high social standing he has. After securing Portia as a wife, and after receiving Antonio's letter, Bassanio tells Portia:

Gentle lady,
 When I did first impart my love to you,
 I freely told you all the wealth I had
 Ran in my veins—I was a gentleman—
 And then I told you true. (3.2.259-63)

Here, Bassanio connects wealth to his status, trying to convince Portia that, despite his lack of fortune, he is still a gentleman. Regarded as a gentleman, Bassanio is able to acquire funding from Antonio, also a member of the privileged class.³⁵ More importantly, Bassanio's nobility provides him the means to take advantage of Belmont's lottery, its "open door." Of greater significance is that this privileging really strives to benefit the hosting nation rather than the would-be immigrant, and this speaks to current-day immigration policy. In the case of the DV lottery, unless a would-be immigrant is already conformed to a high standard of American living (by fully comprehending English and earning above the poverty line), he or she will not be allowed access to the US. As detailed earlier, the likelihood that diversity immigrants will fit the standard is very slim, thereby relieving the "inviting" nation from accommodating foreigners who are *too foreign*.

The same is true for Belmont, evidenced by Portia's stereotypical descriptions of the foreign suitors. She dismisses Monsieur Le Bon for being egotistical—"If a throstle sing he falls straight a capering; he will fence with his own shadow" (1.2.52-53)—and the young German as a drunkard. She suggests to Nerissa, "Therefore, for fear of the worst, I pray thee set a deep glass of Rhenish wine on the contrary casket; for if the devil be within and that temptation without, I know

³⁵ Lars Engle describes Bassanio as "the lord whose nobility and grace protect him from his financial irresponsibility" (21).

he will choose it” (1.2.82-85). Portia’s tone is much more aggressive when describing the Englishman, Falconbridge. While acknowledging the fact that she does not speak English, she emphasizes the fact that he does not speak Latin, French, *or* Italian (1.2.60 emphasis mine). She illuminates linguistic difference, but she also hints at the idea that he is beneath her and unworthy of her. By disparaging the foreign suitors, as I examine more closely below, Portia suggests that they are too different for Belmont, and thus she deems them as unfit for Belmont.

Secure Borders

Securing borders is valued above opening doors as both lottery systems enforce prejudicial exclusionary practices. The DV lottery implicitly relies on these underlying principles, as “race and politics continue to play a significant role in the immigration and refugee policies of the United States” (Ogletree, Jr. 747). The DV lottery program was established to provide “a counterbalance to the concentration of source countries” for immigration (Morrison 16), yet the majority of diversity visa holders are European.³⁶ In its report to the Department of Homeland Security, the GOA concluded that the DV program does promote diversity because immigration from Africa to the United States has increased. At the same time, however, the GOA acknowledges that, along with Africa, “Europe has received the most diversity visas” (Ford et al. 3). Ogletree, Jr. concludes, “Although the current criteria applied to countries in the diversity category is based on a perceived under-representation in the other immigrant categories, Europeans are still the primary beneficiaries” (764). In addition, Ting relates, “statistics for [Fiscal Year] 2001 and 2002 continue

³⁶ Natives from source countries are “not eligible to apply because the countries sent a total of more than 50,000 immigrants to the United States in the previous five years” (“Instructions...” 1). According to the “Instructions for the 2011 Diversity Visa Immigrant Program,” the source countries ineligible are: “Brazil, Canada, China (mainland-born), Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Jamaica, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, South Korea, United Kingdom (except Northern Ireland), and Vietnam” (1).

to show Europe as the number one regional source of diversity immigrants” (15). And Rosemary Jenks finds “that 52 percent of all lottery visas have been awarded to Europeans (19).”³⁷

There is a categorical pattern exposed here: Europeans consistently benefit the most from the DV program. While the DV selection may occur through a computer-generated random drawing, the statistics show that most of the qualifying applications come from the European region. In other words, while the drawing itself may not be influenced, the pool of applicants is. In addition to the language and technological barriers already addressed, regions that have been red-flagged for potential fraud also add to the number of denied applications. For instance, “it is also worth observing that in Bangladesh, consular officers rejected 85 percent of the 2002 diversity visa winners using the visa application process, indicating that the consular office at that post has been very alert to the propensity for fraud” (Patterson 10). Based on these results, only 15 percent of the applications were entered into the pool of millions of other entries. Whether intentional or not, built into the lottery process are methods that make the system a failure in terms of encouraging cultural diversity. The consistency with which Europeans are favored adds, says Romero, “to the privileged racial class in a concrete, numerical sense, and it reinforces the majority western culture” (386).

Securing borders and similitude in Belmont are likewise achieved through discriminating practices. When Portia asks Nerissa to “over name” the suitors to allow her to describe her affection towards each one, she proceeds to delineate the faults of each of the suitors (1.2.31). More than outlining her lack of attraction for each of the suitors, though, Portia’s description

³⁷ Providing testimony at a Capitol Hill Hearing, Jenks concludes, “Europeans are the clear winners” of the DV program, adding, “so if by ‘diverse’ we mean more White, the program is a success. It is clear that the Diversity Transition program did not increase diversity in the immigrant flow” (17).

clarifies the exclusionary prejudices built into the lottery system. When Nerissa asks, “What say you then to Falconbridge, the young baron of England?” (1.2.57-58), Portia responds, “You know I say nothing to him, for he understands not me, nor I him” (1.2.59-60). Understandably, Portia wants to communicate effectively with her husband, but she illustrates that the language issue is more than a barrier; it is a point used to emphasize his inferiority. Portia shows that knowing her language, presumably Italian, is required to gain access to Belmont.³⁸

The next reason Portia provides for Falconbridge’s rejection further highlights the lottery’s prejudicial slant. Portia shifts from the language barrier to his appearance, exclaiming, “How oddly he is suited! I think he bought his doublet in Italy, his round hose in France, his bonnet in Germany, and his behavior everywhere” (1.2.63-66). Portia’s concentration on Falconbridge’s attire is revealing. More than lacking fashion sense, Portia implies that Falconbridge would not fit in nor easily assimilate to the purely Italian Belmontian lifestyle. Rather than “become” Italian, Falconbridge’s attire demonstrates to Portia that he would most likely incorporate some aspects of the Italian culture into, what she might consider, his cacophony of nations. The mix of nations, represented by Falconbridge’s ensemble, is undesirable and unwelcome in Belmont, where sameness is favored. As such, when reminded of the apparently more-similar Bassanio, Portia has nothing negative to say, claiming only to “remember him worthy of [Nerissa’s] praise” (1.2.103-04). Portia’s focus on language, her description of Falconbridge and her preference for Bassanio highlight Belmont’s prejudices of ethnicity and its disposition favoring cultural homogeneity.

With Portia’s description of the young German, we begin to see that built into the lottery system is a principle of similitude. Clearly, Portia finds the young German unattractive, prompting Nerissa to remind her, “If he should offer to choose, and choose the right casket, you should refuse

³⁸ Ironically, this is said in English, the language of the play.

to perform your father's will if you should refuse to accept him" (1.2.79-81). Portia quickly responds by proposing to "set a deep glass of Rhenish wine on the contrary casket" (1.2.82-83) in hopes of thwarting the young German's chances at winning the lottery and his access to Belmont. The circumventing of access proposed by Portia is not dissimilar from the DV lottery system that has in place obstacles in hopes of offering diversity visas to those who are actually most similar to, and familiar with, the American lifestyle.

According to Bruce Morrison, even though the DV lottery program claims to "open the door to those abroad to find a legal channel to immigrate" (20). Anne Patterson states, "about 50 percent of applicants apply from the United States" (8). As Belmont has a preference for sameness, these statistics show that so too does the US. The statistics imply that those applicants with more familiarity, if not a complete understanding, of the English language and American lifestyle have an advantage, but also a priority. Jacob, a critic of the DV lottery, calls it a "preference program that is as unjust as any form of overt discrimination" (301), and Ting adds, "the lottery is unfair and expressly discriminatory on the basis of ethnicity" (18). Under the pretense of opening doors, the lottery systems have built into them processes that actually serve to skew results, keeping undesirables out. As we see by Act 5 of *The Merchant*, all of the immigrants who are welcomed to Belmont are from Venice: Bassanio, Gratiano, Lorenzo, and Jessica.³⁹

Both lotteries, then, seem to promote discrimination and racial prejudice. In Portia's reaction framing the episode with Morocco, we see this made explicit. Upon discovering that

³⁹ While Jessica is Jewish and not considered a Venetian citizen, she appears to desire assimilation in her escape from her father, her marriage into a Christian community, and her light regard for her familial / Jewish heirlooms, tradition, and identity. Focusing on the farewell speech between Launcelot and Jessica (2.3.15-20), Janet Adelman argues, "Lorenzo is invoked in this speech not as the solution to Jessica's erotic desire but as the solution to the problem of her father's blood. Though we might expect her to convert in order to marry, the rhetorical weight of this speech moves in the opposite direction, suggesting that she would marry in order to convert" (5).

Morocco has arrived in Belmont, Portia responds in a racially focused manner, saying, “If he have the condition of a saint and the complexion of a devil, I had rather he should shrive me than wive me” (1.2.112-14). Morocco embodies the traits of a befitting suitor as outlined in Nerissa’s assessment of the lottery. In considering the caskets, Morocco himself says, “I do in birth deserve her and in fortunes, / In graces, and in qualities of breeding; / But more than these, in love I do deserve” (2.7.32-34). Morocco is socioeconomically elite and, unlike Bassanio, praises Portia, not her wealth. Yet, his qualities notwithstanding, Morocco is dismissed because of his dark complexion. The interaction between Portia and Morocco continues to center on race, as, *anticipating* racial prejudice, Morocco begins his communication by telling Portia, “Mislike me not for my complexion” (2.1.1). He apparently knows of the desire for sameness, and in hopes of deferring or eliminating discrimination, he then continues to offer positive associations with his complexion: he can be both protector—“this aspect of mine / Hath feared the valiant” (2.1.8-9)—and lover—“The best regarded virgins of our clime / Have loved it too” (2.1.10-11). Supposedly, however, Morocco does not need to take such a defensive position since the lottery is presumably left to equal chance. And, in fact, like the DV program’s stated position that the lottery is equally available to all eligible applicants, Portia assures Morocco that he has the same chance as every other suitor, saying, “Yourself, renowned prince, then stood as fair / As any comer I have looked on yet / For my affection” (2.1.20-22). However, as both lotteries have built into their systems the ability to discriminate based on ethnicity, the same is true in their ability to discriminate based upon race.

Similar to Portia’s opening statement concerning Morocco, closing out their interactions is her exclamation, “A gentle riddance! Draw the curtains; go. / Let all of his complexion choose me so” (2.7. 79-80). Despite telling Morocco that he stands an equal chance as anybody, Portia’s racist

propensity is undeniable at this moment. Whether Portia is aware of the contents of the caskets all along or only after suitors make their choices, her decision in guiding Bassanio to the correct casket, coupled with her racist remarks towards Morocco, emphasize how the lottery can be manipulated to reinforce similitude and inscribe racial discrimination into the lottery process. Bassanio is allowed access, at least partly because of his complexion, while Morocco is denied access because of his.

Though Bassanio is the only winner of the casket lottery, he is representative of all the immigrants given access to Belmont.⁴⁰ He is from Venice, as are the other immigrants, Gratiano, Lorenzo, and Jessica. These Venetian immigrants are preferred as they are the ones most likely to maintain and prolong similitude. The same idea is implied within the DV lottery system, as the preferred immigration group seems to be European. The people who end up in Belmont and in the United States are not representative of an immigration policy aimed at diversity. In addition, the selection process allowing these individuals access does not conform to the random methodology claimed by either of the lotteries, nor do the results of the lotteries stand in accord with their stated purposes. Thus, the insinuated ease of participating in the lotteries camouflages what seems to be valued most by the lotteries' enforcers: homogeneity is favored, outweighing purported eligibility requirements and equal opportunity. The play's immigration policy is as prejudicial and

⁴⁰ At this point, it might be useful to consider Antonio's part in Belmont's immigration process. He seems to represent the "ideal immigrant," which, in his case, can be classified as a visitor. Unlike Belmont's immigrants, Antonio is not there out of any need. As demonstrated, Bassanio immigrates to Belmont with the desire of financially benefiting from its vast treasure. His kinsman, Gratiano, finds a home base for himself by marrying into the Belmontian community. The fleeing couple, Jessica and Lorenzo, can be considered asylum seekers, searching for refuge from Shylock and Venice. These immigrants all hope to benefit from what Belmont can offer them: wealth, stability, and security. Antonio, on the other hand, already possesses what the immigrants hope to acquire. He has a home in Venice (3.1.61), and, as *the* merchant of Venice, he clearly has a strong professional foundation and esteemed reputation in the city, evidenced by the fact that his credit amounts to a significant sum. Antonio's survival does not depend on what Belmont can offer him. As such, he is a "low-maintenance" visitor as he contributes to the Belmontian economy, first through his sponsorship of Bassanio's journey. More importantly, as Antonio's "argosies / Are richly come to harbor" (5.1.291-92), he will not be taking money out of Belmont. As a visitor/tourist, Antonio paradoxically represents the ideal immigrant because his visit is temporary and he contributes to Belmont's resources.

problematic as the current American immigration policy, with the entire system being based on would-be chance, bias, and bigotry, all serving to discourage difference, while nurturing and perpetuating cultural homogeneity. Neither of the lotteries yield the resolution they intend—resolving past discriminatory immigration policies, in the case of the DV lottery, or finding a suitable and loving husband for Portia, since her now deceased father is unavailable to make the judgment himself, in the case of Belmontian lottery. Even while emphasizing resolution, embedded within both lotteries' policies is a fear of the disruption of similitude, of the unfamiliar. Therefore, while the lotteries purport to offer open doors for the hopeful foreigners, ultimately they establish secure borders to keep them out.

CHAPTER 2: “HERE IN THE SKIRTS OF THE FOREST, LIKE FRINGE UPON A PETTICOAT”: PHOEBE AND ECOFEMINISM ALONG THE EDGE IN *AS YOU LIKE IT*

In Shakespeare’s *As You Like It*, Phoebe accuses Ganymede (the disguised Rosalind) of causing her “much ungentleness” (5.2.67). Though the accusation is focused specifically on Ganymede’s indiscretion with the letter Phoebe has sent to him, I propose that Ganymede’s “ungentleness” towards Phoebe is consistent throughout their interactions, and representative of Rosalind’s “ungentleness” towards nature itself. As the central figure of *As You Like It*, Rosalind is often the focus of scholarship on this play.⁴¹ Even while analyzing Rosalind’s actions, this chapter will bring to the foreground Phoebe, a rich character, very often overlooked within the critical tradition.⁴² This approach not only highlights a peripheral character but also offers a reconsideration of Rosalind—from an ecofeminist perspective I argue Rosalind contaminates the green space that Phoebe inhabits, which results in Phoebe becoming a sacrificial figure.

There is a rich history of critical discussion on the pastoral of the play⁴³—as Harold C. Goddard points out, “It is customary to find the main theme of *As You Like It* in the contrast between court and country” (282). He adds, though, “But whoever goes no deeper than this does not get very near the heart of [the play]” (282). While discussions on the pastoral are valuable, my attempt with this chapter is to delve “deeper” into this play from an ecocritical perspective, an

⁴¹For example, Harold Bloom considers Rosalind “a major literary character” (xv), while Edward I. Berry says, Rosalind “stands so firmly at the center of the play that the history of its criticism seems in large part an attempt to explain from different critical perspectives the preeminence of her role” (42).

⁴² In my research of various databases (*MLA Bibliography*, *JSTOR*, *Project Muse*), only one article focusing on Phoebe and containing her name in the title is located: “Ox-Eyed Phebe” by David-Everett Blythe, a two-page argument located in the Notes section of *Shakespeare Quarterly*.

⁴³ For instance, Jay L. Halio focuses on the forest as a place of regeneration, saying, “To the forest, the repository of natural life devoid of artificial time barriers, the champions of regeneration repair in order to derive new energy for the task before them. There they find refuge, gain strength, learn—and return” (207). Walter R. Davis adds, “Therefore it is no exaggeration to say that in Elizabethan romances, the pastoral land is first and foremost a symbol of an explicit ideal of a desirable state of mind, and that the purpose of the pastoral is to dramatize a state of mind through correspondence of a man’s life to his context” (153).

emerging field within early modern scholarship.⁴⁴ Even though this area of scholarship is recent and concerns with the environment seem to be a contemporary project, early moderns were preoccupied with “green” issues, as well. As Ken Hiltner notes, “early modern England, and especially London, was confronted with a host of environmental crises, including urban air pollution, acid rain, deforestation, endangered species, wetland loss, and rampant consumerism—to name but a few” (2). Todd A. Borlick adds, “it has become evident that people in the sixteenth century thought about a number of issues that continue to vex and galvanize the environmental movement four hundred years later. To name a few: a population boom and widespread deforestation provoked anxieties about a looming energy crisis” (2). More specific to the play, Richard Wilson claims, “*As You Like It* engages in the discursive revaluation of woodland that coincided with the sale and disafforestation (the legal alienation of royal forests) of the crown estates. In 1600 disposal of royal woods realized £150,000 for the Irish war, and this alienation was accomplished by propaganda to devalue the forests as unproductive wastes” (9). What these scholars demonstrate is that environmental concerns are not new. More importantly, they give credence to current ecocritical approaches to early modern literature.

As ecocriticism is relatively new, even less prevalent within the field is ecofeminist scholarship. Ecofeminism is an emerging field particularly within early modern literature, but is

⁴⁴ Gabriel Egan published his monograph *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism* in 2006. In his book, Egan acknowledges the absence of ecocriticism within the field by stating that this work was completed after the 2005 Shakespeare Association of America conference. On its program were topics such as “romance, sex, war, religion, history, and cinema” (Egan 1), but it did not offer a space for “the impending ecological disaster [climate change] facing humankind” (Egan 1). I would like to note, though, at the forty-first annual meeting of the Shakespeare Association of America to be held in 2013, a presentation entitled, “New Directions in Shakespeare and Ecocriticism” is on the program. Other texts concerning ecocriticism and early modern studies include: Bruce Boehrer’s *Shakespeare Among the Animals*; Robert N. Watson’s *Back to Nature: The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance*; Thomas Hallock et al’s *Early Modern Ecostudies: From the Florentine Codex to Shakespeare*; Ken Hiltner’s *Renaissance Ecology: Imagining Eden in Milton’s England*; Jeffrey S. Theis’s *Writing the Forest in Early Modern England: A Sylvan Pastoral Nation*; and Todd A. Borlick’s *Ecocriticism and Early Modern Literature: Green Pastures*. These texts range from 2002 to 2011.

also fairly new, in general. As Karen J. Warren, states, “All ecofeminists agree that there are important connections between the unjustified dominations of women and nature, but they disagree about both the nature of those connections and whether some of the connections are potentially liberating or grounds for reinforcing harmful stereotypes about women” (21). Warren’s statement illustrates the general concept of ecofeminist studies, but also acknowledges tension within the field, also noted by Kate Soper. She writes the main objection to both feminist and green sympathizers is that “such feminization of nature reproduces the woman-nature equivalence that has served as legitimation for the domestication of women and their relegation to maternal and nurturing functions” (314). Furthermore, “a related charge is that idealized associations of women with the ‘land’ and earth-bound values have often been yoked to a reactionary politics, which invokes iconic female figures and a romanticized rural imagery as representative of a national culture whose actual policies toward women, land ownership, and the division of labor are conservative, if not down right bigoted” (Soper 314). The tension described here is the perfect space from which to analyze *As You Like It* and Rosalind because Rosalind is a female figure who, I argue, at the same time defies the “woman-nature equivalence” (Soper 314) and creates and perpetuates destruction.

Greta Gaard’s and Patrick D. Murphy’s assessment of ecofeminism—“Ecofeminism is a practical movement for social change arising out of the struggles of women to sustain themselves, their families, and their communities. These struggles are waged against the ‘maldevelopment’ and environmental degradation caused by patriarchal societies, multinational corporations, and global capitalism” (2)—also largely influences my reading of *As You Like It*. This is the case because, as I will develop more fully later in this essay, the forest and its inhabitants, most especially Phoebe, suffer under “patriarchal societies” and ideologies (Gaard and Murphy 2).

Additionally, Colleen Mack-Canty's perspective of ecofeminism helps highlight the relationship between Rosalind and nature and between Rosalind, Pheobe, and nature. She states, "Ecofeminism, in its use of ecology as a model for human behavior, suggests that we act out of a recognition of our interdependency with others; all others: human and nonhuman" (169). And Noel Sturgeon's definition, though broad, encapsulates the driving force behind this essay. She remarks, "Most simply put, ecofeminism is a movement that makes connections between environmentalisms and feminisms; more precisely, it articulates the theory that the ideologies that authorize injustices based on gender, race, and class are related to the ideologies that sanction the exploitation and degradation of the environment" (23). The lens of ecofeminism allows us to move beyond pastoral scholarship that focuses on the idyllic life the country represents⁴⁵, and it also allows us to take a look at the previously unnoticed Phoebe as well as the complex character that is Rosalind.

While taking an ecofeminist approach, this chapter uses as its conceptual framework patriarchal ideology.⁴⁶ As Warren points out, "What characterizes the position of women under patriarchy is not that women have no power, valued status, prestige, or privilege; they do—what women under patriarchy have in common, as a group, is less institutional power and privilege than men" (64). The patriarchal lens through which I analyze the play is an apt vehicle as "ecology and

⁴⁵ Joseph W. Meeker writes, "The pastoral looks longingly at biological nature as an alternative to society" (51). He adds, "The pastoral goal has always been to find in rural nature an alternative to the ills of civilization" (53). For Rene E. Fortin, "The central symbol, of course, is the Forest of Arden, a 'golden world' whose inhabitants are able to 'fleet the time carelessly'" (570). And, according to A. Stuart Daley, "There is a well-established critical consensus that in *As You Like It* Shakespeare celebrates the superiority of life in the country to life in the city and the court," adding, "Critics have long etherealized the Forest as a fantasy world or fairyland or pastoral retreat apart from time"(300).

⁴⁶ To define "patriarchy" for this essay, I borrow from Karen J. Warren, who states: 'patriarchy' is the systematic domination of women by men through *institutions* (including policies, practices, offices, positions, roles), *behaviors*, and *ways of thinking* (conceptual frameworks), which assign higher value, privilege, and power to men (or to what historically is male-gender identified) than to that given to women (or to what is historically female gendered identified). (italics Warren's 64)

feminism...reflect the ideological parallels in the conception of nature as bestial ‘other’ to human culture and the conception of woman as inferior ‘other’ to man” (Soper 314). In a similar vein, Timothy Clark makes the claim that, for ecofeminists, “ecological problems are seen to result from structures of hierarchy and elitism in human society, geared to exploit both other people and the natural world as a source of profit” (2). Wendy Furman-Adams and Virginia James Tufte add, “the goal of ecofeminist thinking is to recover and empower the suppressed voices of women, of ethnic-minorities, and of the desperately endangered earth” (143).

An ecofeminist reading of this play not only offers a fresh perspective in feminist studies, but also offers a unique reading of the play, given my argument that Rosalind is the source of contamination. Soper nicely captures the essence and stresses the importance of this area of study:

Whether nature is viewed as a sublime “other” that has been lost to human culture or as a mere instrument of its advance, [the] feminized space of nature is still defined in opposition to what is characteristically “human.” In short, any eco-politics that simply reasserts the claims of nature against its human dominion is at risk of reproducing the implicit identification of the species with its male members in its very denunciations of humanity. (317)

Ecofeminism is important because both ecology and women suffer under the ideology of patriarchy. Even as I focus on Rosalind and Phoebe in my reading of the play, one, I argue is victimized while the other is the assailant. As I will explain more fully throughout the chapter, Rosalind-as-Ganymede embodies “*ways of thinking*” that are “historically male-gender identified” while in the Forest of Ardenne, but she also carries with her the little institutional privilege she has as a Duke’s daughter (and niece) to supplement her power while identifying as a male (italics Warren’s 64). In turn, this provides her with the opportunities to irrevocably disrupt the green space of the Forest and its residents, but most particularly Phoebe.

Historically Rosalind

While this reading of *As You Like It* offers a unique perspective on the play, it also diverges greatly from traditional scholarship on Rosalind. In comparison to William Hazlitt to Harold Bloom to feminist scholars such as Carole McKewin to Marjorie Garber who view Rosalind in a positive light, I look at the complexities of Rosalind's character. Bloom believes "Rosalind's wit is the most balanced, the most proportionate to the pragmatics of everyday existence, and clearly the most capable of harmony, of what Yeats liked to call Unity of Being" (2). Hazlitt uses terms such as "sportive gaiety" and "natural tenderness" (199) to describe Rosalind, while H.N. Hudson makes the claim that "her wit neither stings nor burns" (344).⁴⁷ With expressively sweet sentimentality, he adds, "And her heart seems a perennial spring of affectionate cheerfulness and no trial can break, no sorrow chill, her flow of spirits; even her sighs are breathed forth in a wrappage of innocent mirth" (8). Hugh M. Richmond claims that "Rosalind is Shakespeare's most delightful heroine," who is "never tyrannical in her authority over others' emotions" (137). Richmond goes so far as to claim that Rosalind is "the most successful model for women in Shakespeare" (138). These sunny assessments of Rosalind often couple her actions in "wrappage of innocent mirth," as well. While Richmond feels she is "never tyrannical," Bloom claims, "All that Rosalind asks for her will is that it not be violated or usurped; she has no will to power over others" (4). To quote at length, he adds:

[Rosalind's] freedom is that of a wholly normative personality: mature, without malice, needing to turn aggressively neither against herself nor against others. We rejoice in her because no other figure in Western literature, not even in Shakespeare, is at once so accomplished in wit, and so little interested in the power that great wit can bring if properly exercised. No one else, in Shakespeare or any other author, is so free of resentment while yet retaining all of the natural human endowments of curiosity, vitality, and desire. We intensely welcome her company, because no other fictive presence is at once so naturalistically refreshing, or less insistent upon appropriating for herself. (5)

⁴⁷ E.E. Stoll and Georg Brandes make similar claims about Rosalind's wit. Stoll says, "For her wit has no trace of a sting in it" (70) and Brandes argues that "Rosalind's wit is gaiety without a sting" (266).

