

Direction des bibliothèques

AVIS

Ce document a été numérisé par la Division de la gestion des documents et des archives de l'Université de Montréal.

L'auteur a autorisé l'Université de Montréal à reproduire et diffuser, en totalité ou en partie, par quelque moyen que ce soit et sur quelque support que ce soit, et exclusivement à des fins non lucratives d'enseignement et de recherche, des copies de ce mémoire ou de cette thèse.

L'auteur et les coauteurs le cas échéant conservent la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent ce document. Ni la thèse ou le mémoire, ni des extraits substantiels de ce document, ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation de l'auteur.

Afin de se conformer à la Loi canadienne sur la protection des renseignements personnels, quelques formulaires secondaires, coordonnées ou signatures intégrées au texte ont pu être enlevés de ce document. Bien que cela ait pu affecter la pagination, il n'y a aucun contenu manquant.

NOTICE

This document was digitized by the Records Management & Archives Division of Université de Montréal.

The author of this thesis or dissertation has granted a nonexclusive license allowing Université de Montréal to reproduce and publish the document, in part or in whole, and in any format, solely for noncommercial educational and research purposes.

The author and co-authors if applicable retain copyright ownership and moral rights in this document. Neither the whole thesis or dissertation, nor substantial extracts from it, may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms, contact information or signatures may have been removed from the document. While this may affect the document page count, it does not represent any loss of content from the document.

Université de Montréal

Wanted: Dead or Alive
Women as Bodies in Shakespeare's Pericles, King Lear and Macbeth

par
Lydia El-Cherif

Département d'études anglaises
Faculté des arts et des sciences

Mémoire présenté à la Faculté des études supérieures
en vue de l'obtention du grade de maîtrise
en études anglaises

août, 2008

© Lydia El-Cherif



Résumé de synthèse

L'interrogation suivante sous-tend ce mémoire : pourquoi n'y a-t-il que deux fantômes de femme dans les pièces de Shakespeare, en l'occurrence ceux de la Reine Anne dans *Richard III* et la mère de Posthumus ? La réponse à cette question réside dans l'examen des corps et des rôles des personnages féminins dans *Pericles*, *King Lear* et *Macbeth* de Shakespeare à la lumière des manuels de bienséance élisabéthains et des croyances traditionnelles en matière de sorcellerie et de fantômes en vigueur à la Renaissance. Avec le premier chapitre, nous tenterons de démontrer que la conception du corps féminin en tant que marchandise se reflète dans plusieurs rapports à l'œuvre dans *Pericles*. Le deuxième chapitre est consacré à l'étude de *King Lear*. Par sa relation à ses filles, *Lear* fait écho à la tendance de *Pericles* à considérer les femmes comme des corps à valeur marchande. *King Lear* développe aussi le stéréotype de la femme cruelle ou de la « louve ». Puisque les corps féminins obéissent à ce stéréotype négatif, ils ne sont pas uniquement perçus comme des marchandises; ils peuvent en effet être classés en fonction de leur appartenance aux catégories de vice et de vertu. En dernier lieu, le troisième chapitre examine la pièce *Macbeth*. Dans *Macbeth*, Lady Macbeth jouit d'un statut exceptionnel, puisqu'elle n'est pas réduite à l'état de bien appartenant à un homme. Elle tient sa liberté pour acquise et y recourt avec légèreté alors qu'elle transige avec les forces du mal, troquant son corps pour gagner de l'autorité. Ce pacte

démoniaque ne peut être résilié et détermine par conséquent le sort du personnage. Les Trois Sorcières sont contraintes à un état de servitude envers Hecate puisqu'elles ont conclu un pacte semblable à celui de Lady Macbeth. Ainsi, ces trois femmes deviennent le bien exclusif de forces surnaturelles qui disposent d'elles à leur guise.

Mots clés:

Corps féminin, fantômes, Shakespeare, Pericles, King Lear, Macbeth.

Abstract

This thesis is driven by the question: why is there are only two female ghosts in Shakespeare's plays, Queen Anne in *Richard III* and Posthumus' mother in *Cymbeline*? The answer to such a question is found by looking at the bodies and functions of the women in Shakespeare's *Pericles*, *King Lear* and *Macbeth* through the lenses of Elizabethan conduct manuals and Renaissance beliefs in witchcraft and ghost lore. The first chapter will attempt to demonstrate how, in *Pericles*, the female body is used as a commodity. The second chapter focuses on *King Lear*. In his relationship with his daughters, Lear mirrors *Pericles*' tendency to view women as commodified bodies. *King Lear* also fleshes out the stereotype of the vicious woman, otherwise referred to as the She-Wolf. With this negative stereotype, female bodies cannot only be commodified; they can be sorted into categories of virtue and vice. Lastly, the third chapter looks at the play *Macbeth*. In *Macbeth*, Lady Macbeth is exceptional because she is not limited to being a commodity owned by a father or husband. She takes her freedom for granted when she enters into a bargain with evil, trading her body for power. This demonic pact seals her fate as it cannot be broken. The Weird Sisters are bound to serve Hecate as they have made a pact similar to Lady Macbeth's. Thus these women become the property of supernatural forces, to be used and destroyed at the whim of their masters.

Key words:

Female bodies, ghosts, Shakespeare, Pericles, King Lear, Macbeth.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate my work to the following people: my mother, Beata, my grandmother Sonia, my aunt Tanie and my dearest sister Nicole, my shining light Frank Zilahy and my late grandfather, Albert Hoffmann. This is for all their love and support.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge my thesis supervisor, Dr. Joyce Boro, for encouraging me to go on the wild ghost hunt that eventually became my thesis. I would like to thank her for her enthusiasm, suggestions, inspiration and most of all, her tremendous support.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter I	
Under the Sign of the Phoenix: Resurrection in <u>Pericles</u>	9
Chapter II	
Cordials and Poison: Failed Resurrection and Bestialization in <u>King Lear</u>	34
Chapter III	
Bargain Bodies: Supernatural Power and Female Bodies in <u>Macbeth</u>	59
Bibliography	83

Introduction

“But the awakened and knowing say: body am I entirely, and nothing else; and soul is only a word for something about the body” (Nietzsche 34).

This thesis began when I realized that out of all of the ghosts in Shakespeare, only two of them, Queen Anne in Richard III and Posthumus’ mother in Cymbeline, are women. This realization raised a series of questions: how come? Why, when referring to death and resurrection, is the concept of the female soul neglected? As a result, I decided to examine the bodies of the women in Pericles, King Lear and Macbeth, hoping to find some answers. They did not disappoint. Throughout my research, I have found that Nietzsche’s Journeyman’s belief that the “soul is only a word for something about the body” (Nietzsche 34) is a good point of entry into this work, because women’s bodies in these plays replace the soul. In other words, the women in these plays can claim that they are body entirely too.

Among the sources that informed Renaissance sensibilities were conduct manuals meant to instruct wives and daughters. These usually insisted on the man’s claim to superiority. Women were encouraged to view their husbands as the head of their household and to obey them, as they did their father before marriage. For

example, Barnabe Rich uses the metaphor of a merchant and his ship to illustrate the relationship between husband and wife:

it was well noted by him that hath formerly set downe the wife to be the ship, and the husband to bee the merchant, and the husband's words to be the *Routher* to the shipp, by the which she must be turned, guided and directed, she must be a sturring ship quicke of stirrige, ready at a word of her husband, she must not be immoueable like some womenne that a man were as good to remoue a house, as to remoue them from their willes, but a good woman is like a ship but not like a house. (Rich, The Excellencie of Good Women 8)

Rich clearly indicates that in order for one to be a good woman, complete obedience is required.

Under the Common Law of England, married women were considered:

civilter mortuus (civilly dead) and “covered” by the legal personhood of their husbands[...]. In other words, under the logic of coverture, a woman had no legal existence. In a sense, an Englishwoman never became an adult under the law but remained a child in relationship to her husband as she had once been to her father. (Brown and McBride 54)

Not only were women supposed to be subordinate to men and legally non-existent, they were also legally considered as property. For instance, “married women were chattels in sixteenth and seventeenth century England. They and all their personal possessions were legally under the control of their husbands” (Hull, Chaste, Silent & Obedient 47-48). In this manner, marriage can be viewed as a transaction in which ownership of the daughter was transferred from father to husband. Marriage was a big enough business that it was even

possible to fix dowries through common law contracts (Sokol and Sokol 56).

Therefore, it is not surprising that in the plays studied in this thesis, the body is valued as a commodity. In light of the laws and common practice in which a woman's status was that of an object, it is easy to see how these bodies-as-commodities can be prized, hoarded, discarded, bartered and traded. Because of the value bodily invested in these women, rarely are their souls considered. Their true value lies in the body alone, so that nothing but their physical recovery matters.

If a woman possessed anything of value of her own, it was still in connection with her body. As part of her education "a woman was taught that her main job in life was to be a housewife and produce the next generation" (Hull, Women According to Men 47). Thus ability to produce heirs added to a woman's worth. As we shall see, the so-called villainous women of these plays do not have children or are cursed by others to bear vile children.

Linked to the task of childbearing was yet another bodily virtue; of all of the desired female virtues, Vives claimed that "chastite is the principall vertue of a Woman" (Vives 50). This virtue helped to ensure the birth of legitimate heirs. The conduct manuals of the time

unanimously agree on the issue of chastity and insist that “the vertuous woman girdeth her loynes with strength” (Rich, The Excellencie of Good Women 8).

It was also expected that women possess virtues such as mercy, kindness, meekness sobriety and modesty. The conduct manuals set so many rules for women to follow that they, along with “the positive stereotypes of women found in the feminist pamphlets must also be seen primarily as aspirations and ideals rather than as descriptions of the lives of real women” (Henderson and McManus 62).

However, in Pericles and King Lear, Thaisa, Marina and Cordelia behave according to the ideal stereotype without any of the faults of a real woman. They are the guardians of chastity and idealized womanhood by being obedient, accepting of their roles as daughters, wives and mothers as well as allowing themselves to be treated as commodified bodies. They represent typically virtuous Renaissance woman.

In opposition to them are the women like Goneril and Regan in King Lear who assume: “a ruthlessness and action that is natural to masculinity” (Alfar 85). Alfar mentions that Lady Macbeth is also this kind of woman who rebels against the conventions of the time by embracing the qualities associated with the male sex. Because of their

behaviour, these women would have been considered unnatural or even evil.

Therefore, because of the way women's bodies were valued by the law as objects and women were taught that their only worth was bodily, the true tragedy in these plays is not the death of the individual woman; it is the loss of the body. The return of the female characters as ghosts is not an indulgence they are permitted because, in death as in life, the soul is simply worth less than the body.

The first chapter will attempt to demonstrate that a belief in the female body- as- commodity is reflected in many of the relationships in Pericles. Marilyn French identifies in this play the traffic of female bodies, claiming that for the pirates and brothel crew the

female body is a commodity, an object to be rented and profited by. The world of commerce does not seem to be a world at war, but within it, the feminine principal is extinguished as successfully as in Macbeth's Scotland. (French 299)

She limits the barter and trade of female bodies to criminals and pimps. Yet, I will show how even the characters that are supposed to be noble engage in similar behaviour. The only distinction between these two sets of characters, the base and the noble, is that the language they use when commodifying the female body is different. I will also argue that the happy ending of Pericles is due to the fact that the bodies of Thaisa and Marina are restored alive.

In the second chapter, I chose to focus on King Lear because Lear is a lot like Pericles in that he believes that his daughters are his property. As such, they “represent dynastic chattel and verbal coinage to their aging father, a means by which he can purchase added prestige within the larger world” (Chamberlain 183). Lear expects his daughters to be as obedient as the daughters depicted in conduct manuals. What Lear fails to realize is that his eldest daughters know how to act the part of the good daughter but are really interpretations of her opposite, the vicious woman. Fooled, Lear literally buys into the idea of the female body-as-commodity by making Goneril and Regan worth all and reducing Cordelia to nothing. King Lear does not end as happily as Pericles because Cordelia’s body is recovered only temporarily and then destroyed.