While my reading of *Rosalind* diverges greatly from these appraisals, it also uses them as a catalyst to delve more deeply into the play and into the character.

Likewise, feminist scholarship on the play and on *Rosalind* serves as a foundation for this essay, even with the various analyses of both. For example, there tend to be two broader camps from which feminist scholarship on *Rosalind* emerges: those who believe *Rosalind* gives into patriarchal ideology and those who believe she subverts it. Barbara J. Bono, for instance, falls into the former camp, claiming, “[*Rosalind*] resubordinates herself through marriage to masculine hierarchy, giving herself to her father to be given to her husband, and thus serves the socially conservative purpose of Shakespearean romantic comedy” (194), while Leah S. Marcus can be categorized within the latter, claiming, “*Rosalind* exerts almost complete control over the world of Arden, playing many parts male and female, using her disguise as Ganymede to get what she cannot as a woman” (99). Marjorie Garber points out that “in other Shakespearean comedies, women dressed as men have compelling reasons for remaining in disguise” (102), but *Rosalind* does not. Garber claims that the reason for *Rosalind*’s disguise is no longer necessary in the forest, but that she maintains her disguise until Orlando unlearns his Petrarchan desire towards her. James L. Calderwood adds, “At one level these disguisings enable the women not only to get their men but also, as if by proxy, to transform them for the better” (35). Regardless of which side of the feminist spectrum one may land, Carole McKewin points out, “Whatever we may think of [*Rosalind*’s and *Celia*’s] choice in husbands, we must admit that *Rosalind* and *Celia* have had more than romantic pleasures in a setting where fathers, unwittingly or not, let daughters choose their own mates” (124). My aim here is not to argue with these observations but to add to and shift the discussion. As Berry pointed out in 1980:

While the best criticism of *As You Like It* has managed to explore the play’s themes and conventions without losing touch with its “human experience,” it has not entirely avoided

oversimplifying Rosalind's role, even when most insisting upon its complexity. To see Rosalind as an "ideal woman," or as a synthesis of "conflicting attitudes towards love, or as a representative of the "ideals of love and the values of the pastoral" is to conceive of this engaging character as the static embodiment of an idea. (52)

Though I do agree that Rosalind is the central character in the play, my goal is to reevaluate her role in light of previous scholarship from an ecofeminist perspective. Furthermore, since she is the principal character, it is through my analysis of her that I attempt to bring to the foreground another important yet overlooked character, Phoebe.

"Know where you are...?" (1.1.34)

To begin, I believe it is important to discuss the environmental spaces at work in the play in order to then discuss the impact the players have on them and vice versa. Though most of the play occurs in the Forest of Ardenne, it opens in the usurping Duke's court. More specifically, however, the play opens within a green space—the orchard of Oliver's house. The play opens with an angry and frustrated Orlando being kept "rustically at home" (1.1.6). He tells Adam that "Besides this nothing that [Oliver] so plentifully gives me, the something that nature gave me his countenance seems to take from me" (1.1.13-15). Even though the play opens within the realm of the civilized court, Orlando's opening remarks, along with the fact that the scene takes place in an orchard invests the play in a more ecological framework long before the audience is transported to the Forest of Ardenne. Not only does the manicured orchard serve as a contrast to the "wild wood" (5.4.148) of Ardenne, but it also serves as a metaphor for the cultural (patriarchal) constructs of the brothers' environment—what they might consider their "natural" environment.

Ostensibly, Orlando is upset because his brother, Oliver, refuses to care for Orlando as a "gentlemen of [his] birth" (1.1.8). Though the play opens with feuding brothers, Orlando's predicament highlights an oppressive patriarchal ideology, an ideology that we see inhibits Rosalind, and then eventually those in Ardenne. In his case, Orlando is caught within the accepted

bounds of the practice of primogeniture, a patriarchal institution by which men also are victimized. Primogeniture, according to the *OED*, is “the right of the firstborn child of a family, especially a son, to succeed or inherit property or title to the exclusion of other claimants” (*OED* 3). Orlando highlights his inferior status while acknowledging the accepted custom when he says, “The courtesy of nations allows you my better, in that you are the first-born; but the same tradition takes not away my blood...” (1.1.39-40). We see Orlando grappling between his subordinated status as younger brother and his elevated social status as a “gentleman of [his] birth” (1.1.8). The ensuing conversation and physical altercation between the brothers that occur in the orchard underscore how their environment cultivates their belief system and how that belief system continues to manifest itself within their environment. Upon first meeting and at the beginning of their argument, Oliver asks Orlando, “Know you where you are, sir” (1.1.34). Orlando responds with, “O sir, very well; here in your orchard” (1.1.35), to which Oliver clarifies, “Know you before whom, sir” (1.1.36). Orlando interprets, even if facetiously, Oliver’s question as a spatial location, whereas Oliver means to suggest that Orlando is in a place beyond what his rank allows. Thus, the orchard represents the manicured space that the courtly world exists in and the ways with which its inhabitants should be behaving.

The orchard continues to be of great significance. Once Orlando leaves the orchard, telling Oliver, “I will no further offend you than becomes me for my good” (1.1.67-68), Oliver says, “Is it even so? Begin you to grow upon me? I will physic your rankness, and yet give no thousand crowns neither” (1.1.73-74). The *OED* defines the term “grow” in association with plants, stating, “to manifest vigorous growth, to put forth foliage, flourish, be green” (*OED* 2). Making this statement in the orchard is compelling as Oliver is concerned over Orlando’s “vigorous, flourishing growth,” for which there is no room in a cultivated space such as the orchard and what

it represents—the civilized, courtly world. This is further suggested by the term “rankness,” which, according to the footnote, Orlando is in a state of “overgrown vegetation” (1627). As a result, Oliver makes the ominous claim to want to “physic” or trim and tame Orlando’s unruly vegetation. Orlando begins to question authority, the law of the land, and to behave inappropriately in his position within society; thus, Oliver feels the need to cut him down, to put him in his appropriate place. Oliver wants to tame Orlando’s unruliness as he has had his orchard, the green space in which the action takes place, tamed and manicured, as well. According to Roy Strong, while the middle to the late years “of the sixteenth century were not at all conducive to either architecture or gardening” (45), “the palaces and gardens of [Elizabeth I’s] father’s reign remained unchanged as the background to her court” (45). Furthermore, Henry VIII’s gardens, “from the start, [are] strongly cast as a vehicle for symbolic display” (Strong 33). Accordingly, Orlando’s orchard can be viewed as a metaphorical visual to his authority as well as a symbolic display of patriarchy as a whole. That the play opens in the orchard and the fight between the brothers occurs here opens up a conversation for ecofeminism. The orchard serves not only as a counter to the wild Forest of Ardenne, but its cultivated space also demonstrates the potential taming of the wild vegetation of the Forest and of those unruly inhabitants who threaten the dominant patriarchal culture.

As Orlando suffers under the patriarchal practice of primogeniture, Rosalind similarly suffers as a subordinate woman within the patriarchal culture. Like Orlando who lives a frustrated, anxiety-ridden life under the rule of his brother in particular and of primogeniture in general, Rosalind lives under the oppressive regime of her usurping uncle, a member of the dominant patriarchal institution. Her father has been exiled and she has been spared only by the love of her cousin, Celia, daughter of Duke Frederick. After the wrestling match between Charles and Orlando, in which Orlando wins, Celia and Rosalind are again alone within Duke Frederick’s

court, where Rosalind is brooding. When Celia attempts to cheer her up, Rosalind sighs, “O how full of briers is this working-day world!” (1.3.9-10). Like Oliver, Rosalind likens frustrations of her world with wild vegetation. As Oliver finds Orlando to be “overgrown in rankness” (1.1.73), Rosalind finds her world to be overcrowded by thorny stems. Interestingly, overgrown vegetation and thorny stems are natural for a “natural,” undeveloped landscape, but both Oliver and Rosalind use these terms to indicate how unnatural each of their circumstances is. Rosalind and Oliver, and, indeed, the others from court, associate the term “nature” with behavior. As Clark points out, “The very term *nature* has several, incompatible meanings whose interrelations can be said already to enact some distinctive environmental quandaries” (italics Clark’s 6). One definition of the term, with which those from court identify, “may mean simply the defining characteristic of something, as in the ‘nature’ of democracy, or the nature of ‘nature’” (Clark 7). As will be demonstrated throughout this paper, there are incompatible meanings of “nature” between the courtiers and the foresters, as has already been shown with Oliver and Rosalind.

For Rosalind, her uncle as Duke is unnatural, as he has usurped the crown; therefore, her world is laden with briers. Celia’s response to Rosalind is a reminder of Oliver’s manicured orchard and what it symbolizes—order and submission. Celia tells Rosalind that “If we walk not in the trodden paths our very petticoats will catch [burs]” (1.3.12-13). That is, if the women stick to the domesticated pathways, they will easily avoid the sticky nature of thorny stems and burs, both literally and figuratively. If they behave as they should within their cultivated environment, then all will be well. Yet Rosalind, like Orlando, is unhappy with her place in this society. Rosalind’s frustration stems from her place in society as a whole—as a woman to be “chaste, silent, and obedient”—and also by the fact that her uncle, her guardian, hates her. Before being banished by her uncle, we learn just how much the Duke hates Rosalind when Le Beau tells Orlando:

But I can tell you that of late this Duke
 Hath ta'en displeasure 'gainst his gentle niece,
 Grounded upon no other argument
 But that the people praise her for her virtues
 And pity her for her good father's sake.
 And, on my life, his malice 'gainst the lady
 Will suddenly break forth. (1.2.244-50)

Part of Rosalind's insecurity at this point most likely comes from the fact that her uncle hates her. Even more perilous for Rosalind is that she experiences the Duke's wrath despite her dutiful participation within his society, which, according to Oliver's and Celia's way of thinking, should not be the case. Though Rosalind contains herself within the "domesticated pathways," she still catches the "burs", figured in her uncle's hatred and her eventual banishment.

Rosalind and Orlando share similar experiences in their subordinated living, which become even more difficult as they are both exiled from court. Duke Frederick demands that Rosalind leave court within "these ten days" (1.3.17) or risk being put to death. Orlando, on the other hand, goes through a self-imposed exile as he learns that his brother intends to kill him while he is sleeping (2.3.17-29). Orlando, along with Adam, and Rosalind, along with Celia and Touchstone, leave court and make their way to the Forest of Ardenne.

The Dialogue of Nature

Though Orlando and Rosalind share common suppressive environments, what is important to note about their respective responses is that their definition of nature is quite different than an ecological definition of nature. As noted, the play opens with Orlando complaining to Adam about his circumstances. Specifically, he says that Oliver, "Besides this nothing that he so plentifully gives me, the something that *nature* gave me his countenance seems to take from me" (italics mine, 1.1.13-15). Though standing in Oliver's orchard, an actual manifestation of nature, Orlando defines nature in terms of behavior and manners. Likewise, Rosalind's response to her situation,

likening it to being overgrown with briars, implies that her natural world—the one in which she was the daughter of the Duke—no longer exists. Not only do these responses illuminate a fundamental break from ecological ties (and responsibilities), but their definition of nature also stands in contrast to those who live in the Forest. For the foresters and for many ecocritics, “‘nature’ names the non-human world, the non-artificial” (Clark 7). For many ecofeminists, “the term nature refers to ordinarily observable features of the world: the natural as opposed to the urban or industrial environment (landscape, wilderness, countryside, etc.), domestic and wild animals, the physical body in space, and raw materials” (Soper 320). Not only do we see the difference in the meaning of nature when the courtiers first enter Ardenne, but we see that their definition never alters all the while they are in the Forest. Those whose definitions do change, though, even if slightly, are the foresters.

Most famously, perhaps, is the discussion held between Corin, a shepherd of the Forest, and Touchstone, Celia’s fool. Hospitably, Corin begins the conversation by asking Touchstone if he enjoys the shepherd’s life (3.2.11). What is significant about their banter is that Corin thinks through nature while Touchstone equates nature with manners. When asked by Touchstone if he knows philosophy, Corin responds, “No more but that...the property of rain is to wet, and fire to burn; that good pasture makes fat sheep; and that a great cause of the night is lack of the sun” (5.2.20-24). In answering the question with terms associated with nature: “rain,” “fire,” “pasture,” “sheep,” “night,” and “sun,” Corin impresses Touchstone who says as much: “Such a one is a natural philosopher” (5.2.27). He quickly recants, though, when Corin admits to never having been at court. For Touchstone, then, this means that Corin “never sawest good manners” (5.2.34-35). Corin’s “natural philosophy” is no longer valid. Like Orlando and Rosalind who equate nature with behavior, so does Touchstone. This is further demonstrated when the banished Duke’s two

pages sing a song for Touchstone. The pages sing a wedding song in which a “lover and his lass.../ That o’er the green cornfield did pass / In spring-time,” and, “These pretty country folks would lie, / In spring-time,” likening this life to a flower (5.3.14-28). Like Corin, the subjects of the song are connected to their natural, green environment. Touchstone, again, finds fault, stating, “there was no great matter in the ditty” (5.3.38-39) and “I count it but time lost to hear such a foolish song” (5.3.42-43).

Others from court also articulate nature in terms of behavior. When we are first introduced to Rosalind and Celia, they want to “be merry” (1.2.19) and play at sport (1.2.25). They engage in witty banter about Fortune and Nature. When Touchstone enters the scene, Celia tells Rosalind, “Peradventure this is not Fortune’s work, neither, but Nature’s, who perceiveth our natural wits too dull to reason of such goddesses” (1.2.43-45). Again we see the association of nature to behavior, or, in this case, to reason, which informs behavior. Towards the end of the play, we continue to see this train of thought. When Oliver finds Ganymede and Aliena, he relays to them the current state of Orlando’s position—injured by a lioness in saving his brother. In defending Orlando’s honor and *behavior*, Oliver says:

Twice did he turn his back, and purposed so.
But kindness, nobler ever than revenge,
And *nature*, stronger than his just occasion
Made him give battle to the lioness. (*italics mine*, 4.3.126-29).

That is, Oliver states that Orlando would have been justified in leaving the lioness to attack his brother, a brother who treated him very poorly; however, Orlando’s *nature*, good-mannered as a gentlemen by birth, does not allow him to leave his brother.

Celia’s response to the situation further associates nature with behavior: “O, I have heard [Orlando] speak of that same brother [Oliver], / And he did render him the most unnatural / That lived amongst men” (4.3.120-22). Agreeing with his brother, Oliver replies, “And well he might

so do, / For well I know he was unnatural” (4.3.123-24). In this sense, the term “unnatural” is being applied to describe Oliver’s unbrotherly disposition towards Orlando. That is, Oliver did not behave well towards his brother, not just through fraternal bonding, but by the responsibilities explicated by their father’s will.⁴⁸ After having spent time within the Forest, at this point, Celia still perpetuates *preconceived*, patriarchal cultivated ideas about nature, which serves to emphasize her estrangement from the Forest, illuminated by her disguised name—Aliena, meaning “foreign” or “stranger.”

While the descriptors of nature are associated with manners and behavior by those from court, the use of nature by the inhabitants of the Forest are ecologically bound and relational to their lives. Silvius, for instance, is tied to the land by his occupation—a shepherd—and by his name. The name most likely stems from the term “silvi,” Latin for wood or woodland (*OED* 1). More so, though, as others from Ardenne do, Silvius thinks through nature. When asked by Phoebe to deliver a letter to Ganymede, Silvius happily responds:

So holy and so perfect is my love,
And I in such a poverty of grace,
That I shall think it a most plenteous crop
To glean the broken ears after the man
That the main harvest reaps. (3.5.100-04)

Like Corin earlier, so ingrained within his ecological realm, Silvius uses terms associated with the green space surrounding him to articulate meaning. He conveys to a fellow Forester his meaning through ecologically tied terms: “plenteous crop” and “harvest reaps,” as examples. Not only are these terms used to best express his feelings, but they also convey understanding, I would argue, because of Silvius’ and Phoebe’s close relationship with their environment.

⁴⁸ Orlando tells Adam, “it was upon this fashion bequeathed me by will but poor a thousand crowns, and, as thou sayst, charged my brother on his blessing to breed me well” (1.1.1-4). Just a little later in the scene, Orlando reminds Oliver: “My father changed you in his will to give me good education” (1.1.56-57).

Like Silvius and Corin, Phoebe also integrates nature, her environment, with her life and feelings. Once Ganymede leaves the scene, after rebuking and insulting Phoebe, Phoebe remarks, “Dead shepherd, now I find thy saw of might: / ‘Who ever loved that loved not at first sight?’” (3.5.82-83). Though this is a reference to Christopher Marlowe (the “dead shepherd”) and his poem *Hero and Leander*, it also demonstrates Phoebe’s ecological attachment to her surroundings. Evoking the shepherd as her first response to the desire she feels towards Ganymede illustrates Phoebe’s connection to her green space. This is not only the place in which she lives, but it is a space that is a part of her being. The same is true for others from the Forest, as well. When Touchstone asks William, a wooer of Audrey’s, “Wast born i’th’ forest here?” (5.1.21), William simply but strongly replies, “Ay, sir, I thank God” (5.1.22).

“To liberty, and not to banishment” (1.3.132).

While it seems Rosalind and Orlando attempt to escape the pressures of the patriarchal world dominating their lives at court by making their way to the Forest, they bring with them and impose onto others the same ideology that they are attempting to escape, thereby contaminating the ecological realities of the Forest of Ardenne. Orlando literally vandalizes the forest with his love verses that he writes of Rosalind (3.2.1-10). His reasoning for this is so “That every eye which in this forest looks / Shall see [Rosalind’s] virtue witnessed everywhere” (3.2.7-8). He wants to “carve on every tree” (3.2.9) in order to capture the permanence of his love for Rosalind, as evidenced by what he says immediately after: “carve on every tree / The fair, the chaste, and unexpressive she” (3.2.9-10). While this may be looked upon as a romantic gesture, as noted earlier, the inhabitants of the Forest already think through nature and therefore do not need to abuse the ecological space in order to emphasize their feelings.

Orlando's disfigurement of the trees is severe enough⁴⁹, but Rosalind-as-Ganymede's actions are more so as she disrupts the ecological realities (both its natural and cultural landscape) of the forest by imposing upon its residents the patriarchal ideologies from which she herself wanted to escape. Upon first entering the Forest, the brooding, sighing Rosalind from court is transformed into Ganymede, a young man traveling with his young sister, Aliena (the disguised Celia). Rosalind / Ganymede is soon aware of the role she must play; almost immediately, her first words as Ganymede are, "I could find in my heart to disgrace my man's apparel and to cry like a woman. But I must comfort the weaker vessel, as doublet and hose ought to show itself courageous to petticoat; therefore, courage, good Aliena!" (2.4.3-6). Here we see cultural constructs of Rosalind's world being brought into the Forest. She feels like crying "like a woman," but must comfort the woman, "the weaker vessel," since she is disguised as a man. Though Rosalind certainly shows strength at this moment, what I want to point out is that from this moment, patriarchal ideologies are introduced within the Forest. We see this displayed through Audrey, for

⁴⁹ For Thomas Kelly, "Orlando [is] the champion of Nature and the pastoral ideal" (16). Arthur Quiller-Couch claims that Orlando's carving upon the trees demonstrates his true honesty, saying, "Even honest Orlando, being in love, must write ballads and pin them on oaks; but he writes them so very ill that we must allow him honest" (911). He adds, "Orlando...speaks out from the heart" (911) at this moment. Likewise, D.J. Snider argues that Orlando's marking of the trees is evidence that he is "consumed with the most intense passion [love]" (79). For Albert R. Cirillo, though, Orlando is promulgating "conventions of love" (31), to which Peter B. Erickson adds, "Orlando equates being in love with the reflex gesture of producing huge quantities of poetry" (68). Paul J. Willis takes these observations further by discussing theological implications of Orlando's actions, stating:

With knife and pen, Orlando makes obvious what others in the play have done all along: he imposes his own text on the supposedly divine text of the forest. He presumes to write the book of nature. Orlando surpasses the others, however, in perverting the function of natural revelation. Creation is supposed to be a mute witness to the glory of God. But Orlando would have every tree witness the "virtue" of Rosalind, "the unexpressive she." In Petrarch and Sannazaro, to take two examples, the pastoral lover often detects his beloved in the landscape. Shakespeare allows this pastoral tradition to collide head-on with traditional theology. As Rosalind puts it, "There is a man haunts the forest that abuses our young plants with carving 'Rosalind' on their barks, . . . deifying the name Rosalind" (3.2.350-54). Theologically, this deification is an abuse, the exact sort that Paul condemns in his discussion of natural revelation in Romans 1. "Mar no more trees," says Jaques to Orlando (3.2.255), and the next scene presents us with a village vicar by the name of Mar-Text—a name that might more aptly apply to Orlando himself. In marring the trees he mars their text by imposing one of his own. Compared to the Duke's "sermons in stones," his are a "tedious homily" (3.2.152). (70)

instance, towards the end of the play when Touchstone (who had companioned Rosalind and Celia into the Forest) asks her if she is ready to be married. She replies delicately with, “I do desire it with all my heart; and I hope it is no dishonest desire to desire to be a woman of the world” (5.3.3-4). Audrey attempts to display her true desire to be married without coming across as too eager, which having been schooled by Touchstone earlier, she knows means “sluttish” (3.3.28, 30, 31). Rather than thinking through nature here, we see Audrey thinking through patriarchal ideologies imparted upon her by Touchstone, a resident of court.

Though Rosalind and Celia disguise themselves in order to shed their former identities, they stop short of enmeshing themselves within the ecological culture of the Forest. Indeed, when first meeting Ganymede in the Forest and learning that he is a “native of this place” (3.2.306), Orlando responds, “Your accent is something finer than you could purchase in so removed a dwelling” (3.2.309-10). Not fully escaping into nature, Rosalind’s actions, instead, from the time she enters the Forest are mostly disruptive to both the landscape and to its occupants. For instance, upon first arriving, she, Celia, and Touchstone happen upon Corin and Silvius, two shepherds, having an intimate discussion. They overhear the conversation in which Silvius professes his unrequited love for Phoebe (2.4.18-38). For Rosalind, the pain in his voice and his words arouses the memory of the pain she feels for her lost love, Orlando. When Silvius exits crying, “O, Phoebe, Phoebe, Phoebe!” (2.4.38), Rosalind says, “Alas, poor shepherd, searching of thy wound, / I have by hard adventure found mine own” (2.4.39-40).

Even while sympathizing with the pained Silvius, Rosalind’s next plan of action immediately dismisses him and takes no consideration for his feelings or for his livelihood. When Rosalind asks Corin for accommodations, he replies that he wishes he were in a position to offer proper hospitality. As it is, he replies, “Fair sir, I pity [Aliena], / And wish, for her sake more than

for mine own, / My fortunes were more able to relieve her” (2.4.70-72). Upon learning that Corin’s master’s cottage is for sale, Rosalind asks him to buy “the cottage, pasture, and the flock” (2.4.87) for them. While she offers Corin a place of employment on what will be her newly acquired property, she has easily dismissed and overlooked Silvius and his livelihood at the same time. We know this because, before asking Corin to purchase the property on their behalf, Rosalind asks him, “What is he that shall buy his flock and pasture?” (2.4.83), to which Corin replies, “That young swain that you saw here but erewhile” (2.4.84). Knowing that Silvius, a shepherd, plans on purchasing the property, Rosalind unhesitatingly asks Corin to purchase the property for her and her mates. Having just arrived to Ardenne, the disguised Rosalind already disrupts its ecological setting by hijacking the opportunity from Silvius—the experienced shepherd—to purchase the cottage, pasture, and all. Not only has this decision suppressed Silvius from an opportunity to do what he does best within his own territory of living, but the decision has also put the ecological space at peril because neither Rosalind nor those in her group understand the upkeep of such a space. Though we do not learn what the consequences of this deal are for Silvius or for the pasture from the play, we do know that the disguised Rosalind has just subjected Silvius to what was done to her—banishment from a place of comfort and security. Even though she has been subjected to an oppressed state of being, she has no problem in doing the same to others.