Lastly, the third chapter looks at the play Macbeth. In Macbeth, Lady Macbeth is not limited to being a commodity owned by a father or husband; she is an exception to the rule followed by the women in Pericles and King Lear. She takes her freedom for granted when she enters into a bargain with evil, trading her body for power. This demonic pact seals her fate as it cannot be broken. The Weird Sisters are bound to serve Hecate as they have made a pact similar to Lady Macbeth’s. These women become the property of supernatural forces, to be used and destroyed at the whim of their masters. Even in the

magical vision of the line of kings the Weird Sisters reveal to Macbeth, the ghost of Mary, Queen of Scots is missing. Therefore the tragedy of the play of the play is linked to the destruction of all female bodies, including the innocent Lady Macduff.

Chapter I

Under the Sign of the Phoenix:
Resurrection in Pericles

In Pericles, the female body is manipulated by different people and situations. It is, for example, controlled by musically induced magic; subject to resurrections, misinterpreted as a ghost or fairy; and bought, sold and safeguarded as a commodity. Some of the more amazing bodily phenomena, such as crossing the boundaries between the living and the dead are actually real, as in Thaisa's case. All of these manipulations of the female body are effects of the commodification of the body. Thaisa's worth is also calculated through her body. Being young and beautiful, Pericles and Cerimon liken her body to jewels and riches. Thaisa, although dead, comes back through Cerimon's magic and returns to her original state as something of value, as property which Cerimon guards until the rightful owner, Pericles, comes to reclaim her. Marina's body is deemed to be a threat to Pericles even though she is an infant, personifying Pericles' fear of incest. Marina's body passes from one hand to another until Pericles finally reclaims her. The play and Pericles himself are so obsessed with the death, life and value of the bodies of the women that they compel, prolong and, finally, bring to an end Pericles' journeys. There is such an emphasis on the body that even a ghost like Gower has to have some corporality. Instead of rising out of thin air, he rises from ashes. Because he appears to the audience as an infirm old man, we question his abilities as a narrator. The specter of Gower represents an important counterpoint to the

female bodies, and this chapter will therefore begin with an exploration of his ghostly, yet bodily, incarnation. The chapter will then proceed to examine the treatment of the female body in Pericles.

This play begins as a tale of wonder, narrated by the ghost of John Gower, the poet. As a ghost, an Elizabethan audience would not have taken Gower's presence lightly because they believed that:

Ghosts were no more motiveless than witches; they had an important social role to play. In Shakespeare's plays, for example, there are many ghosts and they always come for a purpose. They are instruments for revenge or protection, they prophesy, or they crave proper burial. Invariably they are taken seriously; ghosts were rare in Elizabethan comedy and not a subject for frivolity before the eighteenth century. (Thomas 597)

However, Gower has great difficulty living up to the expectations set for him. Rather than being fearsome or awe-inspiring, Gower has often been described as an apologetic, fumbling narrator, or most unflatteringly, a "cumbersome device which interrupts the flow of the plot" (Pitt 120) with little command over his own role. Even Ben Jonson ridiculed Gower in Ode to Himself, accusing him of telling "a mouldy old tale" (Cooper 107) and declaring Gower archaic.

Despite this criticism, Gower is not completely impotent as a story teller; he is gifted with the ability to use powerful imagery. For example, Gower alludes to Christ and the magical phoenix when pronouncing his *raison d'être*: Gower says he is here "to sing a song that old was sung/From ashes ancient Gower is come/Assuming man's infirmities" (1.0.1-3). He promises a tale so fantastical that he

was handpicked to be resurrected from the afterworld to tell it. The play functions as a restorative (1.0.8) and by becoming one of us, like Christ did— by assuming “man’s infirmities” (1.1.3) – Gower will administer this restorative in an act of grace. This is the stuff of legend and through his words, Gower promises the reader great things.

The resurrection motif in Gower’s words depends on the burning imagery of the phoenix to compliment the Christ-imagery. The death of the phoenix occurs when the bird self-combusts, to be reborn from its own ashes. Similarly, Gower dies and is reborn in a phoenix-like cycle, claiming “I life would wish, and that I might /Waste it for you like taper light” (1.0.15-16), dying nobly for the benefit the reader or spectator. This fiery image of self-sacrifice is awesome in its beauty and from it Gower draws power and respect as a narrator.

As passionate as Gower is about relating his purpose for being, Gower does not present himself as an absolute, authoritative narrator and therein lies the problem of his credibility. Through this beautiful language, he attempts to cover-up that he is in fact a suspect narrator who has recurring lapses in self-doubt within the play. This is because being dead for many years, Gower is out of the loop in every way. As a poet, it unnerves him that his language and grammar are also out of date. Gower pleads with the reader:

If you born in latter times
 When wit's more ripe, accept my rhymes,
 And that to hear an old man sing
 May to your wishes pleasure bring. (1.0.11-14)

Gower wants our forgiveness. This is unusual for a ghost; in Macbeth the ghost of Banquo never apologizes for his presence (3.4.) neither do any of the ghosts in Richard III (5.3) nor the ghost of Hamlet's father (1.1). Especially for a ghost who claims to have superior restorative abilities, Gower's apologies reveal that his earlier words were an act of bravado and that, in truth, he is doubtful of the powers he claimed to possess.

Gower becomes further detached from his tale and discredited when he claims he was bid to "sing a song from old was sung" (1.0.1) and later claims he is merely repeating verbatim "what mine authors say" (1.0.20). Gower really acts as "a medium; the tale did not originate with him, nor is he the proprietor" (Bishop 94). In this limited capacity, he becomes less and less of a great poet in our eyes. Conflicting tones of authority are consistent as Gower promises first to "show you those in trouble reign" (2.0.7) only to conclude by being uncertain that his narrative is powerful enough to follow through when he says "but tidings to the contrary/Are brought your eyes; what need speak I" (2.0.16), abandoning his role as narrator when it becomes too demanding. As a result, the dumb show must proceed due to Gower's failure to keep his audience in thrall. Aware of his

failure, Gower asks the reader, for the second time to: “pardon old Gower; this longs the text” (2.0.39).

Act 3 adheres to the emerging pattern of Gower demonstrating aptitude as a narrator only to proceed to undermine his authority. Gower seems to have gained confidence when he says, “what’s dumb in show I’ll plain in speech” (3.0.14), reversing his tendency to supplement his narration with a dumb show when he becomes unsure of himself. However, this is just another instance of bravado as his abilities as a storyteller are undermined again. He breaks his promise to make everything “plain in speech” (3.10.14) using the dumb show as a crutch.

While Gower has failed to do what he set out to accomplish, he has succeeded in other areas. He skillfully manages to bridge a gap in time spanning from the wedding night and Marina’s conception to the moment when he relies on the next dumb show, revealing a heavily-pregnant Thaisa. Gower, in this way, participates in Thaisa’s pregnancy, bearing the burden of most of it through his narrative so that all Thaisa has left to do is give birth (3.0.51-52). The reader is given a glimmer of Gower’s potential as a ghost through his ability to manipulate time and space. Up until this point, Gower’s appearances have been spaced in intervals so that he appears at the start of each act. After act 3, the appearances become more frequent (4.0, 4.4) as Gower seems to gain momentum.

The fluctuations in power influence Gower and he becomes more authoritative. He says, “imagine Pericles arrived at Tyre” (4.0.1), using his sway over the reader to transport them where he will rather than rely on another dumb show. Gower gains control of the tale so completely that:

the artifice that is at its most blatant here: an in-your-face insistence to the spectators that the play they are watching, not so much a play within a play but a story that takes physical form. The audience is not even allowed to imagine that the stage represents real space: its function as *imagined* space is explicit. The imagination, furthermore, is in the first instance Gower’s — the figure who can conjure into being the occupants of his own brain — and only secondarily that of the audience. (Cooper 107)

He does not beg our patience nor apologize. After gaining confidence through his first experiment, speeding from Marina’s conception to her birth, Gower is gutsy enough to attempt to cover greater stretches of space and time. He commands the imagination once again by giving the reader directions. He orders “now to Marina bend your mind/ Whom our fast-growing scene must find” (4.0.5-6), aging Marina into a young maid in the blink of an eye. This is the kind authority that Gower needs to exert in order to propel the narrative forward. He is aware of his progress and proudly boasts “only I carry winged time” (4.0.47).

This burst of confidence is shattered promptly by Gower himself when he says: “post on the lame feet of my rhyme/ Which never could I so convey/Unless your thoughts went on my way” (4.0.48-50).

As is his tendency, near the end of his narrative, Gower falters. Gower undermines himself by pointing out the weakness of his rhyme. The use of the words “lame feet” refer to the meter, but also invoke Gower’s body and his actual feet, reminding us that Gower is very old. Authority is again undermined by age, as Gower becomes a shuffling old man. Gower’s habit of placing emphasis on the body is common to all the characters in this play, as we shall see with Thaisa and Marina. Even at the end of the play, he is apprehensive when he says: “so your patience evermore attending, / New joy wait on you” (Epilogue 17-18), thanking the readers for their patience. While Gower may be “one of the play’s many connections to the earlier form of miracle play” (Skeele 27), Gower is lackluster and does not summon wonder. A goddess, a healer and a miraculous reunion have to sustain the impression of wonder instead.

Gower’s tale is peopled with many female bodies; these bodies are scrutinized and used against their owners more than Gower’s aged body ever is. Pericles, as the hero of this play, influences the reader’s perception of the female bodies more than Gower ever can. In the remainder of this chapter, I will turn to explore Pericles’ dealings with the women in the play. Looking at his interactions with Antiochus’ daughter, Thaisa and Marina I will show how these women are reduced to the physical, to the bodily. Moreover, I will show how

these bodily forms are instrumental in Pericles' fall and ultimate restitution.

To begin with, Pericles chooses his first destination, Antioch, because of his desire to wed Antiochus' daughter. Pericles' dealings with and knowledge of her are minimal. He does not care to know her. His desire for her stems from "the glory of her praise" (1.1.4). He covets the glory associated with winning her, as if she were a prestigious prize, and thrives off of the competitive edge of the challenge set by Antiochus.

The competition Antiochus creates is "a coercive theatrical mechanism from which there is no escape; the suitor's eye once caught 'in awe' can only wilt before the father's authority, which holds all speech fast in its grip" (Bishop 96). It is little wonder that Pericles pursues the daughter as a trophy so prestigious because she can only be won on pain of death. A daughter's status as a valuable object was an accepted notion during the Renaissance (Busse 212). Therefore, Antiochus does not behave wrongly when he markets her to her suitors. Antiochus is guilty, however, because he hoards his daughter instead of giving her to a suitable husband.

Because the daughter is a prize and not a person, she has no voice. Since she is a thing, words are not necessary to call her; instead, the daughter responds to music (1.1.6). One of the properties of music in Pericles is to summon forth characters from inaccessible

places. Thaisa is called forth from the lands of the dead (3.2.89) and Pericles set free from the grip of his suffering (5.1.73) through music. It is used by Antiochus to summon a daughter who is supposedly neither dead nor mad, but inaccessible as the result of her tainted body and her status as object. Pericles, perhaps noting her response to music, expresses what he dare not say out loud by comparing her to a viol when he says:

you are a fair viol, and your sense the strings,
 Who, fingered to make man his lawful music,
 Would draw heaven down and all the gods to hearken;
 But, being played before your time,
 Hell only danceth at so harsh a chime. (1.1.82-86)

If the body of a woman is an instrument, Pericles is claiming that the music she makes indicates whether or not she is virtuous. A virtuous woman would have the power to “draw heaven down and all the gods hearken” (1.1.84); Pericles questions whether or not she has this ability. The daughter’s “vile crime, of course, is that she has been the passive recipient of untimely attention—but still she has been the crime’s instrument” (Quilligan 218). As a corrupted instrument, her body plays a melody so harsh, it reminds Pericles of hell.