Betwixt Orchard and Forest: “the purlieu of this forest” (4.3.75)

When Oliver seeks Rosalind’s and Celia’s cottage, he asks Ganymede and Aliena, “Good morrow, fair ones. Pray you, if you know, / Where in the purlieu of this forest stands / A sheepcote fenced about with olive trees?” (4.3.74-76). As Heather Dubrow points out, “Virtually all critics refer to her living in the forest; but in fact Rosalind and Celia, we are told not once but twice, instead live on its borders, in an area explicitly identified at one point as its purlieux” (67). The

OED defines these purlieus as “tracts of land on the fringe or border of a forest; one formerly included within the forest boundaries and still partly subject to the forest laws, especially those related to hunting or killing game” (*OED* 1a). The purlieu in which Rosalind lives provides a visual image of the tensions between court and pastoral, and it also captures, metaphorically, the various oppositional positions Rosalind embodies. To quote Dubrow at length, she claims:

It is not surprising that a character who is repeatedly positioned on the margins of gendered categories and desires—male and female and arguably heterosexual and same-sex as well—is also spatially positioned on a border. From another perspective...Rosalind enjoys special hunting rights: in lieu of simply accepting the role of a hunted deer and thus a feminized subject position, she can go after her man. Nor is it surprising that a heroine who forcefully asserts her autonomy at several points in the play, apparently yields to patriarchal authority...” (68)

I think it is important to discuss Rosalind’s purlieu-positioned self as it relates to an ecofeminist reading of this play. Even while struggling with her various dualistic positions that Dubrow points out (Rosalind / Ganymede; courtier / forester; heterosexual / homosocial desire; autonomous / subordinated), Rosalind mostly disrupts the Forest, which causes severe consequences to its inhabitants, especially to Phoebe.

Silvius and the cottage are the first to fall prey to Rosalind’s disturbance, but as the play continues, the most crucial evidence of her intrusion, invasion, and exploitation of the natural world occur through her actions towards Phoebe. When Rosalind makes the offer to purchase the cottage, she has just overheard Silvius’ pining for his love of Phoebe. As we learn later, Rosalind has continued to be fascinated with the drama surrounding Silvius and Phoebe because, according to Rosalind, “The sight of lovers feedeth those in love” (3.4.51). As with her actions to occupy the cottage, Rosalind’s interest in the affairs of Silvius and Phoebe is more selfish than thoughtful. As the cottage serves as a space for Rosalind to find respite, the lovers’ quarrel between Silvius and Phoebe serves as a pseudo-relationship for her to be in (that is, before Orlando comes along). She

inserts herself within this relationship in the same way she did the cottage—indifferently. Furthermore, Corin lets us know that Rosalind has taken a continued interest in the lovers' affairs when he says:

Mistress and master, you have oft enquired
 After the shepherd that complained of love
 Who you saw sitting by me on the turf,
 Praising the proud disdainful shepherdess
 That was his mistress. (3.4.40-45)

To this Rosalind responds by telling Corin to “Bring us to this sight, and you shall say / I’ll prove a busy actor in their play” (3.4.52-53). I imagine she says this with a sly smile on her face, reminiscent of how Puck devilishly messes up the love potions and turns Bottom’s head into that of an ass.⁵⁰ Rosalind’s flippant attitude towards the personal love problems between Silvius and Phoebe is similar to her flippant attitude towards the ecological space of the Forest. As the stage directions tell us, she, Celia, and Corin stand aside (3.5) as they eavesdrop on the conversation between Silvius and Phoebe. This intrusion is not unlike their intrusion of the Forest—where they seek self-assurance, safety, and comfort at the expense of others and of the green space they now occupy. Rosalind uses the ecological landscape and its residents as a means to her own ends, without care of the consequences.

Perhaps one of the most disturbing yet significant moments within the play is Rosalind’s treatment of Phoebe, which represents Rosalind’s intrusion on and exploitation of both the ecological and feminine landscapes. First, as we have learned from Corin, Rosalind premeditates her eavesdropping upon Phoebe. She then comes forward, intruding upon the conversation to insult and admonish Phoebe for statements made during a private conversation, exclaiming:

⁵⁰ It must be noted that almost all of the mischievous actions Puck does are taken against perceived outsiders invading the forest (Bottom and his company, the lovers from Athens...), while Rosalind is an outsider turning the lives of the Forest’s inhabitants topsy-turvy.

Who might be your mother,
 That you insult, exult, and all at once,
 Over the wretched? What though you have no beauty—
 As, by my faith, I see no more in you
 Than without candle may go dark to bed. (3.5.36-40)

At this moment, we might recall the discussion made earlier in this chapter about Audrey's deliberate response to Touchstone about their upcoming nuptials being connected to the patriarchal ideologies introduced to her once the visitors enter Ardenne. Likewise, we might also recall the conversation or "sport" (1.2.20) had between Rosalind and Celia while still at court. Of Fortune, Celia says, "'Tis true; for those that she makes fair she scarce makes honest, and those that she makes honest she makes very ill-favouredly" (1.2.31-33), to which Rosalind responds, "Nay, now thou goest from Fortune's office to Nature's" (1.2.34). Keeping this conversation in mind, not only does Rosalind insult Phoebe's looks, but, in forcibly pushing her towards accepting Silvius, Rosalind takes on the role of a ruling male heir or guardian pushing his female heir into a marriage.

In an even more devastating route Rosalind pursues, she, unexplainably, provokes Phoebe with the mixed signals she sends. As Rosalind notices that she has piqued Phoebe's desire, she continues to berate her while at the same time encouraging that interest, as Jean E. Howard points out in the introduction to the play (1621). Rosalind tells Phoebe, "I like you not" (3.5.75), immediately followed with, "If you will know my house, / 'Tis at the tuft of olives, here hard by" (3.5.75-76). Rosalind teases Phoebe, encouraging an impossible relationship through ecological dialogue ("the tuft of olives") that Phoebe would understand. Meanwhile, as she harshly rebukes Phoebe, Rosalind tells Silvius to "ply [Phoebe] hard" (3.5.77), or, as the editors describe, to "assail her vigorously" (1662). The *OED* concurs, defining "ply" as, "to attack or assail vigorously or repeatedly" (*OED* 4a) and "to bend one's body forcibly; to twist, writhe" (*OED* 1d). As she has

done to Silvius earlier by taking away the cottage, Rosalind has now subjected Phoebe to what she herself has escaped from—a life of oppression under a patriarchal representative.

Rosalind continuously pollutes Phoebe and her landscape with the “manicured” concepts from which she herself has escaped. After Silvius delivers a letter addressed to Ganymede, Rosalind tells Silvius, about Phoebe:

I saw her hand. She has a leathern hand,
A free-stone coloured hand. I verily did think
That her old gloves were on; but 'twas her hands.
She has a housewife's hand. (4.3.24-27)

Though purporting to be from the Forest, Rosalind betrays her origins by misinterpreting the look of Phoebe's hands. If told directly to Phoebe, she might have responded as Corin had earlier to Touchstone: “our hands are hard” (3.2.50), but, “I am a true labourer. I earn that I eat, get that I wear; owe no man hate, envy no man's happiness; glad of other men's good, content with my harm; and the greatest of my pride is to see my ewes graze and my lambs suck” (3.2.63-66). For those living in the Forest, there is pride in working in and for the land. As it happens, though, Rosalind's remark is meant to insult Phoebe's appearance and attempts to rank her from the hierarchal perspective Rosalind understands from court. She does this by categorizing Phoebe within a gendered, domesticated, and lower-class space. According to Rosalind's description, Phoebe is a laborer, evidenced by her hard hands. While her hands may be calloused and hard, indicating that Phoebe is ecologically tied to the land and actively shaped by nature, Rosalind dismisses this role (and the importance of this role) and instead places her within one of a patriarchal realm: the housewife. Even more harmful is that Rosalind tells this to Silvius, the man who will eventually become Phoebe's husband. By introducing him to patriarchal concepts, while disengaging him from his ecological ties works towards putting Phoebe in a subordinated space.

Phoebe in the Forest: Before Rosalind

Before Rosalind's intrusion, Phoebe has demonstrated a strength that is usually attributed to Rosalind within much feminist scholarship. While Rosalind does show agency at moments throughout the play, it occurs only after she is disguised as a man, after she has entered into Ardenne, and with no truly significant goal.⁵¹ Additionally, some scholars argue that once the multiple marriages occur, Rosalind reverts to her subordinated self, only now under the control of her husband, as she returns to the patriarchal court.⁵² Phoebe, on the other hand, is a strong, female character, whose strength is largely connected to her environment. We first are introduced to Phoebe when Silvius begs her to love him. When Silvius pleads for Phoebe's favor, he tells her:

The common execution,
Whose heart th'accustomed sight of death makes hard,
Falls not the axe upon the humbled neck
But first begs pardon. Will you sterner be
Than he that dies and lives by bloody drops?" (3.5.3-7)

Phoebe scoffs at his argument, replying:

I would not be thy executioner...
But now mine eyes,
Which I have darted at thee, hurt thee not;
Nor I am sure there is no force in eyes
That can do hurt. (3.5.8-27)

⁵¹ At Celia's behest, the pair plans to "seek [Celia's] uncle in the forest of Ardenne" (1.3.101), yet, upon, arriving, they continue on with their masquerade even after Rosalind encounters and has a discussion with her father. She tells Celia / Aliena, "I met the Duke yesterday, and had much question with him. He asked me of what parentage I was. I told him, of as good as he, so he laughed and let me go" (3.4.31-33).

⁵² According to Jean E. Howard, "the thrust of the narrative is toward that long-delayed moment of disclosure, orchestrated so elaborately in Act V, when the heroine will doff her masculine attire along with the saucy games of youth and accept the position of wife, when her biological identity, her gender identity, and the semiotics of dress will coincide" (434). Furthermore, "the play has achieved closure in part by reinscribing everyone into his or her "proper" social position" (435). Louis Adrian Montrose adds, "At the end of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, as at the end of *As You Like It*, the marital couplings dissolve the bonds of sisterhood at the same time that they forge the bonds of brotherhood" (69).

Not only does Phoebe assert a firm voice in telling Silvius “no,” but she also, essentially, tells him that he, in fact, will not and cannot die from lovesickness. For many acquainted with this play, this argument probably sounds familiar as Rosalind uses the same reasoning with Orlando. When he complains that he will die without Rosalind, she tells him, “Men have died from time to time, and worms have eaten them, but not for love” (4.1.91-92). However, not only have we *first* heard the argument from Phoebe, but this is a strong example of Phoebe’s agency as she is standing up for herself and speaking candidly without the protection of a disguise. Rosalind, on the other hand, is disguised as a man and also within the realm of tricking Orlando when she uses similar rhetoric. Interestingly also is when Phoebe makes her claim, Rosalind chooses that moment to step from her hiding place and admonish Phoebe. In addition to insulting and criticizing Phoebe for saying such things, Rosalind steals her words and later uses them with Orlando—an example of her exploitation of the human and ecological realities surrounding her.

Phoebe, though, is intertwined with her environmental landscape. According to the *OED*, the etymology of the name Phoebe comes from “the name of a Titan, later identified with the moon-goddess (Diana, Artemis) and as sister of Phoebus”. Additionally, it means “Feminine, bright, radiant, and, also, the moon personified.” Like Silvius whose name and profession ecologically tie him to the land, so does Phoebe’s. Thus, when we hear of Orlando’s plan of hanging his love verses on the trees, we should think also of Phoebe and not just Rosalind. Indeed, we should think of Phoebe first when he says:

Hang there, my verse, in witness of my love;
 And thou thrice-crowned queen of night, survey
 With thy chaste eye, from thy pale sphere above,
 Thy huntress’ name that my full life doth sway. (3.2.1-4)

According to the footnotes of “thrice-crowned queen,” Orlando is evoking “the goddess who ruled on earth as Diana, patron of chastity and of the hunt and in the heavens as Cynthia, Phoebe, or

Luna” (1649). This is a reminder that Phoebe is very much a member of nature and of Ardenne, in particular, while Rosalind is an outsider, literally and metaphorically living “here in the skirts of the forest, like fringe upon a petticoat” (3.2.304-05).

While claiming to want to fit in, Rosalind does not and is particularly harsh on Phoebe. Rosalind’s motivation for her treatment towards Phoebe is not exactly clear, but the play does raise some possibilities about her actions as they pertain to Phoebe. Perhaps Rosalind finds Phoebe’s sustainability within her natural environment threatening. Or, perhaps she is envious of the candor with which Phoebe expresses herself within the “wild wood.” Another possibility lies within Frances Dolan’s assessment of marriage in her monograph *Marriage and Violence*. She argues, “to sustain the erotic tension between equal combatants, the couple must displace some of its resentments and obligations onto a third party, who is usually a servant” (99). Dolan adds, “Once we add the servant to the household then the wife’s relation to domestic power changes; she has access to the rod, if not to the breeches” (104). While Dolan’s analysis focuses on marriage and the inability to have equality within a marriage, her assessment provides an understanding of Rosalind’s actions towards Phoebe. Though not married (yet), Rosalind has assumed a position of power when she disguises herself as a man. To demonstrate and assert that power, she consistently abuses Phoebe, putting her, and then keeping her in a subordinate position. This results in Phoebe becoming a sacrificial figure—she is the third party onto which Rosalind displaces her resentment of the patriarchal culture surrounding her life.

Rosalind continually berates Phoebe, keeping her subordinated in a determined way. Finally becoming frustrated with the various love triangles, Rosalind exclaims, “Pray you, no more of this, ‘tis like the howling of Irish wolves against the moon” (5.3.101-02). She then tells Phoebe, still encouraging her affections, “I will marry you if ever I marry woman, and I’ll be married

tomorrow” (5.3.104-05). And before the wedding takes place, Rosalind clarifies with all those involved their exact positions (5.4.5-16), but includes a condition upon Phoebe’s part, thereby putting emphasis on what will eventually be Phoebe’s outcome. The condition Phoebe must adhere to is to marry Silvius if it turns out that she does not want to marry Ganymede after all (5.4.13-14; 5.4.21-22). As we learn at the wedding, all is unveiled with everyone rejoicing except for Phoebe, who bellows, “If sight and shape be true, / Why then, my love adieu!” (5.4.109-10). To further highlight Phoebe’s heartbreak and subjected status, Hymen tells her, “You to [Silvius’s] love must accord” (5.4.122).

Once all is unmasked, four couples are married, including Rosalind to Orlando and Phoebe to Silvius. At the conclusion of the ceremony, the Duke encourages celebrations and festivities, in the matter befitting his former state. Even as he prompts merriment, his words condone the exploitative actions taken place throughout the play. He says:

First, in this forest let us do those ends
That here were well begun, and well begot.
And after, every of this happy number
That have endured shrewd days and nights with us
Shall share the good of our returned fortune
According to the measure of their states.
Meantime, forget this new-fallen dignity
And fall into our rustic revelry. (5.4.159-66)

In this short passage, the Duke implies relief that he will be leaving the forest and returning to court and emphasizes the pretense with which he and his followers have approached the forest—always having at the back of their minds that who they are in the forest is just a façade and temporary. The Duke’s speech also casts an ominous shadow over the Forest, as he uses terms like “shrewd” and “rustic revelry” to describe it, while employing optimistic adjectives—“returned fortune”—for the courtly world and the patriarchal institutions informing his courtly world.

In a similar fashion, Rosalind also uses her words, in addition to her actions, to disparage the Forest. When Orlando shows a lack of enthusiasm for continuing on with their charade after learning of Oliver's upcoming marriage to Aliena, Rosalind attempts to persuade him to still believe in her. She says, "Believe then, if you please, that I can do strange things. I have since I was three year old conversed with a magician, most profound in his art, and yet not damnable" (5.2.52-55). Though Rosalind tries to assuage the potential malignant association with the dark arts Orlando might have, she, nevertheless, couples the Forest with foreboding. Using terms like "strange" has the opposite effect as does the terms used by Ardenne's permanent residents. This is further exemplified when Orlando and Duke Senior discuss how similar in features Ganymede and Rosalind are, but different in upbringing and manners. Orlando wants to make it a point that Ganymede is:

forest-born,
And hath been tutored in the rudiments
Of many desperate studies by his uncle,
Whom he reports to be a great magician
Obscured in the circle of this forest. (5.4.30-34).

The descriptors Orlando uses—"desperate," "magician," and "obscured"—associate the forest with haunting and threatening spaces. Though Orlando relays this message, it is Rosalind who has first implanted these thoughts and associations into his mind, showing her complete estrangement from her ecological surroundings. Rosalind has done much more than just disguise her body; she has metamorphosed into a threatening figure who exploits the Forest (taking the cottage from under Silvius) and determinately promotes patriarchal strictures within the Forest and onto its inhabitants.

As the wedding festivities reveal, those who have endured "shrewd days and nights" in exile in the forest will naturally be welcome at court with a fortune that fits accordingly to their

rank. Sure enough this is a moment of celebration, but not necessarily for the natives of Ardenne, whose forest has been exploited to suit the purposes of the outsiders. The outsiders, who have been welcomed into the Forest, first come to seek sanctuary; they then pollute it and leave it as is.⁵³ Those left behind in the Forest are also left to deal with the damage done (both to the landscape and to the foresters) by the outsiders. For instance, what will happen to the cottage, pasture, and sheep Rosalind so easily took from a deserving shepherd and so easily leaves behind? What about the space where the Duke and his party lived—in what state is that area left? These are unanswered questions, mostly because they are meant to challenge the audience (both early modern and contemporary) to be more ecologically considerate. We are also left to consider the (unhappy) marriage between Silvius and Phoebe, which Rosalind has facilitated. Rosalind is the culprit who has victimized Phoebe to an unhappy fate with no clear justification.

Though the “purlieu of the forest” (4.3.75) encapsulate the paradoxical states Rosalind embodies, as Dubrow shows, and represents the tension discussed between Oliver’s orchard and The Forest of Ardenne, it also offers a prime opportunity and space for Rosalind to be more culturally and ecologically respectful. On the borders of the Forest of Ardenne is where Rosalind takes up residence. This is a unique space both between and within court and pastoral, particularly as it relates to Rosalind’s autonomy. According to Jeffrey S. Theis, “purlieu were lands where the owner, so-called purlieu-man, enjoyed more freedom over his lands than people living in a royal forest proper” (239). Taking up residence on the border between Court and Forest offers Rosalind-

⁵³ As we have seen, Corin amiably asks Touchstone if he is faring well in the Forest. Before this, though, Corin tells Rosalind, Celia, and Touchstone, as they enter the Forest, “But what is, come see, / And in my voice most welcome shall you be” (2.4.81-82). Kimberly Huth argues:

The invitation “acts as the first step in extending that community [the pastoral] to others who may be passing through the pastoral world by offering to visitors not only a comfortable place to rest but also fellowship and belonging. The pastoral landscape is often imagined as an ideal world respite from the corruption of the court or city, but it is actually the invitation that creates the ideality of that world, which is only recognizable through interactions with other people in the landscape. (45).

as-Ganymede more autonomy, albeit limited, than she has previously enjoyed. This is an incredible opportunity for Rosalind—one she recognizes as she uses a hunting analogy for attaining Orlando’s love. She exclaims, “Od’s my will, / [Phoebe’s] love is not the hare that I do hunt”(4.3.17-18).⁵⁴ Yet, instead of subverting the cultural and ecological tension between court and pastoral, Rosalind promotes it, sacrificing Phoebe, most notably, in the process. This is further solidified by Rosalind’s evocation of Hymen, the god of marriage. Rosalind’s summoning of Hymen rather than of Juno, the goddess of marriage, anticipates her proclivity towards a patriarchal landscape. After Hymen escorts Rosalind to the site of her betrothal, she tells her father, “To you I give myself, for I am yours” (5.4.106) and then tells Orlando the same thing, “To you I give myself, for I am yours” (5.4.107). Though Juno is contrived by song, “Wedding is great Juno’s crown” (5.4.130), she is marginalized to Hymen, the male god.

By the end of the play, Phoebe’s world has drastically changed, in large part due to Rosalind’s machinations. Phoebe is stuck in a relationship with someone whom she does not love, who does not have land to work, and who has been tutored in the ways of patriarchy by Rosalind. Even more grievously, Rosalind, who has suffered much within her own cultural and environmental landscapes, has defaced Phoebe’s without hesitation.⁵⁵ Rosalind-as-Ganymede on

⁵⁴ According to Heather Dubrow:

The areas on the edges of royal forests, known as their ‘purlieux’, were distinguished legally in a number of ways from both the rest of the forest and territory outside it. In particular, people living in these areas, which had previously been included within the actual forest, had hunting privileges within them different from the regulations governing the royal forests per se and from practices in areas totally unconnected to those forests. Similarly, those who had land within the purlieux had property rights that would not have applied to land in the forest itself, notably the ability to sell what they owned. (67)

⁵⁵ Not to justify Rosalind’s actions, but to shed light on the precarious situation she herself is in, I turn to Karen J. Warren, who states, “One simply cannot make ecologically perfect decisions or lead an ecologically perfect lifestyle within current institutional structures characterized by unequal distributions of wealth, consumption of energy, and gendered divisions of labor. When institutional structures themselves are unjust, it is often difficult to make truly just decisions within them” (45).

the purlieus of the forest encapsulates the notion that “the ideologies that authorize injustices based on gender, race, and class are related to the ideologies that sanction the exploitation and degradation of the environment” (Sturgeon 23). When Celia and Rosalind first escape the Duke’s court, Celia optimistically approaches their exile by stating, “To liberty, and not to banishment” (1.3.132). In Celia’s and Rosalind’s quest for liberty, Phoebe has become phenomenally “banished” within her own cultural and natural territory. Even while Rosalind is the central character of *As You Like It*, my aim with this chapter is to reconsider Rosalind while highlighting a marginal(ized), yet important character, Phoebe, as one “goal of ecofeminist thinking is to recover and empower the suppressed voices of women” (Furman-Adams and James Tufte 143).

CHAPTER 3: “I PLAY THE MAN I AM”: GENDER, GEOGRAPHY, AND LABOR IN *CORIOLANUS*

In his chapter, “The History of Masculinity: An Outdated Concept,” John Tosh poses the question: Why should questions of identity be treated as more significant than the materiality of power relations or the subjectivity of experience”? (25). I would argue against the either / or notion Tosh is implying. I believe these categories are intertwined and together form a stronger study into literature. There are feminist scholars who argue that the study of women should be the sole focus of gender studies because women have been excluded from histories by a patriarchal society. As recently as 2009, Phyllis Rackin argued that feminism has been betrayed and women have been displaced as gender and queer studies have evolved in her contribution, “The Presence of History in Feminist Shakespeare Criticism.” Though Rackin makes a strong and passionate argument, I disagree. Focusing on other formations of identity—in this case, gender and sexuality—does not necessarily exclude or betray women and feminist studies. For example, this chapter, where my focus is on Coriolanus’s masculine gender and identity, is informed and shaped by feminist studies, offering insight and intersections with feminist ideas. This chapter, thus, acknowledges an awareness that gendered ideas are socially constructed—a core feminist theory—and that it is important to understand and make visible the processes that inform these constructions. As one of Shakespeare’s most hyper-masculine men, Coriolanus serves as the perfect subject for this type of feminist study.

Unlike Phoebe from *As You Like It*, Caius Martius, later surnamed Coriolanus, is not a marginal character. Indeed, non-Shakespeareans may recognize the name Coriolanus even if not familiar with the play, but many, would not recognize the name Caius Martius. As Shakespeare’s last tragedy, *Coriolanus*, is much less popular in performance and in scholarly research. It is difficult for modern-day audiences and students to understand the complexity of the Roman plays

(particularly *Coriolanus*) as the typical student / audience member lacks the in-depth knowledge of ancient Rome. If seen in the context of today, *Coriolanus* is not easily understood. While the play and titular character certainly garner more attention than Phoebe, critical reception has usually centered on the trope of the “body politic.” This makes sense given that the play is the last in a series about ancient Rome—the bedrock from which modern political discourse stems. In connecting *Coriolanus* with the trope of the body politic, in 1959 Kenneth Muir analyzes manuscripts by two of Shakespeare’s contemporaries, suggesting Shakespeare thought of war in medical terms.⁵⁶ In 1962, Gordon W. Zeeveld writes, *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus* are handbooks of politics, concerned primarily with the perils to the state regarded as social organism, a body politic, which in *Julius Caesar* dies from amputation, in *Coriolanus* from cancer” (322). About a decade later, David G. Hale asserts that there are “sustained attempts to impost the analogy of the body politic on a political situation” in Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus* (197). Focusing on the political aspect of *Coriolanus* absolutely makes sense and I agree with Matthew Proser who, in 1963, writes, “The action, we can be sure, concerns the ‘body politic’ of the state” (508). While this chapter does not focus on a “minor” character like Phoebe, it does focus on an area of research that can be considered “minor” with regards to this play, as much of the research has concentrated on the body politic. As the critics have stated, *Coriolanus* falls between the cracks in the play itself. In this study, I will be bringing *Coriolanus* back to light.

While the play is explicitly political, it implicitly challenges conventional ideals of gender. In what reads like an apology for *Coriolanus*, in 2010, Unhae Langis writes, “none of the critical descriptions [...] seem to offer satisfying interpretations of *Coriolanus*’s paradoxical nature

⁵⁶ Kenneth Muir writes, “Shakespeare, both before 1604 and as late as *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, thought of war in the same medical terms as Dudley Digges—an idea made easy to his contemporaries by the theory of correspondence between the body politic and the microcosm, as well as by the fact that physicians had frequent recourse to bleeding” (139).

because of a moral trickiness to his character” (4). Like me, Langis’s interests are piqued by the “trickiness” of the Coriolanus character, but she wants to offer a different lens with which to understand the character. Even in offering a fresh perspective of the play, Langis still relies on the body politic to do so, claiming, “This ethico-political study examines in Shakespeare’s *Coriolanus* how the lack of virtuous moderation in the eponymous hero, Rome’s first citizen, reflects the collective immoderation of the entire polity: the state’s inability to bring its various parts into salutary corporate balance, thus overturning its pro-republican advances” (4).