Unfortunately, we are never given the opportunity to see her as anything else, especially when she has only two lines: “of all ‘ssayed yet, mayst thou prove prosperous; / Of all ‘ssayed yet, I wish thee happiness” (1.1.60-61). From these limited words, the reader cannot know how she feels or what she thinks. Nor does Pericles care, as to

him, she is beyond redemption. She is left to fend for herself, just as Thaisa will be when thrown overboard and Marina will be when sold to a brothel. In fleeing and remaining silent, Pericles actually aids Antiochus in

keeping the secret hidden, and the daughter remains the baffled victim of an abuse so deep she is unable to speak it. She is hardly more than a cipher, yet the morsel she can say may reach out pathetically for a salvation. (Bishop 98)

Even though Pericles rejects Antiochus' daughter, he still commodifies her. He refers to the daughter as spoiled treasure when he says "fair glass of light, I loved you, and/could still/Were not this glorious casket stored with ill" (1.1.77-78).

This pattern of female commodification in Antioch persists throughout the play. Even far away from Antioch, Pericles will continue to commodify both Thaisa and Marina. However, instead of being spoilt treasure, as was Antiochus' daughter, their virtues make them priceless treasure. Even so, they are abandoned by Pericles as I shall demonstrate. This pattern suggests that Pericles is haunted by the defiled phantom and "by the Antiochus in himself, the incest fear which he must repress and from which he must flee" (Gosset 134). Pericles flees Antioch but not the problem.

Pericles' flight from Antioch leads him to the shores of Pentapolis where he encounters Thaisa and her father, Simonides. On Pentapolis, Pericles enters into a contest reminiscent of the one on

Antioch. Although it would seem at first as if Pericles has come from Antioch none the wiser, his more moderate approach towards Thaisa is reflective of his recent experience. When he met Antiochus' daughter his assessment of female chastity was hasty and based solely on appearance. He made declarations of praise such as:

See where she comes, apparelled like the spring,
Graces her subjects, and her thoughts the king
Of every virtue gives renown to men;
Her face a book of praises, where is read
Nothing but curious pleasures, as from whence
Sorrow were ever razed, and testy wrath
Could never be her mild companion (1.1.12-19)

He assumed that virtue was present where there was physical beauty. In comparison, Pericles' behavior towards Thaisa demonstrates prudence and his newfound ability to judge character by actions rather than appearances. When Simonides asks "what do you think of my daughter, sir" (2.5.32), Pericles' replies evenly "a most virtuous princess" (2.5.33), exemplifying his guardedness. What begins to sway his heart is Thaisa's letter declaring her love and desire for him. Pericles reacts to the letter: "what here? / A letter that she loves the knight of Tyre" (2.5.41-42), seemingly surprised that she has a voice. Although this overt expression of desire may seem bold, Thaisa unifies beauty and virtue once more for Pericles because the "man she desires is the man she wants to marry: the focused desire constitutes marital chastity" (Cooper 110). She thus participates in sanctioned desire. He, on the other hand, leaves her unsure of his sentiments.

She questions him even as she accepts his proposal. She declares “yes-if you love me, sir” (2.5.85), making it conditional on his mutual affection. Pericles does love her, “even as [his] life [his] blood that fosters it” (2.5.86), but this is the first time he lets it be known.

Even though Thaisa has declared her love, the presence of Simonides remains a possible threat to Pericles. However, rather than threaten Pericles with death, Simonides blesses their union. He says: “it pleaseth me so well that I will see you wed;/ Then, with what haste you can, get you to bed” (2.5.89-90). He thereby makes their marriage genuine (Cooper 110). What is interesting about this marriage is that, although children were considered their parent’s valuable property (Busse 212), Simonides does not treat his daughter as a thing. Instead, by allowing Thaisa to choose Pericles, he followed the emerging Renaissance concept that “the children hold the responsibility for assessing the propriety of these [marital] matches” (Busse 229). Simonides even eagerly shoos them off to bed to consummate the marriage instantaneously: “It pleaseth me so well that I see you wed;/ Then, with what haste you can, get you to bed” (2.5. 89-90). He thus reverses the Antiochan paranoia (Bishop 103). Strangely, as we will see later, Pericles will be more like Antiochus than Simonides when he marries his daughter off hastily without the least care whether or not she approves of her suitor.

The final hurdle for Pericles and Thaisa is their wedding night. It is a success according to Gower, who “counts the fecundity of Pericles and his wife as evidence that honest love thrives” (Adelman, Suffocating Mothers 198). Pregnancy is the proof that Pericles has rightly claimed a virtuous female body. After this, Thaisa’s body literally disappears from the scene and when it re-enters, it is a prop: a corpse. When Pericles expresses his sorrow, the cause of it is the loss of Thaisa’s body: “oh you gods! / Why do you make us love your godly gifts/And snatch them straight away?” (3.1.21-23). Furthermore, he can only articulate his loss through the language of value, gifts, and riches. He uses

the old association love equals jewel. This association is built into a personal sense of Thaisa’s and Marina’s jewel-like worth; the love-image of jewel-thrown-into-the-sea becomes Thaisa in her jewel-stored coffin thrown overboard. (Sacks 87)

This action represents the pinnacle of Thaisa’s status as commodified body.

When the Servant and the Gentleman describe their discovery of Thaisa’s casket to Cerimon, their vocabulary is saturated with the language of treasure and riches: “if the sea’s stomach be o’ercharged with gold, /Tis a good constraint of fortune /It belches upon us” (3.2.54-56). The smells of spices, also a treasure, seduce Cerimon and compel him to open the casket. He gets quite the shock when he discovers Thaisa strewn in among the other riches: “o you most potent gods! What’s here, a corpse?”(3.2.62).

The corpse disappoints Cerimon until Pericles' letter is read:

I King Pericles have lost
 This queen, worth all our mundane cost.
 Who finds her, give her burying:
 She was the daughter of a king.
 Besides this treasure for a fee,
 The gods requite his charity. (3.2.71-74)

Through this letter, we understand that Thaisa is part of Pericles' "mundane cost" (3.2.72). The complete contents of the casket, including Thaisa, are his belongings. Accepting the treasure for a fee, Cerimon proceeds to resurrect Thaisa with music. His language is heavily laden with jewels, gold, and richness, echoing the syntax of Pericles' letter:

She is alive! Behold
 Her eyelids, cases to those heavenly jewels
 Which Pericles hath lost, begin to part
 Their fringes of bright gold. The diamonds
 Of a most praised water doth appear,
 To make the world twice rich. Live, and make
 Us weep to hear your fate, fair creature,
 Rare as you seem to be. (3.2.97-103)

The jewels, gold, and diamonds are stressed. The soul or any other spiritual aspect of the deceased is ignored and only Thaisa's body is valued. Moreover, Cerimon's use of music to revive the corpse (3.2) functions as a chilling reminder of Antiochus' use of music to summon his daughter's body forth (1.1.5 and 1.1.12). These scenes function as spectacles in which the viewer/reader's gaze is drawn to the body. Cerimon, like Antiochus did with his daughter, creates a

spectacle with Thaisa's body as the main feature. He sends Thaisa to the temple of Diana, safekeeping her body for Pericles.

However, Cerimon's use of music is distinct from Antiochus'; Cerimon uses a broken melody, starting and stopping with Thaisa's breath and drawing her body away from death. This is no simplistic summoning of her presence at his will, as is the case of Antiochus. While the two women and the two situations are very different, both of their bodies respond to music. Marina will break this pattern later in the play when she becomes the musician and administers music as a restorative to her father. Marina and Pericles reverse the pattern: in their situation it is the woman who possesses the music and the power to use it on the male body. Once Thaisa is revived, Cerimon takes on the role of treasure-keeper.

Meanwhile, Thaisa's death prompts another burst of paranoia in Pericles. The first occurred when he left Antioch, fearful for his life and haunted by Antiochus' daughter's incestuous body. This instance begins when Lychorida attempts to soothe Pericles. She says to him while passing him his little daughter: "here's all that is left living of your queen, / A little daughter. For the sake of it, / Be manly and take comfort" (3.1.20-22). Recalling Antiochus' riddle which described his daughter as "I mother, wife, and yet his child" (1.1.70), the possibility of Pericles taking comfort in this living leftover of his queen is disturbing. He therefore interrupts his journey to stop on Tarsus,

leaving Marina in the care of Cleon and Dionyza. He claims that “the babe cannot hold out to Tyrus” (3.1.76). This is an attempt to differentiate this paternal relationship from that of Antiochus and his daughter. While sending a child to foster was common practice in Elizabethan England, the reasons were usually to cement alliances, to engage in an apprenticeship or to a wet-nurse (Novy, “Multiple Parenting” 188). Pericles has different motives; by keeping Marina out of sight, out of mind, Pericles is putting as much distance from his own inner demons as possible. Frey comments that “in all the romances [as in other Shakespearean plays], lesser characters may be seen as representing in part components within the psyche of the central character” (Frey 301). According to this theory, Marina becomes the personified fear of incest troubling Pericles psyche. Thus he abandons Marina, intending to set eyes on her again only when “she be married” (3.3.29). Or, in other words, when her body is safe.

However, in Cleon and Dionyza’s hands, Marina’s body is not safe. Rather than safeguard her until her wedding day, Dionyza intends to have Marina killed in 4.1. Marina narrowly escapes death and is kidnapped by pirates instead. The pirates see the value of Marina’s body and the setting of the play changes when they sell her to the brothel. This new, crass setting provides a contrasting perception of women’s bodies to that at court. In the brothel, the commodification of women is obvious, whereas at court the practice

was more veiled. The Bawd's job is to make a profit by selling Marina's body. This recalls the way that Cerimon accepted, as payment for safekeeping Thaisa's body, the riches found with her. In truth, the Bawd and Cerimon have both treated the bodies of Pericles' women as profit; even if Cerimon's "profit" is glossed over. The brothel and the temple, however, are really two sides of the same coin. Although the brothel and the court appear on the surface to be dissimilar, Lysimachus, Pander, the Bawd, Bolt, Pericles and Cerimon all view women similarly.

The courtly and the urban collide in Lysimachus' language. Lysimachus exchanges the courtly language of bodily worth for street lingo when he calls Marina "creature of sale" (4.5.82-83). By doing so, he does not use the language appropriate to his station. As a member of the court, one would expect his language to echo that of Pericles and Cerimon; but rather than refer to Marina's worth in terms of jewels or treasure or other rarified objects of value, he stresses her monetary cash value. What discredits Lysimachus is that he does not use the language appropriate to his station.

Arguably, Lysimachus is in a brothel and his language is suited to the setting. He is rightly surprised to be met with resistance from Marina. As he tells her: "the house you dwell in proclaims you/ to be a creature of sale" (4.5.82-83). He should therefore be able to buy her services without a sermon. His error is not in his perception of Marina

as a commodified body; it is that he stoops beneath his station by shopping for a body in the open market of the brothel. Lysimachus should behave like Pericles, sanctioning his desire to own a female body through marriage and appraising her worth by comparing her to gold and jewels. This is the language appropriate to his station. Instead, Marina “piecemeal, becomes the price of her hymen” (Bishop 110), her virtues cast aside.