I appreciate Langis’s attempts to focus on a lesser-known play with a different critical approach, and I would like to do the same.

As a point of departure, let us look at the moment in Act 5 when Aufidius calls Coriolanus a “boy of tears” (5.6.102), with Coriolanus responding accordingly to the designation. Coriolanus cries out, “Measureless liar, thou has made my heart / Too great for what contains it. ‘Boy’? O slave!” (5.6.104-05). Dismissing the First Lord’s plea for “Peace” (5.6.112), in an outburst of anger, Coriolanus continues exclaiming, “Cut me to pieces” (5.6.113). This passage is an appropriate place to begin as it shows what ignites Coriolanus’s wrath: Aufidius’s usage of “boy” when referring to the victorious Coriolanus. As with the use of the gendered and ageist term “boy,” Coriolanus’s masculinity is tied also to his geographic space and his exploits in battle. In his attempt to prove his masculinity, however, Coriolanus’s inadequacy is continually highlighted. Through Coriolanus, especially, we see that masculinity is not only a social construct, but is something that needs to be won. Ancient Roman values emphasize: women will always be women and have their set roles while men have the necessity to become men and are under constant pressure to maintain that masculinity. This masculinity is, according to Homi K. Bhabha, “a prosthetic reality” (57). There is a cycle of symbolic violence through the play in which Coriolanus

will never be satisfied in his search for masculinity. There are “pre-fixed” rules of gender and sexuality that are removed from the subject. Because the subject is removed from the abstract reality of masculinity, throughout the play, Coriolanus struggles with establishing and maintaining his masculinity. Since masculinity itself is fundamentally unstable, as figured in the character of Coriolanus, we see him use geographic spaces and the labor of war to attempt to negotiate his anxieties about masculinity.

The play opens with Coriolanus associating virtue with war, which he accuses the “dissentious rogues” (1.1.152) and “mutinous citizens” of lacking (1.1.stage direction). When he enters, Martius exclaims:

What would you have, you curs
That like nor peace nor war? The one affrights you,
The other makes you proud. He that trusts to you,
Where he should find you lions finds you hares,
Where foxes, geese. You are no surer, no,
Than is the coal of fire upon the ice,
Or hailstone in the sun. (1.1.157-163)

Coriolanus’s understanding of the citizens (according to Martius), and what he points out here, is that they are full of complaints and never satisfied. More so, though, Coriolanus’s admonishment serves to emasculate the male citizens with the verbiage he uses. He calls them “hares” and “geese” as opposed to “lions” and “foxes” thus emasculating the citizens themselves (1.1.160-61). What seems like a legitimate concern for Coriolanus—the inconsistency of the needs of the citizens—quickly turns into a school-year brawl. Although minimal in the grand scheme of the play’s action, it makes absolute sense to Coriolanus because of his deeply imbedded ideals of masculinity.

He continues to berate the citizens, saying:
Your *virtue* is
To make him worthy whose offense subdues him,
And curse that justice did it. Who deserves greatness

A sick man's appetite, who desires most that
 Which would increase his evil. He that depends
 Upon your favours swims with fins of lead,
 And hews down oaks with rushes. Hang ye! Trust ye?
 With every minute you do change your mind,
 And call him noble that was now your hate,
 Him vile that was your garland. What's the matter,
 That in these several places of the city
 You cry against the noble senate, who,
 Under the gods, keep you in awe, which else
 Would feed on one another? (1.1.163-177, italics mine)

Coriolanus, still Caius Martius at this time, finds great offense with the citizens (who do have a reasonable concern) and their virtue. Roman virtues, according to G.K. Hunter are “soldierly, severe, self-controlled, and disciplined,” of which Coppelia Khan says are “a complex [set] of traits and behaviours proper to men, making ‘Roman’ virtue almost synonymous with masculinity” (14). As a soldier, Coriolanus identifies with the idea that masculinity runs parallel with war and fighting. But this idea is not exclusively for soldiers; his speech about citizens shows that he also believes masculine virtuousness is also the foundation for being a good citizen in ancient Roman times. In her essay on masculinity and citizenship, Nancy C.M. Hartsock points out that this concept is rooted even further back to ancient Greece and is still prevalent today. She writes:

War, and the masculine role of warrior-hero, has been central to the conceptualization of politics for the last 2500 years. Moreover, the political community constructed by the ancient warrior-heroes and carried down to us in the writing of political philosophers bears uncomfortable resemblance to a particular type of male community—one whose most extreme form is represented by the military barracks of Sparta, where the male citizens lived until well into adulthood. In this community, military capacity, civic personality, and manhood were coterminous. (199)

Though Coriolanus does not live in this barracks-type community, he has been at battle for much of his life. Therefore, the ideals promoted from ancient Greek militarism are continually promoted and valued. Hartsock continues, “As the Roman Empire replaced the Greek city states, the Roman concept of *virtus* took over many of the connotations of the Greek *aretē*, the moral excellence

essential to the good citizen. And with it came the image of the goodness of the citizen as a capacity for heroic (especially military) action” (200). Not only does Coriolanus correlate virtue with war and battle but this is also, for him, how responsible citizenship is measured. Thus, as he admonishes the citizens in this passage, he is calling into question their “moral excellence essential to the good citizen” by belittling and emasculating them.

Coriolanus’s attitude about the rules of gender, especially those focused on the Roman man, indicates that he accepts them as finite. Coriolanus’s understanding of manliness and citizen is that either someone is or someone is not—there is no in between. The citizens are either lions or hares, foxes or geese. They either greatly vilify or greatly glorify—“call him noble that was now your hate; / Him vile that was your garland” (1.1.172-73). In some ways, this attitude towards masculinity is oversimplified, but it also points to the larger, more complicated production of such definitions. There is not one uniform category in which identity formation occurs, yet this is the idea that is proposed by Roman society as a whole and with which Coriolanus struggles.

In becoming a man and maintaining his masculinity, Coriolanus is also an effective warrior full of rage. In some ways, he is so brutal in his verbal attack against the citizens because he himself struggles with identifying as masculine and maintaining that masculinity. Like the “several places of the city” (1.1.174) that the citizens “cry against the noble senate” (1.1.174), the values with which Coriolanus attempts to assert and maintain his masculinity are fragmented. As he does earlier with the citizens, Coriolanus admonishes his soldiers with wrath and emasculating accusations when his army refuses to advance against the Volscians. He calls his soldiers the “shames of Rome!” (1.5.2) and accuses them of having ‘souls of geese / That bear the shapes of men” (1.5.5-6). Essentially, he tells them they are not real men; they only *look* like men.

Emasculating them at the height of battle illustrates the correlation between manliness (virtue) and war dictating Coriolanus's reality.

For Coriolanus, military prowess is one of the methods by which he attempts to prove and continually prove his manhood. So far the audience has seen him ready to advance against the Volscians. Even though the Roman army does not intimidate the Volscians, Coriolanus is ready to serve immediately and without hesitation. When the messenger tells Coriolanus that the Volscians are in arms, Coriolanus replies, "I am glad on't. Then we shall ha' means to vent / Our musty superfluity" (1.1.215-16). Even while Coriolanus's enthusiasm and passion for serving in war is obvious, the underlying reason is more complicated. Before the audience is even introduced to Coriolanus, the citizens banter on his worth. Though they can almost unanimously agree that he is arrogant, they capture the "violence of the cycle" alluded to earlier in this essay. The First Citizen claims, "I say unto you, what he hath done famously, he did it to that end—though soft-conscienced men can be content to say 'it was for his country', 'he did it to please his mother, and to be partly proud—which he is even to the altitude of his virtue'" (1.1.30-34). While much of his motivation comes from his mother, having been raised from birth to be the most masculine warrior Rome has ever seen, on *why* exactly Coriolanus is a warrior, even the citizens do not fully understand. It may be because he is doing his patriotic duty. It may be because he is trying to please his mother, hopelessly stuck in the masculine warrior trope. It may be because he is prideful. It may be because he wants to be famous. Or it may be because, according to the Second Citizen, it is in his "nature" (1.1.35). They cannot pinpoint an impetus for Coriolanus's drive, nor can they fully capture the complexity of Coriolanus's motivation through the amalgamation they contrive. Helpless to help their leader, what the citizens do, though, is highlight that the prefixed values attached to masculinity are conflicting, indefinable, and unattainable.

Even though this is the case, we learn through Cominius that Coriolanus first entered into battle at the age of 16. This was not just any battle, though—it was against Tarquin, Rome’s “then dictator.” Cominius says he:

saw [Coriolanus] fight
 When with his *Amazonian chin* he drove
The bristled lips before him. He bestrid
 An o’erpressed Roman, and, i’th’ consul’s view
 Slew three opposers. Tarquin’s self he met,
 And struck him on his knee. In the day’s feats,
 When he might *act the woman* in the scene,
 He proved best man i’th’ field, and for his meed
 Was brow-bound with the oak. His pupil age
 Man-entered thus. (2.2.83-95)

Still a boy, evidenced by his lack of facial hair, Coriolanus successfully fought against “real” men—those with “bristled lips.” From this passage we also learn that, because of his youth, it would not be unexpected if Coriolanus had “acted the woman.” He acts the man, though, and instead, this momentous battle serves as Coriolanus’s thrust into manhood. Although, we can assume from a conversation had between Volumnia, Virgilia, and Valeria, Coriolanus has been attempting to prove to be a man since he was a boy. When Valeria visits with Coriolanus’s mother and wife, she reminisces about a time specific to Young Martius, Coriolanus’s son, stating, “O’ my word, the father’s son! I saw him run after a gilded butterfly...Or whether his fall enraged him, or how’ twas, he did so set his teeth and tear it!” (1.3.54-60). Volumnia proudly responds, “One on’s father’s moods” (1.3.61). In likening Young Martius to his father, we can assume, not only that he wants to be like his father, but that his father acted similarly as a child himself. While Coriolanus establishes his manhood at the age of 16 in the battle against Tarquin, through this dialogue between the ladies, we see that Coriolanus has been negotiating the tensions of masculinity since childhood.

Furthermore, while incredibly successful in the battle against Tarquin, we are made aware that Coriolanus uses future warfare to continually affirm his manhood. If this is the battle with which Coriolanus wins fame and induction into manhood, then he has set the bar fantastically high for himself. In order to maintain his fame and masculinity, he needs to participate in feats more amazing and difficult than the battle against Tarquin. According to Cominius, Coriolanus has actively participated in “seventeen battles since” (2.2.296), thrusting “all swords of the garland” (2.2.297). This is another example of the “prosthetic reality,” though. Realistically, Coriolanus cannot possibly always maintain the strength and stamina needed to fight in battle. This measure also assumes there will always be a battle in which Coriolanus can prove his masculinity. Should there be need for soldiers constantly, then the state of affairs is in a precarious state, but that this is the gauge for masculinity in this Roman state points to the contradictions imbedded within the measure. Something is deficient regardless of the state of affairs—war and peace. Without war, Coriolanus cannot prove his masculinity.

As it happens, though, there is a war and Coriolanus’s credibility as a man is only validated with this most recent war against the Volscians. Not only does he run into Corioles without the support of an army, he also, single-handedly, defeats the Volscians. From this victory, Coriolanus achieves his name—from Martius, he becomes Coriolanus, tying his masculine identity of emasculating the Volscians to the city he alone conquered. Additionally, he has a one-on-one fighting match with Aufidius—leader of the Volscians. Neither wins, but their dialogue further demonstrates the complexity of identifying with pre-fixed notions of gender. Aufidius says, “By th’ elements, / If e’er again I meet [Coriolanus] beard to beard, / He’s mine, or I am his!” (1.11.10-12). Earlier, Cominius describes Coriolanus as having an Amazonian chin doing battle against true men in the war with Tarquin; now, though, he is, supposedly, a real man, evidenced by his beard

that is remarked upon by Aufidius. Will Fisher suggests that “facial hair often conferred masculinity during the Renaissance: the beard made the man” (155). Thus, we can take Aufidius’ remark as wanting to meet Coriolanus “man-to-man.” Coriolanus, on the other hand, says, “I sin in envying [Aufidius’] nobility, / And were I anything but what I am, / I would wish me only he” (1.1.220-23). For Coriolanus, Aufidius is the *uberman*, the one to defeat in order to more firmly establish his own masculinity. However brave this may seem for the Roman warrior—to run solo into battle, to fight at 16 years of age, to engage in fighting match with one whom he considers to be an “ultimate” man—it also brings into question the stability, sustainability, and longevity of such an enterprise. That Coriolanus, or any man, for that matter, cannot continually participate in the activities that affirm their manhood shows the problematics of masculinity. In the way with which Coriolanus negotiates his own masculinity, he must always labor in war by engaging in battle and sustaining his identity with his geographic spaces, both impossibilities.

Much occurs between the battle with the Volscians and by the time Aufidius calls Coriolanus a “boy of tears” (5.6.104). Coriolanus’s reaction to the accusation is so incredibly heated as he has spent his entire life trying to embody an impossible ideal. Indeed, when Coriolanus first abandons the Romans and agrees to fight against them, Cominius says:

He is their god: he leads them like a thing
 Made by some other deity than nature,
 That shapes man better; and they follow him,
 Against us brats, with no less confidence
 Than boys pursuing summer butterflies,
 Or butchers killing flies. (4.6.94-98)

Because their warrior is now fighting with their enemies, Cominius likens the Roman state to boyhood—they have regressed from men, victors of battle, to boys. The Romans are like young “brats” and “boys” playing in the summer. They are like Young Martius, who plays at pursuing and tearing “summer butterflies.” In essence, the Romans have lost their masculinity upon the loss

of Coriolanus. Meanwhile, their warrior is now opposed to them, fighting for the Volscians. When Coriolanus swaps allegiances, he takes with him the conquered city of Corioles, too. Furthermore, though, more so than taking with him his strength, power, and might, he also takes with him the name, Coriolanus. Beyond identifying Martius as sole conqueror of Corioles, the new name is synonymous with manliness. As a citizen and chief warrior of the city, the name and its identifiers also represent Rome. So, when Coriolanus abandons Rome to fight with the Volscians against Rome, he also emasculates the entire city-state and thus threatens the body-politic of Rome.

Female Gendered Geographies

Thus far I have discussed how Coriolanus attempts to negotiate his anxieties through the labor of war and geography. He also, though, attempts to fulfill his mother's concept of manhood from an early age. Although his manhood is affirmed after defeating Tarquin, both by society and his mother, Coriolanus must continually prove and reprove his manhood, especially to his mother, Volumnia. That his mother takes such an active role in molding his masculinity is very interesting and unusual. According to Jennifer Jordon, "The lessons of manliness learnt in the earliest years of childhood were to be practiced in the years of adolescence, during which time fathers were to be the teachers" (253). And while we know that Coriolanus's father is out of the picture, this does not necessarily put Volumnia in the role of father. In any case, Coriolanus feels this necessity and desire to establish and maintain his masculinity because Volumnia persistently pushes him to be a "real man." She tells him, "My praises made thee first a soldier" (3.2.07) and "Thy valiantness was mine, thou sucked'st it from me" (3.2.128). Volumnia tries to emphasize to Coriolanus that it is *she* who made him a soldier and a man. Adding another layer to the problematics of masculinity, here, for Coriolanus, his mother attempts to take credit for molding his manliness, something that would be contrary to the thought of ancient Rome.

Though Volumnia is Coriolanus's mother, her role as mother (in the ancient Roman state) is done—she has given birth to him. Her duty is not to raise him or influence him in his role as citizen of Rome; a male influence would have that privilege. As Coppelia Kahn argues, “Shakespeare's Roman works articulate a critique of the ideology of gender on which the Renaissance understanding of Rome was based” (*Roman Shakespeare* 1). Adding further to this assessment, Kahn claims, “Males controlled the meaning of humanity” (*Roman Shakespeare* 1). In quoting Eugene M. Waith, Kahn writes, “This *virtus* is the property of *vir*, the male, while the *virtus* of women is to be chaste and to bear male children” (*Man's Estate* 156). In addition to not being a citizen of the Roman state because she is a woman, Volumnia also has no role in shaping Coriolanus's identity because she is a woman. Using Philip Slater's paradigm of family structure, Kahn claims, “Women, excluded from public life, is devalued save as the bearer of men-children; she must seek primary emotional satisfaction through her son, who becomes a substitute for her absent husband, the vehicle through which she realizes herself, and a cure for the narcissistic wound of being a woman” (*Man's Estate* 156). Kahn focuses her analysis on Volumnia, calling her the “narcissistic wound of being a woman,”⁵⁷ which agitates Coriolanus's identity (*Man's Estate* 156). Volumnia's attempt to mold Coriolanus as a valued member of Roman society backfires, as she has no authority in shaping his masculine identity because she is a woman.

This is further emphasized by the geographic space she embodies and her lack of citizenship. In her essay, Harstock writes:

the connections of citizenship with manliness, established so long ago, still influence both thinking about citizenship and conduct of rulers and ruled. Thus, the familiar gender gap on issues of peace and war should be seen as a symptom of deeper issues about politics, problems with a history traceable over several thousand years of Western history, problems defined by the overlay of citizenship, manliness, and military capacity. (198)

⁵⁷ Though Kahn focuses on masculinity in Shakespeare's Roman plays, she argues that Volumnia wants to be masculine, stating, “Volumnia claims to possess the phallus, the prime signifier of masculinity in Rome. Masculinity belongs first to the mother; only she can pass it on to a son” (*Roman Shakespeare* 149).

As Harstock illuminates, the trifecta of worth, or Roman *virtus*, is “citizenship, manliness, and military capacity.” Adding to this, in addressing the value of women in Rome, Kahn points to the moment when Coriolanus tells his wife, Valeria, “The moon of Rome, chaste as the icicle / That’s curdied by the frost from purest snow / And hangs on Dian’s temple” (5.3.65) and argues, “Shakespeare points to what is symbolically at stake for Rome in this final crisis. Chastity, the female counterpart to *virtus*, is what makes women socially valuable in Roman patriarchy” (*Roman Shakespeare* 156). In disseminating the “male *virtus*” ideology surrounding this trifecta, Volumnia disrupts the system because she an outsider from it, an invaluable member. Through this disruption, her son, Coriolanus, becomes sacrificed. Catherine La Courreye Blecki states, “Volumnia’s eloquence and political success over her son threatened male sovereignty in a period that extolled chaste, silent, and obedient women who did not interfere in the public affairs of men, especially if it meant opposing male members of their own house” (81). Because of Volumnia’s unique position—attempting to uphold Coriolanus’s role within the accepted and promoted system within which they live by opposing those same ideals—the unsustainable and impossible system itself is called into question. In comparing and evaluating Shakespeare’s Volumnia with his source material, La Courreye Blecki states:

...although Volumnia was celebrated as a hero for her successful intercession with her son on behalf of Rome [in classical sources], in the Renaissance, her courage was now evaluated by a different set of cultural assumptions. Her rhetorical ability and the political nature of her victory put her in the category of ‘masculine woman,’ yet she had none of the negative traits associated with the stereotype, such as sexual promiscuity, prophecy, or witchcraft. As a result, male writers frequently raised questions about the effect of her victory on male supremacy, or they hinted that her eloquence had a devious quality to it. (86)

Not only does Coriolanus illuminate the impossibility of the ideals promoted by this system, so too does his mother. As La Courreye Blecki’s analysis shows, Volumnia is demonized, even

without fitting into the “category” often associated with dissentious women because her influence over the conquering, yet unsuccessful, Coriolanus cannot be handled or appropriately explained.

As with Coriolanus’s identity, Volumnia’s is connected to her physical space. In exploring gender and the staging of gender in Shakespeare, Wendy Wall connects the many handbooks on domesticity to plays of the period. As she points out, the domestic was largely connected to women and considered inferior to the male in this patriarchal society. Thus, when the audience sees a woman staged, she is often presented within a domestic sphere. In *Coriolanus*, Volumnia is first introduced to the audience in Act 1 with the stage directions declaring: “Enter Volumnia and Virgilia, mother and wife to Martius. They set them down on two low stools and sew” (scene 3). Jennifer Munroe and Rebecca Larouch assert, “*Eco* means house, *logos* means word, speech, though. Thus ecology is the language of the house. Early modern women’s experiences with nonhuman and human nature was necessarily shaped by the many tasks associated with their households, house, and its environs” (5).⁵⁸ Even though Volumnia and Virgilia are of a higher class, as the audience shall learn as the play continues, they are first staged within a feminine domestic domain, in a gendered subjugated role.⁵⁹ Though Wall maintains that “Early modern women of even high rank attended to domestic chores...[including] pulling hemp, preserving quinces, overseeing candle-making, gardening, dying fabrics, mending linens, [and] keeping accounts...” (21), the initial (re)presentation of Volumnia and Virgilia serves to emphasize their

⁵⁸ Natasha Korda adds, “The early modern conception of what constituted a household was thus defined as much by objects as it was by subjects” (1).

⁵⁹ According to Retha M. Warnicke, “The education of women was directed toward keeping them absorbed in the business of the private household and preventing them from becoming knowledgeable about public matters” (130). In addition, “they were also to learn housewifery and needlework, since the private household was to frame their world” (131). Furthermore, “when women were referred to as private people, then, the world did not mean simply that they were confined to their households, although those areas were viewed as their special domains, but that they could not personally conduct public affairs” (134).

subordinated status. Regardless of their rank, they are still inferior beings whose purpose is to be obedient.

This staging is clearly gendered, but not only by the duty being performed by the women, but because this representation is an expectation of the audience. As Dymphna Callaghan asserts, “Such identities [including ‘woman’] are not grounded in nature or biology but by particular forms of labor—access to (even enslavement within) certain forms of production and exclusion from others” (14). Volumnia and Virgilia are represented and associated to the female gendered landscape wherein they are first introduced to the audience. As Coriolanus’s geography is tied to his masculinity, his mother’s and wife’s geography is tied to their femininity. In her analyses of race and gender in Shakespeare, Callaghan focuses on the lack of marginalized peoples on the stage. Even if the marginalized are scripted within the play, she argues, that does not mean that they are presented on the stage. Men, for instance, cross-dressed to portray the female characters. When a “blackamoor” was staged, he was portrayed by an English, white actor wearing makeup. Delving even further, Callaghan states that once women and black men were allowed on the stage, these actors were still portraying a representation of the characters they were meant to be embodying. Even the portrayals of the marginalized were only representations of the expectations and / or stereotypes of these groups of people. Thus, the gender-specific staging of the Volumnia and Virgilia characters within this gendered landscape illustrates the subordinated and inferior roles within which women were placed. In *Coriolanus*, these roles are compounded by their lack of citizenship. However, as Khan points out, “As a mother, [Volumnia] is of course subjected by the dominant ideology—but she is also instrumental to it, and thus central to the play’s critique of

virtus” (*Roman Shakespeare* 147). Unfortunately for Coriolanus, Volumnia’s attempt at navigating outside of her gendered landscape forces Coriolanus to do so as well.⁶⁰

Similar to the in-flux yet constant “pre-fixed values of gender and sexuality,” Volumnia consistently undermines Coriolanus as a man, even while she elevates him as one. Volumnia has not and will never be the typical Roman woman. Indeed, in taking charge of Coriolanus’s life, she herself has committed the greatest sin for a Roman woman: emasculation. For instance, after insisting to Virgilia that Coriolanus’s manhood is at stake, she tells Menenius, “my boy Martius approaches” (2.1.88). When Coriolanus arrives and bows at her feet, she tells him, “Nay, my good soldier” (2.1.158). These gestures might seem innocent enough; however, they are emblematic of the influence she has always had on Coriolanus. She is insistent that Coriolanus maintain a masculine image, yet she consistently undermines her wishes by maintaining his boyhood. One example of doing this is by explicitly calling him “my boy;” another is by using the term she wishes for him to uphold—“my soldier”—as pet names. These ostensibly harmless gestures actually inform and confuse Coriolanus and his behavior, especially as they are at odds with the ways he should be exemplifying his masculinity, according to the patriarchal institution in which masculinity is deeply rooted. And, as this is coming from his mother, the words are more destructive than if they were coming from his absent father, an accepted disciplinarian.

When Coriolanus is exiled from Rome and joins the Volscians, Volumnia employs rhetoric expounded upon within the masculine tradition to attempt to have him abandon his revolt against Rome. Volumnia tells Coriolanus:

But this is certain,
If thou conquer Rome, the benefit
Which thou shalt thereby reap is such a name
Whose repetition will be dogged with curses,

⁶⁰ Catherine La Courreye Blecki adds, “The Renaissance sources of the [Coriolanus and Volumnia] legend may have contributed to the sense that women’s victory came at men’s expense” (91).