Ever resourceful, Marina plays on Lysimachus’ position as governor. She sees in his position an opportunity to save herself. She riskily dares him: “If you were born to honour, show it now;/If upon you, make the judgment good/That thought you worthy of it” (4.5.96-98). She backs him into a corner so that only by submitting to her arguments and leaving her virginity intact can he retain his nobility. However, Lysimachus perpetuates his image as a less than noble governor when he does not help Marina escape Pander and the Bawd; instead he gives her gold (4.5.100). The transaction is dishonorable because the money he gives her was the money he had already intended to give her. The item for sale has changed; he is no longer paying to take her virginity, but for its temporary preservation. The temporariness of the situation must be stressed; he doesn’t save her but only provides a momentary reprieve. Moreover, by paying her in gold, Lysimachus perpetuated the commodification of Marina. Therefore even though Marina’s pleas are successful, Lysimachus’

reformation is not entirely convincing. He benefits more from the transaction than she does: he leaves with a clean conscience while it is just a matter of time before Marina has to endure the ordeal all over again with another customer.

After Lysimachus' departure, Marina is left to barter with her owners. These owners see no marketable value in her virtues, viewing them as separate from the profit they can make off of her body. However, for Marina, virtues are inseparable from the body. Virginity is more than a bodily state of purity. Renaissance "conduct manuals agree that if the female body is kept pure, a woman will be regarded as fair, well-favored, rich, fruitful and noble, rather than as a corrupt female body, a sea and treasure of illness" (Alfar 15). Marina agrees with such values, considering her chastity not just a bodily state, but a moral one as well.

In Marina and Lysimachus' second encounter, Lysimachus retains his belief in the use-value of the female body. At this time, Pericles is entrenched in his own melancholy which Helicanus describes as: "too tedious/ To repeat, but the main grief springs from the loss/ Of a beloved daughter and a wife" (5.1.23-25). It is a loss so deep that it has become unutterable. Lysimachus and the Lord try to cure Pericles by introducing Marina to him. They hope that her "other choice attractions" (5.1.38-39) will do the trick. Their lack of sensitivity to Pericles' deep wounds exposes Lysimachus and the Lord

as simple, shallow characters. They believe that the lovely Marina may lure Pericles out of his stupor by replacing the bodies of his dead wife and daughter with another female body. In this way, we see that for them female bodies are interchangeable. Yet as ridiculous and shallow as Lysimachus may seem, he unknowingly recovers for Pericles one of the two female bodies that could bring Pericles back to his senses.

During the revelation scene (5.1) music is once again used as a restorative tool. So far in Pericles, women have been obedient to the power of music. In Marina's attempt to entice Pericles out of his state of mourning through the use of her "sweet harmony" (5.1.38), she is the master over the music and not he. This is a departure from the established relationship with music that the other women have had. Even though she is originally summoned at the will of Lysimachus, Marina takes the music into her own hands and sings for Pericles (5.1.73). In this role, she recalls Cerimon, but she achieves the resurrection of not one person, but two. First, she acts as a restorative, bringing Pericles to his senses. Secondly, by waking Pericles senses, he eventually recognizes Marina, and in doing so saves her from her supposed death. By doing this, the restorative powers displayed by Cerimon and Gower (through the telling of his tale) peak in Marina (Bishop107).

Even so, Marina is not recovered simply through her song. Pericles is preoccupied with the body in this scene, as he questions and marvels at Marina: “but are you flesh and blood? /Have you a working pulse and are no fairy” (5.1.144-45). He demands of her some physical credibility. Her identity hangs in the balance while Pericles decides whether or not to validate her existence. Marina exists to him in a state that is neither bodily nor ghostly, she is somewhere between being and non-being. She, meanwhile, tries harder and harder to prove herself to him, giving Pericles Lychorida’s name, the tale of her birth at sea and, lastly, her name. Perplexed, Pericles says “this cannot be/ My daughter, buried” (5.1.154-55) as though there is still something missing for him.

In order to accept Marina, Pericles needs to “rebirth” her. He exclaims:

O, come hither,
 Thou that beget’st him that did thee beget,
 Thou that was born at sea, buried at Tarsus,
 And found at sea again! (5.1.184-187)

Pericles uses the sea to rebirth Marina. He also reverses his paternity when he says “thou that beget’st him that did thee beget” (5.1.185). Quilligan aptly points out that this “moment of healing in Pericles is presented in the language of metaphorically incestuous begetting” (Quilligan 224). Once she has been resurrected, her body becomes dangerous again. This may explain Pericles’ hasty marriage of Marina to Lysimachus. He blurts out to Lysimachus “you shall prevail, were it

to woo my daughter” (5.1.247). Adelman believes that the reader’s “unease about Lysimachus, our slight dismay at the marriage, register the extent to which sexuality of any sort has become taboo in the reformations celebrated at the end of *Pericles*” (Adelman, “Masculine Authority and the Maternal Body” 187).

The resolution of the play seems to be staged to reassure Pericles once and for all that woman will not corrupt him. Even though he has decided to marry Marina to Lysimachus, Diana encourages him to go to Ephesus where he will be reunited with Thaisa (5.1). There, when Thaisa sees Pericles, her happiness is expressed through her body: she faints at the sound of Pericles’ voice (5.3.13-14). The voice is enough to confirm Pericles identity to her, but she must use riches to prove her identity to him. Until she presents him with the ring (5.3.40), he considers her “dead Thaisa” (5.3.34) and will not validate her existence. Even though Pericles then claims to believe her, he still goes to Cerimon’s home to “be shown all was found with her” (5.3.67). The final seal of approval from Pericles rests on this proof, on the rest of the treasure that was thrown overboard.

Both mother and daughter rely on Pericles to confirm their identities. Since Marina is a spitting image of her mother (5.1.98-102) there should be no doubt. Yet they need Pericles to authenticate their relationship. For Thaisa to recognize Marina, Pericles must say “look

who kneels here: flesh of thy flesh, Thaisa/Thy burden at the sea, and called Marina, /For she was yielded there” (5.3.46-48). This is the first time Thaisa can be sure she had a child and it is the first time she learns the child’s name. Pericles has to remind her that she gave birth at sea, recounting her own history to her. He must recreate the family relationship.