Whose chronicle thus writ: "The man was noble,
 But with his last attempt he wiped it out,
 Destroyed his country, and his name remains
 To th' ensuing age abhorred." Speak to me, son.
 Thou hast affected the fine strains of honor
 To imitate the graces of the gods,
 To tear with thunder the wide cheeks o' th' air
 And yet to charge thy sulfur with a bolt
 That should but rive an oak. Why dost not speak?
 Think'st thou it honorable for a noble man
 Still to remember wrongs? Daughter, speak you,
 He cares not for your weeping. Speak thou, boy.
 Perhaps thy childishness will move him more
 Than can our reasons. There's no man in the world
 More bound to's mother, yet here he lets me prate
 Like on I'the' stocks. Thou hast never in thy life
 Showed thy dear mother any courtesy,
 When she, poor hen, fond of no second brood,
 Has clucked thee to the wars and safely home,
 Loaden with honour. Say me request's unjust,
 And spurn me back. But if it be not so,
 Thou art not honest, and the gods will plague thee
 That thou restrain'st from me the duty which
 To a mother's part belongs.—He turns away.
 Down, ladies. Let us shame him with our knees.
 To his surname 'Coriolanus' longs more pride
 Than pity to our prayers. Down! An end.
 This is the last. (5.3.142-173)

Volumnia caters to and counts on her son's anxieties, beginning by evoking his name, through which he more firmly established his greatness, strength, and success. Should Coriolanus succeed in defeating the Romans with their enemy, the Volscians, his name shall be "dogged with curses" (5.3.145) and "abhorred" (5.3.149). Later in her speech she twists the enormity of worth associated with his name, which he earned by single-handedly claiming Corioles for Rome, stating, "To his surname 'Coriolanus' 'longs more pride / Than pity to our prayers'" (5.3.171-71). Here, Volumnia cunningly reshapes the meaning associated with his name as something dishonorable when, in fact, he initially earned it for the same reasons she is implying are wrong. While his mother has the inane ability to shape Coriolanus's hyper masculinity, she has also damned him by focusing solely

on his victories and masculinity. Thus, Coriolanus is now being brought down by the one person who has spent her entire life bringing him to the fulcrum. Following up with this slight, Volumnia then preys upon his honor, a chief virtue of Romanness. By reminding him, “Thou hast affected the fine strains of honour” (5.3.150), she implies that he *used* to be an honorable man. The implication continues when she asks him, “Think’st thou it honourable for a noble man / Still to remember wrongs?” (5.3.155-56). Phrased differently, Volumnia is telling Coriolanus that his actions, in attempting revenge, are dishonorable. When she implies that Coriolanus is dishonorable, she also layers upon this anxiety his faith and trust in the gods, claiming that he has “imitate[d] the graces of the gods” (5.3.151). Vivian Thomas asserts that Roman values “are not platitudinous precepts but deeply held convictions about the relative worth of different kinds of human actions” (1). Some of these central values include “service to the state, constancy, fortitude, valour, and respect for the gods” (1). Volumnia relies upon Coriolanus’s embedded convictions about these values as she uses them against her son. Essentially playing “mind games” with her own son, Volumnia relies upon the unsustainable ideals associated within these deeply embedded and encoded precepts Coriolanus relies on. One of the reasons Volumnia’s pleas are successful is because she depends upon Rome’s chief virtue. According to Thomas, “In the primitive Rome of *Coriolanus* it is valour which is the chief virtue, because this is a period when the very existence of Rome is dependent on the courage of its warriors and citizens to do battle with its immediate neighbours” (2). Coriolanus is still embodying his society’s ideologies, only now is using them for the Roman enemy, the Volscians, and Volumnia uses this against him.

After several unsuccessful attempts by fellow Romans, Volumnia finally is able to convince Coriolanus to enter into a peace treaty. At this moment, Coriolanus’s “black or white” attitude is no longer one on which he can rely. Once he agrees to the reconciliation prompted by

his mother, Coriolanus becomes like the citizens he detested in Act 1: Coriolanus admonishes them, roaring, “What would you have, you curs / That like nor peace nor war? The one affrights you, / The other makes you proud” (1.1.157-59).⁶¹ According to Audrey Elizabeth Yoder, “The conception of dog is as a repulsive creature” (34).⁶² Coriolanus continues to insult the citizens by equating their (lack of) manliness to their not fighting in the war. In choosing or preferring peace, the citizens are not true men and are repulsive creatures, according to Coriolanus, and therefore do not deserve respect. Upon finding himself in the situation where he is asked to choose between war and peace, the realization and deeper symbolic meaning of this decision is voiced by Coriolanus when he says:

O mother, mother!
 What have you done? Behold, the heavens do ope,
 The gods look down, and this unnatural scene
 They laugh at. O my mother, mother, O!
 You have won a happy victory for Rome;
 But for your son, believe it, O believe it,
 Most dangerously you have with him prevailed,
 If not most mortal to him. (5.3.183-90)

⁶¹ In Audrey Elizabeth Yoder’s analysis of animal analogy in Shakespeare, she writes, “From the earliest times, animal nicknames were often unpleasant. Unless they were heraldic, they were probably bestowed because of embarrassing resemblances to animals” (32). She continues, “Homer, the Greek dramatists, Spenser, and many others pictured their warriors fighting like lions, boars, and fierce bulls in the heightened ferocity of war, and Shakespeare follows this technique in representing groups of characters in conflict” (51). In continuing her discussion of animal imagery, Yoder asserts:

Probably the best sustained animal imagery for warring factions is the employed in *Coriolanus*, where the brilliant and varied animal metaphor applied to the hero pits him again the mob, the Volscian leader Aufidius, and other Volscians, who are made to seem like cruel, treacherous, and merciless animals. The citizens, hungry for bread, regard Caius Marcius, the future Coriolanus, as ‘a very dog to the commonalty’. His mother, Volumnia, proudly pictures the Volscians fleeing from her valiant son ‘as children from a bear’. Because Coriolanus refuses to toady to the people for consulship, Sicinius incites the mob against ‘this viper, that would depopulate the city and be every man himself,’ and he urges the citizens to ‘dispatch this viperous traitor’. (52)

⁶² She adds, “Iago’s villainy was also stigmatized by Shakespeare as that of a dog” (36).

In choosing peace, Coriolanus becomes emasculated because the gauge by which he (and others) has measured his masculinity has been through fighting.⁶³ Moreover, this gauge and measure of masculinity have been so ingrained in his thinking and being that choosing peace is “unnatural” (5.3.185) for him.

After Coriolanus, reluctantly, gives into his mother’s request, Aufidius emphatically calls Coriolanus a “boy of tears.” Aufidius finds Coriolanus’s attitude cowardly and unbecoming to the soldiers that they are. Once wanting to meet “beard to beard” (1.11.10), Aufidius no longer considers Coriolanus a real man. Regarding him as a boy rather than as a “bearded” counterpart is significant because, according to Fisher, “facial hair is not simply imagined as a means of constructing sexual differences between men and women; it is also a means of constructing distinctions between men and boys. Thus, it would appear that boys were considered to be a different gender from men” (155). Calling Coriolanus a boy, then, is a calculated and meaningful insult. And it is this insult that evokes such a heated response from Coriolanus. Adding insult to injury, Aufidius first calls him a traitor. Then he calls him by his given name, Martius, rather than Coriolanus.

After being called by his given name rather than by his earned name, when compounded with the term “boy,” Coriolanus indulges in a tirade. According to Alexandra Shepard, “Terms such as ‘ape,’ ‘beast,’ and ‘dog’ suggested a total absence of the reason expected of manhood. Carrying an even greater sting was the label ‘boy,’ which implied that a man had no claim to competence or authority in the first place” (174). Jennifer Jordan adds, that “two of the central characteristics which were thought to distinguish adult men from women and boys were physical strength and reason” (246). And Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos claims, “Ordinary people associated

⁶³ According to Catherine La Courreye Blecki, “Coriolanus prefers the heroic life of ‘true wars’ over the civilian life of ‘convenient peace’” (91).

young years with lack of reason and understanding” (29). Thus, Aufidius’s insult, calling Coriolanus a “boy of tears,” threatens Coriolanus’s entire masculine identity by calling into question both his strength and reason. Furthermore, by referring to him by his given name, Martius, Aufidius is pointedly emasculating Coriolanus by removing from him the name he earned as a warrior and which identifies him as the conqueror of Corioles.

While Coriolanus has seemed to have played the part of a man well, he has also exhibited the complexity and “prosthetic reality” in attempting to play the part effectively. He is plagued by his anxious masculinity, which is constantly in a state of flux, never fixed. Because of the problematics with masculinity, Coriolanus continually, as he puts it, “play[s] the man I am” (3.2.14-15). He lacks any true self, real identity, as he has tried to identify with competing conceptions of masculinity. Rather than affirm he is the man he is, he says he *plays* the part of a man, like the boy actor playing the part of the woman. How one may identify him, then, is skewed. For instance, his manhood is lauded when he has an Amazonian chin—a boy, but then denounced when he is bearded—an adult man. Another example is when he has to choose between his mother’s plea to save Rome and Aufidius’ desire to sack Rome. What Volumnia and Aufidius represent for Coriolanus are reminders of what it is to be a man. But in this moment, the reminders are in tension and out-of-sync with each other, leaving Coriolanus to make an impossible decision—with regards to his masculinity. Coriolanus is in a situation that would have him constantly asserting his manliness to affirm his masculinity.

Such thousands-years-old Western definitions of gender are still prevalent today. In an interview, General Robert Barrow, former commander of the U.S. Marines, claims:

War is a man’s work. Biological convergence on the battlefield [by which he means women in combat] would not only be dissatisfying in terms of what women could do, but it would be an enormous psychological distraction for the male, who wants to think that he’s fighting for that woman somewhere behind, not up there in the same foxhole with him. It

tramples the male ego. When you get right down to it, you have to protect the manliness of war. (Hartsock 199)

Protecting the “manliness of war” and manliness of masculinity, however, is not so clear cut and easily defined, as evidenced by *Coriolanus*. As J.M. Gregson asserts, “Shakespeare [*Coriolanus*] shows the inflexibility and unrelenting egoism which are the defects of the military man who dwells only upon glory and war [...] At each key moment of his military progress, Coriolanus is reduced to a war-machine, fearsome but inhuman” (233). What constitutes manliness is different for those within the play, molding Coriolanus into an inhuman machine. Thus, Coriolanus’ ultimate tragedy, his death, can be seen also as an escape or the only solution to an impossible situation. The unnatural fixation of Coriolanus on masculinity may be seen as also having another victim: Rome itself, as *Coriolanus* is seen as being the last play in Shakespeare’s Roman four.

CHAPTER 4: VIOLENT LANDSCAPE: EXILE, GENDER, AND THE RHETORIC OF RAPE IN *CYMBELINE*

On a late January evening in 2015, a woman was sexually assaulted behind a dumpster on the Ivy League Stanford campus. Stanford freshman and athlete Brock Allen Turner raped an intoxicated and unconscious woman in the filthy and degrading space behind a garbage dumpster. According to news reports, Turner “was found thrusting himself into an unconscious woman” (“Letter to Stanford...” par. 1). He was caught only because two Stanford graduate students cycling by witnessed Turner’s actions, intervened, and held him until police arrived. In March 2016, “Turner, 20, was convicted of three felony charges: assault with intent to commit rape of an intoxicated woman, sexually penetrating an intoxicated person with a foreign object and sexually penetrating an unconscious person with a foreign object” (“Demand Justice for...” par. 3). This story made national and international headlines because of the severity of the crime and the location of the crime, coupled with the leniency of the sentence the rapist received.⁶⁴

I begin this essay by recounting the events of that awful January evening because rape and the rhetoric of rape are historically situated and treated similarly now as 400 years ago when Shakespeare was writing and even further back. One of the most famous (or infamous) tales of a raped woman is that centered on Lucrece. According to Coppelia Kahn, “The story of Lucrece, celebrated by Livy, Ovid, Chaucer, and Shakespeare, is one of the founding myths of patriarchy” (142), with “patriarchal” being defined as “no feminist catchphrase but merely accurate to term that world patriarchal, because it was patrilinear and primogenitural in the means by which it deployed power and maintained degree as the basis of the social order” (143). The patriarchal basis of social order through the trope of rape is not only found in Shakespeare’s early works, *The Rape*

⁶⁴ In June 2016, “Turner was sentenced to only six months in the county jail and three years probation” (Baker par. 1). Furthermore, because of his “good behavior,” Turner may spend only three months out of the six-month sentence.

of *Lucrece* and *Titus Andronicus*,⁶⁵ but is maintained and more complexly developed in his later work, *Cymbeline*. Set in ancient Britain, written during the English Early Modern era, and being analyzed through an American contemporary perspective, one might think that conceptions and definitions of rape are quite varied. What this paper will show, however, is that the “founding myths of patriarchy” to which Kahn alludes are not just historical—they are preserved in the 21st century. Although Shakespeare was writing 400 years earlier, his *Cymbeline*, (composed circa 1609-1610) evokes many of the same audience responses as the Brock Turner Case.

⁶⁵ A revenge tragedy, *Titus Andronicus* is Shakespeare’s first tragedy written in 1592. The entirety of the play is quite grotesque with a son being sacrificed in front of his mother in the opening scene. Adding to this is the last scene where that same mother unknowingly partakes in the cannibalism of her two other sons. And included in between these graphic scenes are slaughter, mutilation, and rape. After killing her beloved, Bassanius, Tamora’s two sons, Demetrius and Chiron, turn their aggression toward Lavinia. Begging for a swift death over having her chastity reviled by the brothers, Lavinia pleads with Tamora for pity: “O, keep me from their worse-than-killing lust, / And tumble me into some loathsome pit / where never man’s eye may behold my body” (2.3.175-77). After Tamora’s cold responses, “. . .away with her, and use her as you will—/ The worse to her, the better loved of me” (2.3.166-67) and “So should I rob my sweet sons of their fee. / No, let them satisfy their lust on thee” (2.3.179-80), her boys proceed to gang rape Lavinia. After they ravish her, like the story of Philomel and Tereus, Demetrius and Chiron cut out Lavinia’s tongue so that she cannot orally accuse them. Taking the story of Philomel and Terues even further, however, Tamora’s boys continue to mutilate Lavinia, cutting off her hands to further prevent her ability to accuse them. As brutal as this treatment is, even more brutal for Lavinia is being left alive to live with the shame of the rape. In the end, Lavinia’s father, Titus, kills her so that neither she nor her family, the Andronici, have to live with the shame of the sexual assault. As demonstrated in this essay, scholars have noted that rape and its consequences are often imagined as a familial property issue. Similarly, the editors of this text note, “in neither case is Lavinia’s consent at issue: she becomes the property of whoever happens to carry her off by force” (404). While *Titus Andronicus* maintains intense, gory action throughout the play, Shakespeare’s poem, *The Rape of Lucrece* (1594) centers more on the thoughts and emotions of Lucrece and Tarquin before and after the rape. In Shakespeare’s adaptation, Tarquin’s lust is incited only because of Collatine’s bragging. Collatine describes his wife as the most chaste and beautiful woman:

For he the night before in Tarquin’s tent
 Unlocked the treasure of his happy state,
 What priceless wealth the heavens had him lent
 In the possession of his beauteous mate,
 Reck’ning his fortune at such high-proud rate
 That kings might be espoused to more fame,
 But king nor peer to such a peerless dame. (15-21).

Upon *hearing* these attributes, Tarquin’s lust is instigated. He sets off to Collatium with the goal of ravishing Lucrece. After the rape, both Tarquin and Lucrece lament the shame and dishonor of the assault; for Lucrece, she believes there is only one solution to this—her suicide. Before thrusting the knife in her chest, she confesses the crime to her family and urges them to seek revenge. Emphasized in the poem is not only Lucrece’s shame of having her body violated but the shame that violation would bring to her husband. The editors note that, “When Tarquin rapes Lucrece, he does not merely perpetrate an act of brutal violence against her, but he defies Collatinus’s exclusive claim on his wife’s body, imagined as the husband’s property” (663). Oliver Arnold adds, Collatine and Lucretius instead treat both Sextus’s sexual violation of Lucrece and her subsequent suicide as crimes against their property” (103).

According to Ian Donaldson, “To the ancient Romans” (the timeframe corresponding to Shakespeare’s *Cymbeline*) “the contamination of illicit sex was not confined to the parties immediately concerned. There was a strong sense of what a modern anthropologist has called ‘transfer pollution’. A woman’s family was thought to be tainted by her adultery, in particular her husband and any children she might subsequently bear...” (23). The anthropological term, “transfer pollution” holds true also for the Romans if a woman is raped. In analyzing rape in Aphra Behn’s *The Rover*, an early modern play, Anita Pacheco states:

While medieval rape law perceived rape as a crime against male-owned property, the legal focus shifted in the late sixteenth century from property to person. It was the female victim rather than her male relations who was the injured party in a case of rape, and the crime itself came to be seen not as a property violation but as the ravishment of a woman against her will. *However*, when it came to the law’s practical application, it appears that patriarchal definitions of rape continued to hold sway. (324, italics mine)

What we learn from Pacheco is that medieval and early modern considerations about rape is not much different than the ancient Romans’. Rape still is considered “transfer pollution” in some way. In her seminal work, Susan Brownmiller strongly suggests that the initial concept of rape as a crime was “that the violation was first and foremost a violation of *male* rights of possession” (377). Kim Solga finds that, “for a significant portion of the thirteenth through the early sixteen centuries, rape was largely a property crime, centered on a woman’s chastity as her family’s asset and defined principally by its theft from them with or without her consent” (57).⁶⁶ Solga adds that

⁶⁶ For her analysis on the *Wife of Bath*, Suzanne Edwards researched medieval statutes on rape, finding, that, “After the rape of a nobleman’s daughter in 1380, laws governing rape culminated in the 1382 Statute of Rapes, which was a medieval reform that sought to protect patriarchal control of female sexuality and to punish women for autonomous marriage choice” (3). Furthermore, “As historical work has shown, statutes concerning *raptus* increasingly elided distinctions between violent sexual assault against a woman’s will and the transgression of familial property rights from the thirteenth century through the fourteenth centuries” (3). In the thirteenth century, “the *Statute of Westminster I* (1275) and *II* (1285) eroded procedural and punitive distinctions between rape and abduction to protect families’ and guardians’ financial interests in women’s marriages. Before the late thirteenth century, the law treated the two crimes separately. Prior to the *Statutes of Westminster*, a claim of rape could be pursued by a woman’s own appeal or by indictment. The crime was a felony, punishable by death. An appeal of rape could also be settled by a fine or by marriage between the woman and her attacker. By contrast, claims concerning abduction were trespasses, punishable by a fine and brought by those with financial interests in a ward’s marriage.

statute changes, “immediately before and near the end of Elizabeth’s reign, 1555 and 1597, began once more to focus rape’s specificity on the body—but this time on the sexualized body, specifically on the absence of a woman’s sexual consent in determining crime. In practice, however, the old emphasis on property remained, to be awkwardly negotiated alongside the new emphasis on woman’s agency” (58).⁶⁷ While laws and statutes adjust to presumably give agency to women in cases of rape, what is happening in actuality is that patriarchal conceptions about women and their sexuality are continuously maintained. As Solga argues, “The avowedly innocent rape victim must not only refuse consent to her attacker, but also find a way to make her non-consent visible to a public deeply skeptical of women’s sexual motives” (58). And, while there is not a literal rape in Shakespeare’s *Cymbeline*, Innogen suffers the same shame associated with rape when she is rhetorically raped by her husband’s kinsman.

Two of the minor yet connected plot elements of *Cymbeline* that are minimally addressed within the play are when Giacomo figuratively and Cloten literally plan to rape Innogen.⁶⁸ When

In the law, both abductions and—theoretically, at least—rape accusations were potential avenues to marriage” (6). Thus, the *Statutes of Westminster* effectively turned the law of rape into a law of elopement and abduction and shifted the law’s focus from a woman’s injuries to her family’s interests” (6). Thus, Edwards argues, “The 1382 statute permits families to punish daughters’ marriage choice much more harshly than they could punish sons’ by invoking a distinctively feminine vulnerability to rape; the threat of rape reveals how women’s choices in cases of abduction and elopement are always compromised in a way that men’s are not” (13).

⁶⁷ Solga continues to discuss the significance of these changes in statutes:

In fact, the sixteenth-century emphasis on a woman’s non-consent as the ultimate arbiter of rape, combined with misogynist assumptions about women’s unruly sexual appetites, resulted in renewed fears of what Deborah Burks calls woman’s sexual ‘defecation.’ Was she raped, or did she give herself (her husband’s property) away? Failing to prove non-consent, a woman became not only complicit in the crime but, in popular prejudice, her own rapist. So rape comes, by the turn of the seventeenth-century, to rest on the proof of female sexual innocence—a remarkably challenging prospect. (58)

⁶⁸ On choosing Innogen rather than Imogen, the Norton editors note: “the heroine’s name, given as ‘Imogen’ in F, is here changed to ‘Innogen.’ There are several reasons for this alteration. In Holinshed’s *Chronicles*, one of Shakespeare’s sources for the play, the wife of Brute (an early King of England) was named Innogen. Many scholars assume that this was Shakespeare’s source for the name, including Coppelia Kahn who believes “Imogen is taken from Innogen, wife of Brute, the legendary founder of Britain” (*Roman Shakespeare* 161). In addition, Simon Forman, one of Shakespeare’s contemporaries, who described a performance of the play in 1611, gave the name of the Princess as Innogen. Finally, in *Much Ado About Nothing*, Leonato has a wife called Innogen (who never makes a stage appearance); that couple might thus anticipate the Innogen and Leonatus of *Cymbeline*. The Oxford editors

Giacomo wagers Innogen's chastity with Posthumus, he devises a plan to win. He sneaks into Innogen's room inside of a trunk. Once Innogen is asleep, Giacomo surreptitiously inspects Innogen's room and then her sleeping body. Based on Giacomo's machinations within Innogen's bedchamber and her "unconscious" body, he is able to manipulate Posthumus into believing Innogen is unfaithful and unchaste. More than sounding similar to the Brock Turner Stanford rape case, the rhetoric surrounding both "events"⁶⁹ suggests the prevalence of rape culture is historically situated yet incredibly relevant today.

The majority of this paper focuses on the rhetoric of rape as it pertains to Innogen. However, as "in 'rape cultures,' the danger, the frequency, and the acceptance of sexual violence all contribute to shaping behavior and identity, in women and men alike" (Higgins and Silver 2), I will also spend time discussing how rape rhetoric affects and shapes the behavior of the King of Britain, Cymbeline. While Innogen's rape is much more in tune with the literal definition of rape, Cymbeline's rape is much more subtle and rhetorical as it is committed by the conquering state via his wife. As discussed earlier, rape and its consequences have been and are still linked to male possession and power. In their edited collection, Lynn A. Higgins and Brenda R. Silver state that "the essays suggest that rape and rapability are central to the very construction of gender identity and that our subjectivity and sense of ourselves as sexual beings are inextricably enmeshed in representations" (3). Furthermore, to strengthen her argument focused on international law, Teema Ruskola turns to a phrase scripted by Sharon Marcus who "develops the term 'rape script' to emphasize that 'the violence of rape is enabled by narratives, complexes and institutions which

surmise that the compositors who set type for F misread the word 'Innogen,' mistaking 'nn' for 'm' and so printing 'Imogen' (1238).

⁶⁹ In a letter written by Brock Turner's father, Dan, he states, "First of all, let me say that Brock is absolutely devastated by the events of January 17th and 18th, 2015" (Miller para. 20). Throughout the letter, Dan Turner addresses the sexual assault and rape as "events".

derive their strength not from outright, immutable, unbeatable force but rather from their power to structure our lives as imposing cultural scripts” (1530). Brownmiller adds, “All rape is an exercise in power, but some rapists have an edge that is more than physical. They operate within an institutionalized setting that works to their advantage...” (256). The institutional power maintained through Innogen’s near-rape experience with Cloten and rhetorical rape by Giacomo is also sustained through a metaphorical rape experienced by the conquered Cymbeline. As I will explore throughout this chapter, the geographic rhetoric of *Cymbeline* is sustained by cultural, historical, and social constructions—both as Shakespeare was writing and in the second decade of the 21st century.

Cymbeline, written early in the reign of James I, is not one of the most popular plays produced or focused upon within the critical tradition. Ros King states, “it is one of the most neglected plays in the canon” (1). Echoing King’s sentiments, Warren Chernaik adds, “Studies of Shakespeare’s Roman plays are rarely comparative in approach: indeed, the standard pattern for critics is to limit themselves to *Julius Caesar*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *Coriolanus* (or any two of these three), considered in isolation, ignoring Shakespeare’s early *Lucrece* and *Titus Andronicus*, his late *Cymbeline*, and the plays on Roman themes by his contemporaries” (5). And, a large part of critical attention of the play is focused upon reading it as a political metaphor for the Stuart court. With James I presenting himself in the Roman image to his English subjects, this metaphor, as Chernaik points out, “In the court of James I, the Roman analogy is standard currency for praise of the monarch as ‘*England’s Caesar*’” (4). Scholars have shown that James I fashioned himself with the Roman persona, hoping to evoke the nostalgia and admiration of ancient Roman rule (having to suspend, for a moment, England’s complicated history with its at-one-time

conquerors).⁷⁰ Jonathan Goldberg declares, “Throughout his career, James invoked the style of gods” (27), famously riding through “Roman” arches into London for his coronation as James I of England. Chernaik describes this moment, writing, “In James’s elaborately staged entrance into London in 1604, the streets were lined with arches and statues in ‘a triumph in the high Roman style,’ recreating ancient Rome in the eyes of the beholders” (4). And James continues to present himself in the Roman style throughout his reign, even having his Roman image stamped upon currency. Given James’s fixation and fascination with his Roman identity, it makes sense that scholars, too, would focus on this point, especially as the play is set in ancient Britain, when Britons still paid tribute to Rome. As the Roman-Stuart dynamic cannot be overlooked, this paper will add to previous critical attention by attending to the sexual violence in the play as it connects to gender, geography, and nation-building.

The Sovereign is Not Rapable and the Rapable Cannot be Sovereign⁷¹

According to Chernaik, “the history of Rome, as Shakespeare, Livy, and Plutarch present it, is a history of war and conquest” (2). As the title of the play suggests, the primary plot line focuses upon King Cymbeline and his hold upon his monarchy. We learn that the ancient Briton no longer wants to pay tribute to Rome at the instigation of his unnamed wife. While Cymbeline’s wife is unnamed in the play, her actions portray a woman who has great influence over her husband. When Roman ambassador, Lucius, arrives in Britain, he reminds Cymbeline of the agreement made between the two countries:

When Julius Caesar—whose remembrance yet

⁷⁰ About James I, according to the editors of the Oxford edition, he “was interested in linking imperial Rome and the Roman Emperors to modern Britain and to his own kingship. He had himself painted, crowned with laurel leaves, in the Roman manner, and had coins stamped with his laurel-crowned profile. Like Augustus Caesar, James presented himself as the great peacemaker after Elizabeth’s reluctant involvement in wars in Ireland and in defending the Protestant countries of the Continent against Catholic powers, especially Spain. Moreover, just as Augustus ruled over a vast empire, James aspired to unite Scotland and England (along with the already incorporated Wales) into a single entity with one church and one set of laws” (1232).

⁷¹ From Teema Ruskola’s “Raping Like a State” (1529).

Lives in men's eyes, and will to ears and tongues
 Be theme and hearing ever—was in this Britain
 And conquered it, Cassibelan, thine uncle,
 Famous in Caesar's praises no whit less
 Than in his feats deserving it, for him
 And his succession granted Rome a tribute,
 Yearly three thousand pounds, which by thee lately
 Is left untendered. (3.1.2-10)

As Lucius's rhetoric draws upon Cymbeline's honor and family heritage, the Queen quickly takes control of the conversation before Cymbeline has a chance to respond to the ambassador. In this instance, the Queen exerts a dangerous amount of influence on her husband—a negative feature both in ancient Rome and in early modern England. In her article, "Social Stereotypes and Historical Analysis: The Case of the Imperial Women at Rome," Susan Fisher writes: "The ideal woman was noted for their beauty, fertility and faithfulness to her husband, as well as her ability to run the household" (120). The "good" Roman woman was to support her family and keep the household, and, while Cymbeline's Queen does support her husband, she does so by usurping his influence. Moreover, by creating a division between Cymbeline and Innogen, the Queen causes chaos in the family, which stands in contrast of the very definition of a moral Roman woman. In addition, she strongly suggests that Britain is protected by the god of the sea, Neptune and that their island country is impenetrable.

Trumping Lucius, the Queen couples Cymbeline's family heritage along with *his* strength, saying:

Remember, sir, my liege,
 The kings your ancestors, together with
 The natural bravery of your isle, which stands
 As Neptune's park, ribbed and paled in
 With banks unscalable and roaring waters,
 With sands that will not bear your enemies' boats,
 But suck them up to th' topmast. A kind of conquest
 Caesar made here, but made not here his brag
 Of 'came and saw and overcame.' With shame—

The first that ever touched him—he was carried
 From off our coast, twice beaten; and his shipping,
 Poor ignorant baubles, on our terrible seas
 Like eggshells moved upon their surges, cracked
 As easily 'gainst our rocks; for joy whereog
 The famed Cassibelan, who was once at point—
 O giglot fortune!—to master Caesar's sword,
 Made Lud's town with rejoicing fires bright,
 And Britons strut with courage. (3.1.16-33)

At the Queen's incitement, Cymbeline's refusal to pay tribute to Rome causes a schism with Rome and the potential for war and invasion. The Queen is successful in persuading Cymbeline to quit paying tribute to Rome, especially now because Cymbeline's authority has been publicly threatened by his own daughter who secretly married a man of her choice. The Queen's suggestive powers over her husband are especially heightened by the time Lucius arrives in Britain. More so than being angry with his daughter for marrying the "basest thing" (1.1.126), accusing her of taking a "beggar" for a husband who would make his throne a "seat for baseness" (1.1.142-143), Cymbeline is angry with the fact that Innogen has disobeyed him—she has stepped out of line with her place as a woman in society (both in ancient and early modern England) and with her place as a king's subject. His first words in the play accuse his daughter of being a "disloyal thing" (1.1.132), "past grace, obedience" (1.1.137). In return, Innogen is openly defiant in "talking back"⁷² to her father instead of immediately apologizing, begging forgiveness, and quietly accepting his wrath—something Cymbeline would have expected. Becoming angrier with this disobedience, he calls Innogen a "vile one!" (1.1.144). Even if not intentional from Innogen's point-of-view, Cymbeline's authority is still called into question as she refuses to stay silent and obedient. Thus, the Queen is more successful in her manipulations of Cymbeline. The Queen

⁷² Rather than staying quiet, Innogen passionately responds to her father's accusations: "I am senseless of your wrath" (1.1.136), "I chose an eagle / And did avoid a puttock" (1.1.140-141), "No, I rather added / A lustre to it" (1.1.143-144), and, "Would I were / a neatherd's daughter, and my Leonatus / Our neighbor shepherd's son" (1.1.149-151).

appeals to his ego as an authority figure—over her as a woman and as a subject, and she more easily is able to convince him to stop paying tribute to Rome.

In her success at manipulating Cymbeline, not only is the Queen meant to unlikeable—more so, she is meant to be evil. She may go unnamed because she serves as a villain of the play. In his analysis, John E. Curran, Jr. claims, “the Queen and Cloten are both transparent villains, their villainy goes beyond mere malignancy; their iniquity derives mostly from their inordinate love of title and lineage” (287). He adds, “The nameless Queen is certainly evil in her own right; when we first see her, her dabblings in poison sufficiently attest to her character” (287). While the Queen and her son may be obvious villains of the play, their wickedness distracts from the villainy towards Innogen of which Posthumus and Cymbeline are also culpable.

As Cymbeline becomes more resistant to Roman rule, he unwittingly sets up his daughter Innogen for rape (as will be seen later in this analysis). At the same time, he sets himself up to be rhetorically raped by a conquering nation.⁷³ In her seminal work, Teema Ruskola defines the sovereign states as normative masculine (1477). In line with this analysis, Ruskola continues, “This so-called private law analogy justified the projection of key Roman law categories onto the international plane. Sovereignty, for example, became an extension of the Roman notion of *dominium*, or ownership, with the sovereign constituting effectively a kind of Roman proprietor” (1490). In allowing his unnamed queen to negatively influence him, Cymbeline has given up his role of sovereign and thus placed himself in the unenviable position to be taken advantage of by the Roman state through a figurative rape. As Ruskola articulates, “it is a commonplace observation that aggression among states is often phrased in terms of sexual violation” (1479). In

⁷³ I don’t mean to suggest here at all that the potential literal rape experienced by Innogen is the same to the figurative rape that Cymbeline may experience by being conquered by Rome. Rather, what I want to highlight is that ideas about power and possession are linked to sexual violence. Even the literal sexual violence of a woman’s body is “hijacked” to sustain patriarchal notions about social order.

submitting to his wife, Cymbeline has cast his country in the role of (potentially) conquered. As critics have pointed out, this leads to a noteworthy change in the state:

In their feminist analysis of international law, Hilary Charlesworth and Christine Chinkin characterize the standard conception of the sovereign state as ‘a bounded, self-contained, closed, separate entity that is entitled to ward off any unwanted contact or interference.’ Hence, they observe, the state possesses ‘a heterosexual male body’ which has ‘no natural’ points of entry, and its boundedness makes forced entry the clearest possible breach of international law.’ From their valuable insight regarding the state’s gendered body, Charlesworth and Chinkin, following many others, proceed to the logical conclusion that colonized and conquered states were in turn gendered female. (Ruskola 1495)

Given the hypermasculinity of ancient Rome (and the fact that this perception was part of the interest in Roman history and culture for early moderns), it is of little surprise that Rome will respond with all the machinations of war. More noteworthy though is that as Cymbeline’s sovereignty is challenged by his daughter’s agency, his wife’s influence, and Rome’s threat to conquer Britain, Cymbeline becomes more and more “rapable” as he is “gendered female” (Ruskola 1495). As Cymbeline continues to lose control of his country, he likewise loses control of his family to the maneuvers of the queen. Devastatingly, this will have major repercussions in the welfare of his daughter Innogen.

Ripe for Conquest

As Cymbeline and Britain march towards conflict against Rome, audiences are introduced to the Innogen / Posthumus saga. Innogen has secretly married the man whom she loves but who is not approved of by her king father. When the marriage is discovered, Posthumus is exiled and Innogen is shunned until she obeys her father. At the manipulative suggestion of his wife, Cymbeline demands Innogen to marry his stepson, Innogen’s stepbrother, Cloten. The First Gentleman summarizes the tumult stating:

[Innogen], and the heir of’s kingdom, whom
He purposed to his wife’s sole son—a widow
That late he married—hath referred herself

Unto a poor but worthy gentleman. She's wedded,
Her husband banished, she imprisoned. (1.1.4-8)

As the Innogen / Posthumus and Cymbeline / Britain and Rome plotlines are interwoven throughout the play, they are more than tangentially related. The geographic space with which *Cymbeline* is concerned, especially with the now-tainted line of succession,⁷⁴ is figuratively embodied by Innogen. With Innogen imagined as Britain, both are ripe for a violent attempt at conquest.

While Innogen is shunned by her father, Posthumus is banished from Britain. Posthumus decides to go to Rome to stay with a friend of his father's, Filario.⁷⁵ Once in Rome, Filario hosts a dinner for several men: a Frenchman, a Dutchman, a Spaniard, Posthumus, a Briton, and the Roman, Giacomo (1.4). In what is meant to be a collegial dinner, Giacomo takes an opportunity to provoke Posthumus. The Frenchman had broken up a duel between Posthumus and another Frenchman over a disagreement they had over the virtues of women of their respective countries.⁷⁶ Upon hearing this discourse, Giacomo instigates Posthumus into a similar response he had with the Frenchman. Giacomo begins by stating, "You must not so far prefer her fore ours of Italy"

⁷⁴ Angrily addressing Innogen in choosing Posthumus over his choice of husband, Cloten, Cymbeline yells, "Thou took'st a beggar, wouldst have my throne / A seat for baseness" (1.1.142-143). Using this same scene, John E. Curran, Jr. points out that Cymbeline is "overly preoccupied with matters of title and lineage" (291), which now seem ruined as Innogen, without royal permission, marries Posthumus. Cymbeline is not only angry because Innogen didn't ask his permission but he is also angry because her decision threatens his legacy—as Marion Wynne-Davies suggests, "Control of the womb was paramount to determining a direct patrilineal descent, and when this exercise of power failed and women determined their own sexual appetites regardless of precreation, the social structure was threatened with collapse" (136).

⁷⁵ Before leaving Britain, Posthumus tells Innogen:
My residence in Rome at one Filario's,
Who to my father was a friend, to me
Known but by letter; thither write, my queen,
And with mine eyes I'll drink the words you send
Though ink be made of gall. (1.1.98-102).

⁷⁶ The Frenchman tells Giacomo:
'Twas a contention in public, which may without contradiction suffer the report. It was much like an argument that fell out last night, where each of us fell in praise of our country mistresses, this gentleman at that time vouching—and upon warrant of bloody affirmation—his to be more fair, virtuous, wise, chaste, constant, qualified, and less attemptable than any the rarest of our ladies in France. (1.4.46-53)

(1.4.56), followed by, “As fair and as good—a kind of hand-in-hand comparison—had been something too fair and too good for any lady in Britain. If she went before others I have seen—as that diamond⁷⁷ of yours outlustres many I have beheld—I could not but believe she excelled many; but I have not seen the most precious diamond that is, nor you the lady” (1.4.60-65). With each time he speaks, Giacomo provokes Posthumus further and further. After telling Posthumus that, “Either your unparagoned mistress is dead, or she’s outprized by a trifle” (1.4.69-70), Posthumus passionately responds: “You are mistaken. The one may be sold or given, or if there were wealth enough for the purchase or merit for the gift. The other is not a thing for sale, and only the gift of the gods” (1.4.71-74). Now Giacomo knows that Posthumus is engaged in this battle of words. Continuing to provoke him, Giacomo elicits an angry response from Posthumus who angrily replies, “Your Italy contains none so accomplished a courtier to convince the honour of my mistress if in the holding or loss of that you term her frail” (1.4.83-85). At this point, the conversation has gotten so heated that the host, Filario, urges everyone to calm down and to change the subject. In spite of Filario’s interpolation, the conversation turns into a wager between Giacomo and Posthumus:⁷⁸ a portion of his estate against the ring gifted to Posthumus by Innogen, to which Posthumus agrees.⁷⁹

Giacomo is one of the villains of the plays. As Paul Innes states, “The opposite of this world of *virtus* is, of course, Iachimo, and he represents a displaced form of contemporary Renaissance Italian behavior, that of the sexually degenerate Machiavel figure” (12). Huw

⁷⁷ Innogen gives Posthumus a diamond ring before he leaves court: “Look here, love: / This diamond was my mother’s. Take it, hear” (1.1.112-113).

⁷⁸ Filario says: “Let us leave here, gentlemen” (1.4.87), “Gentlemen, enough of this. It came in too suddenly. Let it die as it was born; and, I pray you, be better acquainted” (1.4.105-106), and, “I will have it no lay” (1.4.130).

⁷⁹ It should be noted that the conversation at dinner began with the Frenchman and Posthumus reconnecting after having met in France. At first Posthumus is embarrassed by his behavior attributing it to his youth: “By your pardon, sir, I was then a young traveler, rather shunned to go even with what I heard than in my every action to be guided by others’ experiences...” (1.4.37-39). But it doesn’t take very much or very long for Giacomo to engage Posthumus into an even more dangerous quarrel.

Griffiths adds, “The dominant image of the Roman characters onstage in *Cymbeline* is of a community with loose morals, a nation of idlers and of philanderers” (354).⁸⁰ Even while Giacomo is the agitator in this conversation, *the rhetoric of rape begins with Posthumus* (emphasis mine). When Posthumus asks, “What lady would you choose to assail?” (1.4.109), Posthumus is the one who positions Innogen’s body in geographic terms, as a conquerable state, a location that is assailable and on which battle can be fought and won. Even though the Queen and Cloten, (according to Curran) and Giacomo (according to Innes) are obvious villains of the play, Posthumus, Innogen’s husband, is also a villain. He actually gives Giacomo the opportunity to assail his wife.

Figuring Innogen in such a way is further compounded by the location at which this occurs, at what is meant to be an informal dinner party. Innes point out that the “Italians, Spaniards, Dutchmen, Frenchmen and Englishmen: all are members of nations vying for economic and political power in the great game of international empire in the period we all call the Renaissance. And all become present in this Wager Scene” (2).⁸¹ Thus, the Giacomo-Posthumus wager locates Innogen the woman as a conquerable body as it mirrors the current state of affairs with which *Cymbeline* is dealing—the conquering Rome (Giacomo) to the conquerable Britain (Innogen). Additionally, the wager further figures Innogen as Britain as a conquerable state vulnerable to various global powers, not just to Rome. Because, as Innes states, “The players in this scene [Frenchmen, Dutchmen, Spaniards, Romans, and Britons], whether or not they speak, are

⁸⁰ Griffiths further adds, “When Leonatus leaves Britain for ancient Rome, he arrives in Renaissance Italy instead. As in contemporary prose fiction, Italy is perceived as a land where the virtuous Englishmen may get into all sorts of trouble at the hands of unscrupulous foreigners, as Leonatus does” (355). Posthumus is easily roped into an argument with Giacomo, and later the wager, but I would argue that it’s not because of Giacomo’s unscrupulousness. Posthumus has already established a pattern of unscrupulous behavior: marrying the King’s daughter without permission and fighting a Frenchman in his youth over a matter “trivial in nature” (1.4.36) to name a couple.

⁸¹ Peter Parolin adds, “London may have been among the largest cities in Europe in 1600, but the centers of political, economic, and cultural power remained continental” (188).

emblematic of the play's imperial concerns" (2). Thus, the anxieties of masculinity, inheritance, and colonization are spatiality figured onto Innogen, by her husband, by her father, and by Giacomo.

Upon first arriving to Cymbeline's court, Giacomo, a Roman foreigner, is overtaken by Innogen's beauty and immediately invokes the language of conquest. In an aside, Giacomo strongly desires the strength to win Innogen, exclaiming:

Boldness be my friend;
 Arm me audacity from head to foot,
 Or, like the Parthian, I shall flying fight;
 Rather, directly fly. (1.6.18-21)

The rhetoric with which Giacomo engages is that of war and conquest of land. In asking, "arm me audacity from head to foot," Giacomo is metaphorically asking to be at the ready like an invading soldier—armed with the right weapons to be successful. This metaphor is continued as he evokes the image of the Parthian. According to the editors, the Parthians were "the mounted archers of Parthia" (1253). They "were famous for their tactics in warfare, which included shooting arrows behind them as they retreated" (1253). Giacomo imagines Innogen as land ripe for conquest, ready to be seized by his "shooting arrow." As if the wager made with Posthumus isn't enough motivation, now, armed with nationalistic pride as a metaphorical soldier, he is determined to conquer the battlefield—Innogen.

Strategically invading Innogen's bedroom in a trunk, Giacomo waits for her to fall asleep before attacking. Upon exiting the trunk in which he was hidden, Giacomo alludes to Tarquin, a Roman who rapes Lucrece—"Our Tarquin thus / Did softly press the rushes ere he wakened / The chastity he wounded" (2.2.12-14). He notes, too, the book Innogen was reading before falling

asleep, a tale of Tereus, another noted rapist.⁸² Giacomo seems pleased in aligning himself with the two notorious rapists, noting that Tarquin is “Our[s],” (a Roman) and that Innogen has left off in her book where “Philomel gave up” (2.2.46) to her rapist. This indicates that he feels he’s successful in his invasion, especially when he says, “I have enough” immediately after seeing where Innogen has left off in her book (2.2.46). Once Giacomo looks upon Innogen’s sleeping body, he begins to itemize her body, treating it like property rather than as a person.⁸³ He notes:

But my design—
 To note the chamber. I will write it all down.
 Such and such pictures, there the window, such
 Th’adornment of her bed, the arras, figures,
 Why, such and such; and the contents o’th story.
 As, but some natural notes about her body
 Above ten thousand meaner movables
 Would testify t’enrich mine inventory...
 On her left breast
 A mole, cinque-spotted, like the crimson drops
 I’th’ bottom of a cowslip. Here’s a voucher
 Stronger than ever law could make. This secret
 Will force him think I have picked the lock and ta’en
 The treasure of her honour. (2.2.23-42)

As with literal rape, this rhetorical rape of Innogen completely disregards her as a person. It situates her as a space to be conquered, for Giacomo to succeed in victory over Posthumus in this battle.

Compounding Giacomo’s invasion of and competition over Innogen’s space and body is Cloten’s attempt at wooing her. So far in the play, the audience has only seen Innogen abused: disregarded by her king father, warged by her husband, and metaphorically raped by Giacomo.

⁸² Tereus is the King of Thrace who raped Philomena, his wife’s sister. He cuts out her tongue after the assault so that she couldn’t speak the name of her rapist. Later, Philomena weaves the assault into a tapestry.

⁸³ “Etymologically, the Latin term *persona* refers to a ritual mask worn by an actor performing a role on stage. That is, it refers to something that *covers* one, rather than to what one *is*, one’s substance. It was only subsequently that ‘*persona*’ became a metaphor and was carried from the language of the theater into legal terminology. What distinguished a private individual and a Roman citizen was that the latter had a *persona*—a ‘legal personality,’ in contemporary parlance. In short, person was originally a theatrical term of art, then a legal metaphor for a Roman rights-bearer and it was only later when Roman law was rediscovered, reconceptualized, and crossbred with a Christian sense of interiority that ‘person’ acquired its modern metaphysical meaning: not only a legal actor but an individual human being as such” (Ruskola 1490).

Very early in the day after her space is invaded by Giacomo, Cloten, her stepbrother, lingers outside her bedchambers in his attempt to woo her—though he knows full well that she is unavailable. Waiting for the musicians he has hired, he says, “Winning will put any man into courage. If I could get this foolish Innogen I should have gold enough” (2.3.6-7). His goal, similar to Giacomo’s, is to elevate his masculinity—to win. According to Marion Wynne-Daves, “rape is a crime primarily enacted by men against women, but in all circumstances it is used to assert the absolute authority of one being over another” (131). In continuing, Cloten uses heavily sexually charged language. He says, “I would this music would come. I am advised to give her music o’ mornings; they say it will *penetrate*” (2.3.10-11). Once the musicians arrive, he hurries them up, stating, “Come on, tune. If you can *penetrate* her with your *fingering*, so; we’ll try with tongue too” (2.3.12-13). The editors to the play note here that “these lines also carry an explicitly sexual secondary meaning” (1261). To penetrate means to “sexually arouse her” (1261). Furthermore, Cloten’s message to the musicians can also mean: “If you can insert your fingers inside her, that’s good. We’ll try oral sex as well” (1261). And after the musicians have played their song, Cloten harshly hurries them to leave, saying, “So, get you gone. If this *penetrate* I will consider your music the better...” (2.3.24-25). The sexually charged language continues when Cymbeline asks Cloten how he is succeeding in wooing his daughter. Responding to the King, Cloten says, “I have assailed her with musics...” (2.3.35). Not only is this reminiscent of Posthumus’s positioning Innogen as assailable, it demonstrates that the rhetoric of rape is culturally embedded within ways of thinking about one’s masculinity. Cloten’s use of language is connected to his desire to win Innogen, as if she is a conquerable state.

When this tactic does not work and after discovering her plans of escape, Cloten becomes more aggressive in his desire to conquer Innogen. Upon learning about her plans from Pisanio,

Posthumus's servant, Cloten devises his own maneuver to succeed in winning Innogen. Similar to Giacomo's motivation in rhetorically raping Innogen, Cloten is also driven by his desire to out rival Posthumus. When he first learns about Innogen's plans, Cloten ruminates over his desire to best Posthumus:

Even there, thou villain Posthumus, will I kill thee. I would these garments were come. She said upon time—the bitterness of it I now belch from my heart—that she held the very garment of Posthumus in more respect than my noble and natural person, together with the adornment of my qualities. With that suit upon my back will I ravish her—first kill him, and in her eyes; there shall she see my valour, which will then be a torment to her contempt. He on the ground, my speech of insultment ended on his dead body, and when my lust hath dined—which, as I say, to vex her I will execute in the clothes that she so praised—to the court I'll knock her back, foot her home again. She hath despised me rejoicingly, and I'll be merry in my revenge. (3.5.129-41)

Clearly angered by Innogen's preference to Posthumus over his noble birth and rank, Cloten is motivated by revenge. His plan is to kill Posthumus in front of Innogen then rape her –“ravish her” (3.5.135)—all while wearing Posthumus's clothing. To further enforce his authority over her, he plans to follow the murder and rape by beating and dragging her back to court.⁸⁴ Already past the mid-point of the play, Innogen has been used by all of the men in her life to meet their own desires or to elevate their position in a quest.

From Giacomo's figurative rape, Cloten moves towards a literal rape of Innogen. Act IV begins with Cloten disguised in Posthumus's clothing reiterating his plan to kill him and rape Innogen. In a boasting manner, Cloten reminds the audience of his motivation, that Innogen prefers the base Posthumus to himself:

How fit his garments serve me! Why should his mistress, who was made by him that made the tailor, not be fit too?—the rather—saving reverence of the word—for 'tis said a woman's fitness comes by fits. Therein I must play the workman...I mean the lines of his body are as well drawn as his: no less young, more strong, not beneath him in fortunes,

⁸⁴ According to Wynne-Davies, “In medieval Europe a woman was often abducted and sexually penetrated in order to force an unwanted or unsuitable marriage, thereby enabling her abductor to take possession of her lands and inheritance” (131).

beyond him in the advantage of the time, above him in birth, alike conversant in general services, and more remarkable in single oppositions. (4.1.2-12)

In comparing himself to Posthumus, Cloten uses both the language of battle and of sex to metaphorically best Posthumus. The editors of the play provide the double meaning behind the lines “alike conversant in general services, and more remarkable in single oppositions” as “similarly acquainted with battle tactics, and superior in single combat or duels (with puns on ‘service’ and ‘opposition’ as referring to sexual exploits)” (1287). Remembering that Innogen has chosen Posthumus over him, Cloten angrily reminds the audience about his plans to rape her. In his very disturbing soliloquy, Cloten says:

Yet this imperceiverant thing loves him in my despite. What mortality is! Posthumus, thy head which now is growing upon thy shoulders shall within this hour be off, thy mistress enforced, thy garments cut to pieces before thy face; and all this done; spurn her home to her father, who may haply be a little angry for my so rough usage; but my mother, having power of his testiness, shall turn all into my commendations. (4.1.12-18)

Stating again that he plans on raping Innogen, Cloten adds that her father *may* get upset about his treatment of Innogen, but that he will get over it.⁸⁵ It is noteworthy to remember, of course, that the king’s original plan (under the Queen’s machinations) was to have Cloten marry Innogen. Not only does this demonstrate how sure of himself Cloten is but it also emphasizes the prevalence of rape culture that exists. Even Innogen is aware of this when she says:

...no more ado
With that harsh, churlish, noble, simple nothing,
That Cloten, whose love suit hath been to me
As fearful as a siege. (3.4.131-134)

⁸⁵ Cloten’s expectation that Cymbeline would quickly overcome Cloten’s rape is further emphasized when Cymbeline condemns Arviragus and Guiderius to death after they admit to killing Cloten. Cymbeline tells them, “I am sorrow for thee. / By thine own tongue thou art condemned, and must / Endure our law. Thou’rt dead” (5.6.297-299). Despite the fact that the boys rescued Cymbeline and that Cloten threatened their lives, Cymbeline still punishes them to death because they killed a prince.

Imagining her body succumbing to Cloten's siege shows that "spatial divisions are also affected by and reflected in embodied practices and lived social relations" (McDowell 35). Jean E. Howard and Phyllis Rackin add: "In the struggle for power between men of two nations, the sexualized bodies of women become a crucial terrain where this battle is played out" (5).

Though Cloten is not successful in killing Posthumus and raping Innogen—in fact, he is killed trying—the suggestion that he could get away with these things is just as problematic. Highlighted with Giacomo's figurative rape and Cloten's attempted literal rape is the geographic rhetoric that allows for the positioning of Innogen as a "rapable location," an incredibly desperate position to be in. Unfortunately, Innogen's ultimate fate lies in the hands of men.

"The Briton Reveller"⁸⁶

While the Queen, Cloten, and Giacomo are obvious villains of the play, Posthumus proves to be a rogue as well. He is the one who first uses the rhetoric of rape toward his own supposed beloved when participating in the wager with Giacomo. Following this is his attitude towards the information Giacomo provides to him upon his return from Britain. Upon returning to Rome, Giacomo tells Posthumus:

If I had lost it
I should have lost the worth of it in gold.
I'll make a journey twice as far t' enjoy
A second night of such sweet shortness which
Was mine in Britain; for the ring is won. (2.4.41-45)

The ring to which Giacomo is referring is the ring given to Posthumus by Innogen—one of the prizes the winner of the wager will win. With a double meaning, though, the ring that Giacomo has won and to which he alludes to is Innogen's chastity and Posthumus's consequent ownership of Innogen. He is claiming that he has slept with Posthumus' wife, stating to Posthumus that "Your

⁸⁶ (1.6.62). According to Giacomo, this is what Posthumus is called in Rome.

lady being so easy” (2.4.48). Posthumus’s response is to ask for proof: “If you can make’t apparent / That you have tasted her in bed, my hand / And ring is yours” (2.4.56-58). Giacomo begins by describing Innogen’s bedchamber in detail, specifically noting the elaborate tapestry in her room. Giacomo follows these descriptions by showing Posthumus the bracelet that he had gifted to Innogen before leaving Britain. In its omnipotence, the audience knows that Giacomo has stolen this bracelet from Innogen when he removed it from her sleeping body, but for Posthumus, it serves as proof of Innogen’s infidelity. More with feelings of anger rather than of being heartbroken, Posthumus shoves the ring towards Giacomo conceding that he believes in Innogen’s infidelity.

Enjoying the moment and continuing to be a rake, Giacomo wants to prolong his malevolent pursuit. He suggests to Posthumus that perhaps Innogen simply lost the bracelet or that one of her ladies has stolen it (2.4.115-117). Posthumus takes heed and takes back his ring. Giacomo is having fun with Posthumus, and he is able to do so with such effect because he knows full well that Posthumus’s personality leans towards jealousy and insecurity. Posthumus has not deviated from the man he was when he fought with the Frenchman in France. Giacomo depends on Posthumus’s reactionary response to continue in his venture. Posthumus doesn’t think through things; he reacts, as evidenced by how pliable he is by Giacomo. In a letter, he tells his servant, Pisanio, who is now serving Innogen about her supposed adultery. Even Pisanio does not believe this and he cannot believe Posthumus’s irrational actions. After reading the letter, Pisanio says:

How? Of adultery? Wherefore write you not
 What monster’s her accuser? Leonatus,
 O master, what a strange infection
 Is fall’n into thy ear! What false Italian,
 As poisonous tongued as handed, hath prevailed
 On thy too ready hearing? Disloyal? No. (3.2.1-6)

Giacomo relies on Posthumus’s mindset to succeed in besting Posthumus, and it’s working. At this point, Posthumus has given Giacomo the ring, showing that Giacomo has won the wager, then

taken the ring back, then giving Giacomo the ring once again before taking it back again. In this convoluted set of events, Posthumus becomes apprehensive regarding Innogen's faithfulness. Thus, when Giacomo tells him that Innogen has given him the bracelet, it is no surprise that Posthumus so easily believes him, again, giving him back the ring. He says:

'Tis true, nay, keep the ring, 'tis true. I am sure
 She would not lose it. Her attendants are
 All sworn honourable, They induced to steal it?
 And by a stranger? No, he hath enjoyed her.
 The cognizance of her incontinency
 Is this. She hath bought the name of whore thus dearly. (2.4.123-27)

Posthumus concludes that the only way for Giacomo to have the bracelet is that Innogen has given it him along with her chastity. In his mind, Posthumus works to this conclusion because he believes so highly in the honour of Innogen's attendants that it seems impossible for them to have stolen it. Consequently, he determines Innogen herself must be dishonorable. And this is when Giacomo pounces, offering "corporal" proof (2.4.119). He finally gets to "prove" that he has assailed Innogen. He tells Posthumus:

If you seek
 For further satisfying, under her breast—
 Worthy the pressing—lies a mole, right proud
 Of that most delicate lodging. By my life,
 I kissed it, and it gave me present hunger
 To feed again, though full. You do remember
 This stain upon her? (2.4.133-39)

To this, Posthumus's response is violently addressed to Innogen, not Giacomo, "O that I had her here to tear her limb-meal! / I will go there and do't i'th' court, before / Her father" (2.4.147-149). Much like Othello succumbs to circumstantial proof of his Desdemona's supposed infidelity, so too does Posthumus about Innogen's betrayal.

While Posthumus's susceptibility to Giacomo's manipulation and his quick acceptance of Innogen's infidelity may have to do with Posthumus's anxiety about his own placelessness,⁸⁷ his reaction should be compared to Innogen's response when she hears about Posthumus's supposed infidelity. Pisanio does not believe these accusations about Innogen and even says, "O my master, / Thy mind to hers is now as low as were / Thy fortunes" (3.2.9-10). When Giacomo arrives in Britain, Innogen asks after her husband's health. Giacomo tells her that Posthumus is doing "Exceedingly pleasant, none a stranger there / So merry and so gamesome [sportive and / or sexually playful]. He is called / The Briton Reveller" (1.6.60-62). Like he does with Posthumus, Giacomo speaks to her vulnerabilities hoping that she will be just as gullible as Posthumus. Using double meanings, he subliminally suggests that Posthumus has been unfaithful. Or, at the very least, that Posthumus is having a grand old time in Rome. Setting Innogen up for this possibility, Giacomo then tells her:

Had I this cheek
To bathe my lips upon; this hand whose touch,

⁸⁷ Throughout the play, there seems to be some anxiety Posthumus feels about his identity. Who is he? Is he Roman? Briton? At the beginning of the play, the First Gentleman says that he cannot say too much about Posthumus's past because no one knows what it is. He says, "I cannot delve him to the root" (1.1.28). What we do know is that Posthumus's father was a soldier who fought against the Romans, Posthumus had two brothers who also died, and that his mother died giving birth to him. An orphan, Posthumus is brought up at court by Cymbeline's generosity. Though raised with high esteem, he is immediately banished from Britain after marrying the princess Innogen, far above his station. While not royal, Posthumus has always believed to be "part of the family" and to be treated this way is traumatizing. Posthumus goes to Rome where his father has an acquaintance. Though there is tension between the two nations, Posthumus fits right in with the Romans. Innes even says that Giacomo "Romanizes Posthumus to Innogen" (10). His name is also very Roman-sounding—Posthumus Leonatus. Later, when Giacomo swears that he has had Innogen's chastity, Posthumus quickly believes him. One of the reasons he does so is because Giacomo invokes the Roman god, Jupiter. This shows that Posthumus's identity isn't quite established for himself. Furthermore, Curran states:

Sicilius epitomizes the plethora of royal nobodies inhabiting the pre-Roman section of the British History, all of whom serve as nothing but fillers designed to connect Geoffrey's heroes lineally to each other; the name is typical of the vagueness and obscurity of much of Geoffrey's pre-Roman world. Posthumus's heritage beyond Sicilius, the First Gentleman tells us, is an impenetrably obscure mystery. (294)

Raised in a court where lineage and inheritance is everything, Posthumus is reminded and deals with being a nobody. Even towards the end of the play, we see Posthumus struggle with his identity. At one point he says, "No more a Briton, I have resumed again / The part I came in" (5.5.75-76). And later, when asked by Cymbeline's soldiers, "who's there" (5.5.88), Posthumus replies, "A Roman" (5.5.89). This placelessness is sure to cause him anxiety and to even inform (though not excuse) his reactions to events and news.

Whose every touch, would force the feeler's soul
 To th' oath of loyalty; this object which
 Takes prisoner the wild notion of mine eye,
 Firing it only here: should I, damned then,
 Slaver with lips as common as the stairs
 That mount the Capitol; join grips with hands
 Made hard with hourly falsehood—falsehood as
 With labour; then by-peeping in an eye
 Base and illustrious as the smoky light
 That's fed with stinking tallow—it were fit
 That all the plagues of hell should at one time
 Encounter such revolt. (1.6.100-13)

Hearing this, Innogen responds, “[Posthumus], I fear, / Has forgot Britain” (1.6.114). Giacomo, thinking she will succumb to his machinations, follows:

And himself. Not I
 Inclined to this intelligence pronounce
 The beggary of his change, but 'tis your graces
 That from my mutest conscience to my tongue
 Charms this report out. (1.6.115-18)

He assures her that he only has her best interest at heart as he reports information about Posthumus. Immediately, she says she does not want to hear anymore. Unlike Posthumus who wants to hear more, she just does not believe this slander about her husband. Concerning her request, Giacomo continues:

O dearest soul, your cause doth strike my heart
 With pity that doth make me sick. A lady
 So fair, and fastened to an empery
 Would make the great'st king double, to be partnered
 With tomboys hired with that self exhibition
 Which your own coffers yield; with diseased ventures
 That play with all infirmities for gold
 Which rottenness can lend to nature; such boiled stuff
 As well might poison poison! Be revenged,
 Or she that bore you was no queen, and you
 Recoil from your great stock. (1.6.119-29)

Feigning concern for Innogen's own interests, Giacomo suggests that Posthumus has been unfaithful despite her devotion. Unlike Posthumus, Innogen is much more thoughtful about what

she hears. She says, “If this be true— / As I have such a heart that both mine ears / Must not in haste abuse” (1.6.130-132). Unlike her much-cherished husband, she will not be so hastily accepting of this information. This generous action indicates that she has complete trust in Posthumus. And, when Giacomo suggests that she take revenge on Posthumus by sleeping with him, she immediately calls for help and admonishes Giacomo:

Away, I do condemn mine ears that have
So long attended thee. If thou were honourable
Thou wouldst have told this tale for virtue, not
For such an end thou seek’st, as base as strange.
Thou wrong’st a gentleman who is as far
From thy report as thou from honour, and
Solicit’st here a lady that disdains
Thee and the devil alike. (1.6.142-49)

Unlike her husband, Innogen not only disbelieves the information provided to her but she strongly and passionately stands up for her husband. She doesn’t even ask for proof—she just rebukes Giacomo and his assertions. In line with other level-headed Shakespearean heroines, Innogen proves herself to be steady despite the adverse occurrences.

“Civil or Savage?”⁸⁸

Despite Innogen’s steadfastness, Giacomo is successful in outrivaling Posthumus with words alone. As a result of Giacomo’s invasion, though she is innocent, Innogen is exiled to literal boundaries of the nation—Wales. Though not literally raped by Giacomo, Innogen is shamed in the same way as if she had been. In the letter he writes to Pisanio, Posthumus directs Pisanio to murder Innogen for her supposed indiscretions. Pisanio is shocked by this request:

How? That I should murder her,
Upon the love and truth and vows which I
Have made to thy command? I her? Her blood?
If it be so to do good service, never
Let me be counted serviceable. (3.2.11-15)

⁸⁸ Looking for sustenance, Innogen asks if the inhabitants of a cave where she arrives are civil or savage (3.6.23)

Struggling with what to do and to whom to show service, Pisanio eventually shows the letter to Innogen. This is the first time she is hearing of the accusations made against her. In her husband's words, she reads:

‘Thy mistress, Pisanio, hath played the strumpet in my bed, the testimonies whereof lies bleeding in me. I speak not out of weak surmises but from proof as strong as my grief and as certain as I expect my revenge. That part thou, Pisanio, must act for me, if thy faith be not tainted with the breach of hers. Let thine own hands take away her life. I shall give thee opportunity at Milford Haven. She hath a letter for the purpose, where if thou fear to strike and to make me certain it is done, thou art the pander to her dishonor and equally to me disloyal.’ (3.4.21-30)

Upon reading this, Innogen is angry—understandably so because she is completely innocent of these charges. Moreover, she asks what it means to be false:

To lie in watch there and to think on him?
To weep ‘twixt clock and clock? If sleep charge nature,
To break it with fearful dream of him
And cry myself awake? That’s false to ‘s bed, is it? (3.4.40-43)

Innogen has been completely faithful to Posthumus, mourning their separation while she has been slandered by Giacomo. She is angry with Posthumus for believing that slander. She says, “So thou, Posthumus, / Wilt lay the leaven on all proper men. / Goodly and gallant shall be false and perjured / From thy great fail” (3.4.60-63). Because of her anger towards Posthumus and in spite of her innocence of the false accusations, she concludes, “I must die” (3.4.73). She tells Pisanio, “What shall I do the while, where bide, how live, / Or in my life what comfort when I am / Dead to my husband?” (3.4.127-129). Without her husband on whom to rely, her disobedience to the king, her father, is paramount. What can she do? The only way out of this is her death, she thinks. Her pessimistic attitude is heartbreaking as she states to Belarius, Guiderius, and Arviragus: “I am ill, but your being by me / Cannot amend me. Society is no comfort / To one not sociable” (4.2.11-13). Her desperation at finding herself exiled and completely alone has left her despondent.

Pisanio offers another solution. He suggests that she flee while he tells Posthumus that his command has been carried out. He points out, though, that Innogen, to survive, “not in Britain must...abide” (3.4.134). He says she should make her way towards Milford Haven in Wales disguised as a man and to seek to serve Lucius. Rhetorically raped, Innogen is forced into the outskirts of society—to the wilderness of Wales. Griffiths says, “The pastoral here is not a tame agrarian pastoral but something much more disturbing. Wales is truly primitive. There are no shepherds here, only hunters and a setting of mountains and caves” (347). Furthermore, “In *Cymbeline*, Wales is imagined as a harsh pastoral landscape in which Belarius and the King’s sons live in a cave, hunt for the food they eat, and have little contact with other human beings” (Greenblatt, et al 1232). Though portrayed as wild and uncivilized, Wales plays a crucial and complex part in the play. As McDowell claims, “Places are made through power relations which construct the rules which define boundaries. These boundaries are both social and spatial—they define who belongs to a place and who may be excluded” (4). As with Innogen, anxieties about empire and authority are emphasized with Wales.

In comparison to Britain, Wales is portrayed as barbaric. Even so, “Wales was a necessary origin for Tudor monarchical legitimacy” (Howard and Rackin 168).⁸⁹ Milford Haven is the site where James receives political legitimacy. This is where Henry VII landed to go on to defeat

⁸⁹ Paul Innes adds:

The history of Celtic Britain has to be carefully aligned with an overall British Renaissance project, with England of course as the senior nation. But such a project immediately and inevitably runs into a very serious obstacle: the English were not British, at least not to start with. They may have remade Britain in their own image by the time of the Renaissance, but they were Germanic invaders who conquered and displaced the indigenous Celtic populations. This is why Wales is so important: it is the location of the remnants of Cymbeline’s Britons. It is also fundamentally associated with the Tudors and James of Scotland’s claim to the British throne. (8)

Andrew Escobedo says, “An English king claims blood comradeship with a Welsh subject whose ancestors the English violently displaced centuries ago, and so the appeal to ancient British roots potentially reveals national heritage as an imposed fabrication, dividing the nation as much as it legitimizes it” (60).

Peter Parolin writes that *Cymbeline* “presents a much more complex view of history” (189).

Richard III and to begin the Tudor dynasty. In negotiating anxieties about nationhood and a barbaric past, Britain, in the play “manages both to include and to exclude the location of Wales” (Griffiths 340). In the play, Milford Haven is the location where the Romans begin their invasion of Britain and it is also the site where Cymbeline’s two long lost princes are living. Curran states that “the two lost princes represent a primitive Britain which is inherently noble despite its savagery” (278). When Guiderius and Arviragus first encounter the disguised Innogen in their cave, she immediately says she wasn’t stealing and offers them money for what she has eaten. Emphasizing their civility, their father, Belarius tells Innogen, “Prithee, fair youth, / Think us no churls, nor measure our good minds / By this rude place we live in” (3.6.61-63). Arviragus welcomes Innogen stating, “Most welcome. / Be sprightly, for you fall ‘mongst friends” (3.6.71-72). About these supposed savage men of whom she has heard, Innogen states, “These are kind creatures. Gods, what lies I have heard!” / Our courtiers say all’s savage but at court” (4.2.32-33). It turns out that these Welsh boys are the long lost princes and Innogen’s actual brothers. This simple act by Shakespeare allows Wales to remain a brutal environment while the essential Englishness of the princes save them from succumbing to the cruel environment.

Guiderius and Arviragus were kidnapped as young boys, leaving Innogen as the sole heir to the kingdom. The First Gentlemen who informs the audience about Innogen’s secret marriage also tells them about the two boys:

He had two sons—if this be worth your hearing,
 Mark it: the eld’st of them at three years old,
 I’th’ swathing clothes the other, from their nursery
 Were stol’n, and to this hour no guess in knowledge
 Which way they went. (1.1.57-61)

As the only heir to the throne, which already causes anxiety about inheritance because she is a woman, twenty years later (1.1.63), Innogen marries a man beneath her position, further exacerbating those anxieties. According to Jodi Mikalachki:

Powerful females loomed large in early modern visions of national origins, from the universal gendering of the topographical and historical ‘Britannia’ as feminine⁹⁰ to the troubling eruptions of ancient queens in the process of civilization by Rome. Like the unruly women who challenged the patriarchal order of early modern England, these powerful and rebellious females in native historiography threatened the establishment of stable, masculine identity for the early modern nation. (302)

Though considered by some as “the darling of the nineteenth-century stage” and “celebrated as the perfect embodiment of Victorian and feminine traits” (Lander 158), Innogen does threaten Cymbeline’s masculine identity and stability for his nation as early as when her brothers are kidnapped. The lineage of which Cymbeline seems to be so proud is further threatened when Innogen marries Posthumus. Thus, as the play negotiates between the savagery and civility of their forbears through Wales⁹¹, this site is also necessary for there to be a “peaceful” resolution to the play.

“Peace”⁹²

When the two kidnapped princes bravely join Cymbeline’s army, they also fight quite valiantly. During battle, Cymbeline is taken hostage but is rescued by the boys and Posthumus. At the same time, the princes also take Lucius, Giacomo, and other Romans prisoner. The boys are highly praised for their bravery. The First Captain says, “‘Tis thought the old man and his sons were angels” (5.5.85). Later Cymbeline calls them, “Preservers of my throne” (5.6.2). Cymbeline

⁹⁰ Posthumus says, “Our Britain’s harts die flying, not *her* men” (5.5.24). This is one of the moment’s when Britain is gendered female. After Britain has won the battle against Rome, Cymbeline also genders Britain female: “To you, the liver, / heart, and brain of Britain, / By whom I grant *she* lives” (5.6.13-15).

⁹¹ With Cymbeline, “Englishmen were learning to reevaluate standards for judging the past—to locate virtue in savage forebears and obscure origins” (Curran 278).

⁹² (5.6.485). This is the last line of the play.

even goes so far as to knight the two and to take them into his service. When the boys admit to killing Cloten, though, Cymbeline feels obligated to sentence them to death, even though it saddens him to do so, because Cloten was a prince, of higher rank than the boys, and his first choice for a son-in-law. At this point, overcome with guilt, Belarius admits to Cymbeline that the two boys are in fact his long lost prince sons. After showing proof, the boys are over joyously welcomed into the family and into the kingdom by Cymbeline and Innogen.⁹³

While this may seem like a happy ending, ensuring a male succession to the throne, establishing peace with Rome, allowing for the marriage of Innogen and Posthumus, and having been vanquished by the villains—the Queen and Cloten, it is really a bit more complicated. Curran argues that “we are invited to be deeply satisfied by a surrender to Roman domination” (282) and Innes claims that “the play attempts to combine different histories as part of its resolution. Britain’s debt to Rome is made to seem natural, so much that Britain is made to seem the obvious heir to masculine Roman *virtus* and Empire” (9). He adds, “The play represents the progression from Roman Empire to British Empire as natural, continuous and unproblematic, because the historical incorporation of Britain into the Roman Empire is rewritten so as to be misrepresented as voluntary” (9). Cymbeline tells Lucius:

My peace we will begin: and, Caius Lucius,
Although the victor, we submit to Caesar
And to the Roman empire, promising
To pay our wonted tribute. (5.6.459-62).

⁹³ The discovery of the boys relieves anxieties about inheritance. According to Wynne-Davies:

Primogeniture not only determined familial inheritance but was the basis of royal descent in the early modern period. Ensuring that there was a male heir to further the line was a persistent concern of the monarch and his / her statesmen. However, in late sixteenth-century England the determining of a successor was a paramount source of disquiet and a promise of, rather than an insurance against, future political turmoil. (139)

Problematizing this natural and continuous ending is Teema Ruskola's analysis in "Raping Like a State." Ruskola contends that legal rhetoric maintains normative masculinity attributed to sovereign states (1477). Thus, with Cymbeline as the king of the state, he and Britain are close to being rhetorically sexually assaulted when the Romans land in Wales. As Ruskola continues, "To be sovereign is not to be rapable, and to be rapable is not to be sovereign" (1529). Cymbeline teeters on the edge of sovereign until the end of the play when everything is seemingly restored to a happy ending. But what his respectable agreement to the Romans suggests, however, is that this political partnership is one of rhetorical, consensual intercourse—with this partnership, Britain and its sovereignty are no longer rapable / conquerable. Normative masculinity is reiterated with the agreement and with the male lineage strengthened by the discovery of the two princes.

The cultural scripts feminizing landscapes and therefore rendering them (sexually) conquerable is heightened by the end of the play by Innogen's displaced status. Though she is reunited with both father and husband, she is at the same time reunited with the man who views her in assailable terms and she is no longer first in the line of succession. She is not even second—here agency as heir has been destroyed. As Innes points out, "the specificity of inheritance via the female must not be allowed to sully the masculine world of Roman Britain" (7). It is only because Innogen is sacrificed that the play can have a natural and satisfying ending. Curran claims that Innogen is "eager to enact a plan which would permit Posthumus to reveal his true feelings; she continues to look for virtue in her husband" (296). However, as stated earlier, Posthumus is one of the villains that slips under the radar because there are more obvious villains in the play. Sadly, by the end of the play, Innogen is quieter and more submissive than she has been before. She throws herself into her husband's arms, not bringing up his mistreatment of her or of his murderous attempt on her life. She accepts this behavior, presumably because she is also well aware of the

cultural scripts ruling over her life. Lander says, “male virtue is test actively; men prove their honour, their virtue, by doing good deeds and fighting good battles, by challenging obstacles and learning consequences...female virtue is tested passively. Female virtue is a state of being, not doing...” (174). Anne Duggan stresses, “Through rape, the female body becomes the site where national, religious, and class conflicts, as well as those concerning gender, get expressed and worked out, and such a representation necessarily denies female characters agency in negotiating such tensions” (139). While all the men, Romans and Britons alike, have proved their virtue on the battlefield, Innogen becomes more submissive and accepting of her heteronormative positions—daughter and wife (not heir or queen). Just as Innogen changes, Posthumus continues to behave in the same way he had when he first encounters the Frenchman: he is still hot-tempered and quick to react. As with the fight that first introduced him to the Frenchman, Posthumus hastily and angrily knocks Innogen (disguised as Fidele) unconscious. Meanwhile, Posthumus is very quick to forgive Giacomo, one of his wife’s assailants. When Giacomo bends his knees towards Posthumus, Posthumus replies:

Kneel not to me.
 The power that I have on you is to spare you,
 The malice towards you to forgive you. Live,
 And deal with others better. (5.6.418-21)

While Posthumus has ordered the murder of his wife for her supposed infidelity, not offering her the chance to defend herself, he very quickly accepts Giacomo’s apology for the harm he actually created and forgives him. One of the reasons for this, I argue, is due to the social scripts and nationalistic rhetoric expounded during, before, and since Shakespeare’s time—those social scripts that elevate and sustain patriarchal social norms and institutional power. Mikalachki adds, “recent work on mutually informing constructs of nationalism and sexuality has defined the former as a virile fraternity perpetuated by...its relegation of women to a position marginalized respectability”

(303). The virile fraternity to which Posthumus and Giacomo belong provide them with justification for their actions. Meanwhile, not only has Innogen's respectability been marginalized but she has also been literally marginalized to the borders of Britain.

The geographic space Innogen embodies (Britain) mirrors social constructs of conquests and rape. Rhonda Lemke Sanford argues, "the land thus feminized, discovery, exploration, invasion and conquest are frequently figured as seduction, penetration, and rape" (63). The end of *Cymbeline* should be viewed as problematic because the language allowing for Posthumus's and Giacomo's elevated status is still in play today. As Giacomo is so easily forgiven by the victim's husband, Brock Turner, the Ivy League student found guilty of raping an unconscious woman, was only sentenced to six months in the county jail by the presiding judge. One of the reasons for such a light sentence is because the presiding judge is a graduate of Stanford University, the college to which the assailant, Turner, also belonged. Not only do the presiding judge and the accused rapist belong to the same "virile fraternity," but they belong to the same landscape that enables their behavior. This landscape to which they belong teaches them that "men do not *catch* women; they *win* them, and a woman's ultimate appeal lies in her ability to be a *prize that is won*. Her value is as captured trophy" (Brownmiller 333). The landscape teaches them that "possession of women has been a hallmark of masculine success" (Brownmiller 17). Like Posthumus and Giacomo belonging to the same "virile fraternity," the presiding judge and Turner are also members. Critical to her study, says Susan Brownmiller, is "the recognition that rape has a history, and through the tools of historical analysis we may learn what we need to know about our current condition" (12). The judgment and punishment Turner received are historically situated, as seen through the unfolding of events in *Cymbeline*. Innogen is not just a character from a world from over 400 years ago that allows for and then makes her accept her metaphorical and literal rape of her body. What

Innogen experiences in Shakespeare's time is still happening in the second decade of the 21st century.

REFERENCES

- Adelman, Janet. "Her Father's Blood: Race, Conversion, and Nation in *The Merchant of Venice*." *Representations*, vol. 81, no. 1, 2003, pp. 4-30.
- Arnold, Oliver. *Third Citizen: Shakespeare's Theater and the Early Modern House of Commons*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- Baker, Katie J.M. "Here's The Powerful Letter The Stanford Victim Read To Her Attacker." *BuzzFeed*, 3 June 2016, www.buzzfeed.com/katiejmbaker/heres-the-powerful-letter-the-stanford-victim-read-to-her-ra?utm_term=.mcz1KKgk5.
- Benston, Alice N. "Portia, the Law, and the Tripartite Structure of *The Merchant of Venice*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 3, 1979, pp. 367-85.
- Berger, Harry Jr.. "Marriage and Mercifixion in *The Merchant of Venice*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 2, 1981, pp. 155-62.
- Berry, Edward I. "Rosalynde and Rosalind." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 31, no.1, 1980, pp. 42-52.
- Bhabha, Homi K. "Are You a Man or a Mouse?" *Constructing Masculinity*, Ed. Maurice Berger et al., Routledge, 1995, pp. 57-58.
- Bloom, Harold. *Rosalind*. Chelsea House Publishers, 1992.
- Blythe, David-Everett. "Ox-Eyed Phebe." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 33, no.1, 1982, pp. 101-02.
- Boehrer, Bruce. *Shakespeare Among the Animals*. Palgrave, 2002.
- Bono, Barbara J. "Mixed Gender, Mixed Genre in *As You Like It*. *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation*. Barbara Keifer Lewalski, ed., Harvard UP, 1986. pp. 189-212.

- Boose, Lynda E. "The Father and the Bride in Shakespeare." *PMLA*, vol. 97, no. 3, 1982, pp. 325-47.
- Borlick, Todd A. *Ecocriticism and Early Modern Literature: Green Pastures*. Routledge, 2010.
- Brandes, Georg. *William Shakespeare: A Critical Study, Vol. 1*. Translated by William Archer and Diane White, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1963.
- Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*, Simon and Schuster, 1975.
- Calderwood, James L. *Shakespeare and the Denial of Death*. University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.
- Callaghan, Dympna. *Shakespeare Without Women: Representing Gender and Race on the Renaissance Stage*. Routledge, 2000.
- Cirillo, Albert R. "As You Like It: Pastoralism Gone Awry." *ELH*, vol. 38, no. 1, 1971, pp. 19-39.
- Change, Kornel. "Enforcing Transnational White Solidarity: Asian Migration and the Formation of the U.S.-Canadian Boundary." *American Quarterly*, vol. 60, no. 3, 2008, pp. 671-96.
- Chernaik, Warren L. *The Myth of Rome in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*, Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Clark, Timothy. *The Cambridge Introduction to Literature and the Environment*. Cambridge UP, 2011.
- Curren, John E. Jr. "Royalty Unlearned, Honor Untaught: British Savages and Historiographical Change in *Cymbeline*." *Comparative Drama*. vol. 31, no. 2, 1997, pp. 277-303.
- Daley, A. Stuart. "The Dispraise of the Country in *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 3, 1985, pp. 300-14.

Davis, Walter. R. "Masking in Arden: The Histrionics of Lodge's *Rosalynde*." *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, vol. 5, no. 1, 1965, pp. 151-63.

"Demand Justice for Stanford Rape Victim." *Change.org*, June 2016,
www.change.org/p/superior-court-judge-of-santa-clara-county-demand-justice-for-stanford-rape-victim.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Hospitality*. Translated by Rachel Bowlby, Stanford UP, 2000.

--. *Writing and Difference*. Translated by Alan Bass, Chicago UP, 1978.

De Sousa, Geraldo U. "'My Hopes Abroad': The Global / Local Nexus in *The Merchant of Venice*," paper presented at the Shakespeare Association of America, April 2010, Chicago, Ill..

Detmer-Goebel, Emily. "Crossing Boundaries in Shakespeare." *ESC*, vol. 33, no. 3, 2007, pp. 2-13.

"Diversity Visa (DV) Lottery." *Bureau of Consular Affairs, US Department of State*, 2010,
http://travel.state.gov/visa/immigrants/types/types_1322.html#2 Accessed 15 June 2010.

Dolan, Frances. *Marriage and Violence: The Early Modern Legacy*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.

Donaldson, Ian. *The Rapes of Lucretia: A Myth and its Transformations*, Clarendon Press, 1982.

Dubrow, Heather. "Fringe Benefits: Rosalind and the Purlieux of the Forest." *Notes and Queries*, vol. 53, 2006, pp. 67-69.

Duggan, Anne. "Rape and Sociopolitical Positioning in the *Histoire Tragique*." *Early Modern Women: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, vol. 5, 2010, pp. 137-65.

Edwards, Suzanne. "The Rhetoric of Rape and the Politics of Gender in the *Wife of Bath's Tale* and the 1382 Statute of Rapes." *Exemplaria*, vol. 23, no. 1, 2001, pp. 3-26.

- Egan, Gabriel. *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*. Routledge, 2006.
- Engle, Lars. "'Thrift is Blessing': Exchange and Explanation in *The Merchant of Venice*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 1, 1986, pp. 20-37.
- Erickson, Peter B. "Sexual Politics and the Social Structure in *As You Like It*." *The Massachusetts Review*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1982, pp. 65-83.
- Escobedo, Andrew. "From Britannia to England: *Cymbeline* and the Beginning of Nations." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 59, no. 1, 2008, pp. 60-87.
- Fiorentino, Giovanni. *Il Pecorone*, L.S. Marcus (ed.), Norton & Norton Company Inc: 2006, pp. 84-99.
- Fisher, Susan. "Social Stereotypes and Historical Analysis: The Case of the Imperial Women at Rome." *Women in Ancient Societies*. Ed. Leonie J. Archer, et al. Routledge, 1994.
- Ford, Jesse, et al.. "Border Security: Fraud Risks Complicate State's Ability to Manage Diversity Visa Program," *Highlights of United States Government Accountability Office*, vol. 07, no.1174, 2007: 1-47. Available at: <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d071174.pdf>. Accessed 15 August 2010.
- Fortin, Rene E. "'Tongues in Trees': Symbolic Patterns in *As You Like It*." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, vol. 14, no. 4, 1973, pp. 569-82.
- Furman-Adams, Wendy and Virginia James Tuft. "'Earth Felt the Wound': Gendered Ecological Consciousness in Illustrations of *Paradise Lost*." *Renaissance Ecology: Imagining Eden in Milton's England*. Ed. Ken Hiltner. Duquesne UP., 2008. pp. 107-62.
- Gaard, Greta and Patrick D. Murphy. Eds. *Ecofeminist Literary Criticism: Theory, Interpretation, Pedagogy*. University of Illinois Press, 1998.

- Garber, Marjorie. "The Education of Orlando." *Comedy from Shakespeare to Sheridan: Change and Continuity in the English and European Dramatic Tradition*. A. R. Braunmuller and J.C. Bulman, eds. University of Delaware Press, 1986. 102-12.
- Gillies, John and Virginia Mason Vaughan, Eds. *Playing the Globe: Genre and Geography in English Renaissance Drama*. Associated UP, 1998.
- Goddard, Harold C. *The Meaning of Shakespeare*. University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Goldberg, Jonathan. *James I and the Politics of Literature*, Stanford University Press, 1989.
- Gregson, J. M. *Public and Private Man in Shakespeare*. Barnes & Noble, 1983.
- Griffiths, Huw. "The Geographies of Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*." *English Literary Renaissance*, vol. 34, no. 3, 2004, pp. 339-358.
- Hale, David G. "Coriolanus: The Death of a Political Metaphor." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 3, 1971, pp. 197-202.
- Hallock, Thomas, Ivo Kamps, and Karen L. Raber. Eds. *Early Modern Ecocriticism: From the Florentine Codex to Shakespeare*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Halio, Jay L. "'No Clock in the Forest': Time in *As You Like It*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1962, pp. 197-207.
- Hartsock, Nancy C.M. "Masculinity, Citizenship, and the Making of War." *PS*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1984, pp. 198-202.
- Harty, Maura. "U.S. Visa Policy: Securing Borders and Opening Doors." *The Washington Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2005, pp. 23-34.
- Hazlitt, William. *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays*. Wiley and Putnam, 1845.

- “Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims of the Committee on the Judiciary House of Representatives,” *Diversity Visa Program and Its Susceptibility to Fraud and Abuse*, 2004,
<http://judiciary.house.gov/legacy/patterson042904.htm> Accessed 13 August 2010.
- “Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims of the Committee on the Judiciary House of Representatives.” *Diversity Visa Program*, 2005,
http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/judiciary/hju21780.000/hju21780_0.HTM#44
 Accessed 11 August 2010.
- Higgins, Lynn A., and Brenda R. Silver, eds. *Rape and Representation*, Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Hiltner, Ken. Ed. *Renaissance Ecology: Imagining Eden in Milton’s England*. Duquesne UP., 2008.
- Hirschman, Charles. “Immigration and the American Century.” *Demography*, vol. 42, no. 4, 2005, pp. 595-620.
- Hunt, Maurice. “Ways of Knowing in *The Merchant of Venice*.” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 1, 1979, pp. 89-93.
- Howard, Jean E. “Crossdressing, The Theatre, and Gender Struggle in Early Modern England.” *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 39 no. 4, 1988, pp. 414-40.
- . Introduction. *As You Like It*. By William Shakespeare. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, et al. W.W. Norton & Co., 1997. 1615-22.
- Howard, Jean E. and Phyllis Rackin. *Engendering a Nation: A Feminist Account of Shakespeare’s Histories*. Routledge, 1997.
- Hudson, H.N. *Shakespeare: His Life, Art, and Characters, Vol. 1*. Ginn & Company, 1973.

- Huth, Kimberly. "Come Like With Me and Feed My Sheep: Invitation, Ownership, and Belonging in Early Modern Pastoral Literature." *Studies in Philology*, vol. 108, no.1, 2011, pp. 44-69.
- Innes, Paul. "Cymbeline and Empire." *Critical Survey*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2007, pp. 1-18.
- "Instructions for the 2011 Diversity Immigrant Visa Program," *Bureau of Consular Affairs: US Department of State*, 2009, <http://www.travel.state.gov/pdf/DV-2011instructions.pdf> Accessed 28 July 2010.
- Kahn, Coppélia. "Lucrece: The Sexual Politics of Subjectivity." *Rape and Representation*, Eds. Lynn A. Higgins and Brenda R. Silver, Columbia University Press, 1991. pp. 141-59.
- . *Man's Estate: Masculine Identity in Shakespeare*. University of California Press, 1981.
- . *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds, and Women*. Routledge, 1997.
- Kelly, Thomas. "Shakespeare's Romantic Heroes: Orlando Reconsidered." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 24, no.1, 1973, pp. 12-24.
- King, Ros. *Cymbeline: Constructions of Britain*, Ashgate, 2005.
- Korda, Natasha. *Shakespeare's Domestic Economies: Gender and Property in Early Modern England*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.
- Koren, Marina. "Telling the Story of the Stanford Rape Case." *The Atlantic*, Atlantic Media Company, 6 June 2016, www.theatlantic.com/news/archive/2016/06/stanford-sexual-assault-letters/485837/.
- Jacob, Walter P. "Diversity Visas: Muddled Thinking and Pork Barrel Politics." *Georgetown Immigration Law Review*, vol. 6, 1992, pp. 297-344.

- La Courreye Blecki, Catherine. "An Intertextual Study of Volumnia: From Legend to Character in Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*." *Privileging Gender in Early Modern England*, Ed. Jean R. Brink, Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, Inc., 1993, pp. 81-92.
- Lai, Paul, and Lindsey C. Smith. "Introduction." *American Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 3, 2010, pp. 407-36.
- Lander, Bonnie. "Interpreting the Person: Tradition, Conflict, and *Cymbeline*'s Imogen." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 59, no. 2, 2008, pp. 156-184,
- Langis, Unhae. "*Coriolanus*: Inordinate Passions and Powers in Personal and Political Governance." *Comparative Drama*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2010, pp. 1-27.
- Law, Anna O. "The Diversity Visa Lottery: A Cycle of Unintended Consequences in United States Immigration Policy." *Journal of American Ethnic History*, vol. 21, no. 4, 2002, pp. 3-29.
- "Letter to Stanford University in Support of Survivor of Brock Turner Case." *Change.org*, Stanford Association of Students for Sexual Assault Prevention, www.change.org/p/letter-to-stanford-university-in-support-of-survivor-of-brock-turner-case.
- Mack-Canty, Colleen. "Third-Wave Feminism and the Need to Reweave the Nature / Culture Duality." *Feminist Formations*, vol. 16, no. 3, 2004, pp. 154-79.
- Marcus, Leah S. *Puzzling Shakespeare: Local Reading and its Discontents*. University of California Press, 1988.
- McDowell, Linda. *Gender, Identity, and Place*. Polity Press, 1999.
- McKewin, Carole. "Counsels of God and Grace: Intimate Conversations between Women in Shakespeare's Plays." *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*. Eds.

- Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Green, and Carol Thomas Neely. University of Illinois Press, 1980. pp. 117-32
- Meeker, Joseph W. *The Comedy of Survival*. The University of Arizona Press, 1997.
- Mikalachki, Jodi. "The Masculine Romance of Roman Britain: *Cymbeline* and Early Modern English Nationalism." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 46, no. 3, 1995, pp. 301-322.
- Miller, Michael E. "'A Steep Price to Pay for 20 Minutes of Action': Dad Defends Stanford Sex Offender." *Washington Post*, The Washington Post, www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2016/06/06/a-steep-price-to-pay-for-20-minutes-of-action-dad-defends-stanford-sex-offender/.
- Moehling, Carolyn., and Anne M. Phiel. "Immigration, Crime, and Incarceration in Early Twentieth-Century America." *Demography*, vol. 46, no. 4, 2009, pp. 739-63.
- Montrose, Louis Adrian. "'Shaping Fantasies': Figurations of Gender and Power in Elizabethan Culture." *Representations*, vol. 2, 1983, pp. 61-94.
- Muldrew, Craig. "'Hard Food for Midas': Cash and Its Social Value in Early Modern England." *Past & Present*, vol. 170, 2001, pp. 78-120.
- Munroe, Jennifer, and Rebecca Laroche. Eds. *Ecofeminist Approaches to Early Modernity*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Muir, Kenneth. "The Background of *Coriolanus*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 10, no. 2, 1959 pp. 137-145.
- Newman, Karen. "Portia's Ring: Unruly Women and Structures of Exchange in *The Merchant of Venice*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 1, 1987, pp. 19-33.

- Newton, Andowa.A. "Injecting Diversity into U.S. Immigration Policy: The Diversity Visa Program and the Missing Discourse on its Impact on African Immigration to the United States." *Cornell International Law Journal*, vol. 38, 2005, pp. 1049-82.
- Ogletree, Charles J. "America's Schizophrenic Immigration Policy: Race, Class, and Reason." *Boston College Law Review*, vol. 41, no. 4, 2000, pp. 755-70.
- Oldrieve, Susan. "Marginalized Voices in *The Merchant of Venice*." *Cardozo Studies in Law and Literature*, vol. 5, no. 1, 1993, pp. 87-105.
- Pacheco, Anita. "Rape and the Female Subject in Aphra Behn's *The Rover*." *ELH*, vol. 65, no. 2, 1998. pp. 323-45.
- Parolin, Peter A. "Anachronistic Italy: Cultural Alliances and National Identity in *Cymbeline*." *Shakespeare Studies*, vol. 30, 2002, pp. 188-215.
- Proser, Matthew. "*Coriolanus*: The Constant Warrior and the State." *College English*, vol. 24, no. 7, 1963, pp. 507-12.
- Quiller-Couch, Arthur. "The Workmanship of *As You Like It*." *The North American Review* vol. 203, no.727, 1916, 904-14.
- Rackin, Phyllis. "The Presence of History in Feminist Shakespeare Criticism." Proceedings of the Shakespeare Association of America, 9 June 2009. Washington D.C.
- Richmond, Hugh M. *Shakespeare's Sexual Comedy: A Mirror for Lovers*. The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1971.
- Romero, Victor C. "Critical Race Theory in Three Acts: Racial Profiling, Affirmative Action, and the Diversity Visa Lottery." *Albany Law Review*, vol. 66, 2003, pp. 375-86.
- Rose, Susan and Robert Shaw. "The Gamble: Circular Mexican Migration and the Return of Remittances." *Mexican Studies / Estudios Mexicanos*, vol. 24, no.1, 2008, pp.79-111.

- Ruskola, Teema. "Raping Like a State." *UCLA Law Review*, vol. 57, 2010, pp. 1477-1536.
- Snider, D.J. "Shakespeare's Comedy *As You Like It*." *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, vol. 7, no. 4, 1873, pp. 74-85.
- Sanford, Rhonda Lemke. *Maps and Memory in Early Modern England*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Soper, Kate. "Feminism and Ecology: Realism and Rhetoric in the Discourse of Nature." *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, vol. 20, no. 3, 1995, pp. 311-31.
- Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, et al. W.W. Norton & Co., 1997. pp. 1625-81.
- . *Cymbeline*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, et al. W.W. Norton & Co., 1997. pp.1240-1320.
- . *Coriolanus*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, et al, W.W. Norton & Co., 1997. pp. 1068-1146.
- . *The Merchant of Venice*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, et al. Norton & Norton Company Inc., 1997. pp. 1121-75.
- . *The Rape of Lucrece*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, et al. W.W. Norton & Co., 1997. pp. 669-710.
- . *Titus Andronicus*. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt, et al. W.W. Norton & Co., 1997. pp. 408-63.
- Solga, Kim. "Rape's Metatheatrical Return: Rehearsing Sexual Violence among the Early Moderns." *Theater Journal*, vol. 58, no. 1, 2006, pp. 53-72.
- Stoll, E.E. *Shakespeare's Young Lovers*. Oxford UP., 1937.
- Strong, Roy. *The Renaissance Garden in England*. Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1979.

--. *Small Period Gardens*. Rizzoli International Publications, 1992.

Sturgeon, Noel. *Ecofeminist Natures: Race, Gender, Feminist Theory and Political Action*.
Routledge, 1997.

Theis, Jeffrey S. *Writing the Forest in Early Modern England: A Sylvan Pastoral Nation*.
Duchesne UP, 2009.

Thomas, Vivian. *Shakespeare's Roman Worlds*. Routledge, 1989.

Tienda, Marta. "Demography and the Social Contract." *Demography*, vol. 39, no.4, 2002, pp.
587-616.

Tosh, John. "The History of Masculinity: An Outdated Concept." *What is Masculinity?:
Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary*, John H. Arnold and Dean
Brady. Eds., Palgrave, 2011, pp. 17-34.

United States, Congress, House of Representatives. *U.S. House. bill S. 2868: A Bill to Amend
Title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act to Replace the Diversity Visa Lottery
Program with a Program that Issues Visas to Aliens with an Advanced Degree,"* 110th
Congress Hearing, Washington: Government Printing Office, 2008.

Vaught, Jennifer C. *Masculinity and Emotion in Early Modern English Literature*. Ashgate,
2008.

"The Visa Lottery: A Result of the Influence of Special Interests on U.S.

Immigration Law, Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security,
and Claims of the Committee on the Judiciary House of Representatives." *Diversity Visa
Program* 2005, [http://www.numbersusa.com/content/files/pdf/Jenks%20-
%20Visa%20LotteryJune152005.pdf](http://www.numbersusa.com/content/files/pdf/Jenks%20-%20Visa%20LotteryJune152005.pdf) Accessed 11 August 2010.

“Visas.” *Bureau of Consular Affairs, US Department of State*, 2010,

http://travel.state.gov/visa/visa_1750.html Accessed 15 June 2010.

Wall, Wendy. *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge UP, 2002.

Warnicke, Retha M. “Private and Public: The Boundaries of Women’s Lives in Early Stuart England.” *Privileging Gender in Early Modern England*, Ed. Jean R. Brink, Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, Inc., 1993, pp. 123-140.

Warren, Karen J. *Ecofeminist Philosophy: A Western Perspective an What it is And Why it Matters*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2000.

Wolfsdorf, Bernard and Naveem R. Bhora. “The Diversity Lottery – A Deceptively Simple Program.” *Interpreter Releases*, vol. 79, no. 1395-6, 2002, pp. 1-20.

Wynne-Davies, Marion. “‘The swallowing womb’: Consumed and Consuming Women in *Titus Andronicus*.” *The Matter of Difference: Materialist Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, Edited by Pott, Cornell UP, 1991. pp. 129-152.

Yamin, Priscilla. “The Search for Marital Order: Civic Membership and the Politics of Marriage in the Progressive Era.” *Polity*, vol. 41, no. 1, 2009, pp. 86-112.

Yoder, Audrey Elizabeth. *Animal Analogy in Shakespeare's Character Portrayal*. King's Crown Press, 1947.

Zeeveld, Gordon W. “*Coriolanus* and Jacobean Politics.” *The Modern Language Review*, vol. 57, no. 3, 1962, pp. 321-34.

ABSTRACT**GENDER, GEOGRAPHY, AND ALTERITY IN SHAKESPEARE**

by

ELIZABETH VALDEZ ACOSTA**December 2018****Advisor:** Dr. Ken Jackson**Major:** English**Degree:** Doctor of Philosophy

Largely informing my dissertation is my experience growing up and teaching in a border town. I grew up in a Mexican family where education, especially higher education is considered a luxury—especially for women. While my parents supported me as I continued my education, many women within the Mexican culture aren't necessarily encouraged to go to college. And, if they do attend college, it's not completely understood why. Adding to growing up with this way of thinking, I also grew up and currently teach in a border town, where many of the students who attend school in El Paso cross from Mexico into the United States every day. My experiences as a Latina and as a teacher at a border institution in the current political climate that is somewhat aggressive towards immigrants, thus, not only inform my research heavily grounded in feminist studies, but focuses my attention on plays and / or characters that are often overlooked, both by scholars and play-goers.

The framing chapters of the dissertation offer a presentist connection between two of Shakespeare's plays—*The Merchant of Venice* and *Cymbeline*—with issues concerning contemporary society. Chapter 1 looks at the similarities between the lottery in *The Merchant of Venice* and the Diversity Visa Program initiated in the United States. While both lotteries

seemingly are meant to diversify the pool of candidates, what my research indicates is that both actually serve to maintain heteronormative conditions. The final chapter also offers a presentist perspective on one of Shakespeare's romances, *Cymbeline*. Through this play, in not only reviewing a lesser-known play, I analyze how the rhetoric of rape is used to exercise and sustain patriarchal power. In Chapter 2, I offer a close reading of *As You Like It* through an ecofeminist perspective. While Rosalind is the main character and the one female character with the most lines in all of Shakespeare, the focus of my research is on one of Shakespeare's most overlooked heroines—Phoebe. And in the third chapter, I analyze another one of Shakespeare's plays often overlooked in scholarship and in performance, *Coriolanus*.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT**Elizabeth Valdez Acosta**

I am from El Paso, Texas, where I majored in Public Relations as an undergraduate student at the University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP). My goal was to put that degree to good use working for a major league baseball team. With the encouragement of a literature professor in my last semester of college, I decided to pursue a graduate degree in English. My first course began the week after graduation—that course was Shakespeare. And while I still love baseball, after that first course, I focused full time on getting my MA in English. My thesis stemmed from that first graduate seminar I took and I knew I wanted to continue my studies in the early modern field. After earning my MA in English and American Literature from UTEP, I enrolled at Wayne State University to pursue a PhD in Literary and Cultural Studies before 1700.