The reunion of mother and daughter alleviates Pericles’ anxiety because now he is no longer in the same position as Antiochus was. His lust can be rightfully directed unto his wife. The validity of the resolution is made questionable when he decides that he and Thaisa will rule Pentapolis and send Marina and Lysimachus to rule Tyre. Pericles could be perceived as generous by giving away Tyre to his daughter and son-in-law or this move could be viewed as an extension of his general paranoia surrounding women. The further away he can send his daughter, the better, so that she may never entice him to commit incest. This is the second time he sends Marina away.

Gower’s Epilogue should have been called a catalogue as it consists of a list of dead and restored bodies. Antiochus’ daughter, for example, is reintegrated (Epilogue.1-2) followed by the reunion of Pericles and his family (Epilogue.3). The function of this naming of Antiochus’ daughter is purgative for Pericles, cleansing him from the initial threat of incest. Gower has completed his purpose and having been consumed “like taper light” (1.0.15-16) will return to ashes.

When the play is read or acted again, he will rise from his ashes like the phoenix. Like Gower, the bodies of Pericles' women are subjected to the cycle of life and death every time the play is read or performed. The restoration is repetitive and cyclical; it is the only way to achieve Pericles' salvation. This seems to be the true nature of the restorative of the play.

Chapter II

Cordials and Poisons:
Failed Resurrection and
Bestialization in King Lear

In King Lear there is a distinction between virtuous and vicious female bodies far stronger than there was in Pericles. There is no intermediate category as the play deliberately pits the “bad” female body against the “good” female body. Indeed, Lear’s three daughters seem to exist simply to differentiate what is “good” from what is “evil”. On their own they “are characters simple enough. The subtlety of their drawing is not in any of them singly, but rather in the way in which they are handled as a group” (Coe 91), almost as if they are an experiment in modes of being female. The excessive cruelty and beastliness that Goneril and Regan display are set in sharp contrast to Cordelia’s stubborn refusal to be anything but a woman true to ideal Renaissance concepts of the feminine as established by conduct manual of the time (Alfar 16; Sacks 90). Lear creates the circumstances which lead to his own deception, giving Goneril and Regan all that he possesses while casting Cordelia aside, making his most precious daughter “nothing”. All of these women’s bodies, whether good or not, whether worth something or worth nothing, perish in the course of the play. If Michael Bristol is correct and “a dead body is an instructive object” (Bristol 187), the reader then takes on the role of detective, out to discover what the bodies mean.

The world of King Lear is at first orderly, becoming topsy turvy only as Lear learns what Pericles learnt on Antioch and what Macbeth will learn from the witches: “fair is foul, and foul is fair” (*Mac*.1.1.10).

The witches' words accurately describe the illusions Lear must eventually see through. Lear is accustomed to living in a luxurious world, in which his every whim is fulfilled. As a result he takes his authority and Cordelia's acquiescence for granted (Lenker 56). When Lear creates his love-contest, he exposes his weak point: flattery. Goneril and Regan perform magnificently as "their replies, rather than exhibiting an insincerity innate to their characters, take their cue from their father's formality and hyperbole, performing their love as his demand requires of them" (Alfar 89). They deliver exactly what Lear asks for. Their prize is, of course, Lear's calculated affection. Lear claims of Cordelia to have "lov'd her most" (1.1.123), and therefore expects the best performance to be hers. He plans to make her the most valuable by giving her the largest portion of the kingdom; however, she fails to perform.

Critics such as Phillipa Berry and Vanessa McMahon link the manipulative language used by Goneril and Regan in the initial scene of King Lear to the language used by villainous women such as Tamora, Dionyza, Lady Macbeth and real Renaissance women who were tried for either murder or witchcraft. Their manipulation of words is what Berry diagnoses as mimicry of masculine eloquence, which carries with it a tendency to violence (Berry 53). McKewin makes the observation that not only do their words have a masculine

eloquence to them, they carry a masculine tendency to action. She explains:

At the other extreme, female conversations are sometimes like men's, direct preparation for action. The private exchange between Regan and Goneril after the appropriation of the kingdom has, in contrast to other Shakespearean feminine conferences, an uncharacteristic expediency. Only twenty-two lines long, and therefore one of the shortest scenes of women talking alone together, the close dialogue between sisters about the conduct of their father ends with Goneril's fiercely insistent: "We must *do something*, and i' th' heat." (121)

Goneril and Regan are representations of the type of woman who talks and acts like a man. Their actions against their father are an assault on Renaissance sensibilities. This is especially the case when the father is also the king. As Henry VIII reminded his daughter Mary, "...although sons and daughters were bound to some obedience towards their mothers, their chief duty was to their fathers, and [the princess] must submit to his pleasure" (Hull, Women According to Men 135), so Lear believes likewise. Therefore Goneril and Regan's refusal to submit to their father's pleasure and acting like a man make them monstrosities for their time. As Goneril and Regan's actions transform them from women and daughters to bestial fiends the language of the play adapts to their shape-shifting.

Of the two sisters, Goneril "is the more self-possessed and the craftier, while Regan is more emotional and takes great delight in physical cruelty" (Coe 90). Goneril might be called the brain, while Regan tends to be the muscle. The crimes that Goneril commits are

falsehood, emasculation and murder. The consequences of these actions, as we shall see, cause and inform her beastly metamorphosis.

Goneril demonstrates her linguistic expertise when she effects the transformation of her husband into a woman. Behind his back, she refers to Albany as “our mild husband” (4.2.1). She uses the connection between woman and breast milk to emasculate Albany when she sneers at his “milky gentleness” (1.4.340) and calls him a “milk-livered man” (4.2.50). Furthermore, she attacks his military prowess when she says:

France spreads his banners in our noiseless land,
With plumed helm thy state begins to threat,
Whist thou, a moral fool, sits still and cries,
“Alack, why does he so?” (4.2.56-59)

Goneril attacks Albany’s morality as his source of weakness. Goneril’s tactics foreshadow Lady Macbeth’s claims that Macbeth “is too full o’th’ milk of human kindness ” (Macbeth 1.5.17) to make his dreams come true.

Goneril is contemptuous of maternity and femininity and rejects them as possibilities. This causes Goneril’s own unsexing, recalling Lady Macbeth’s in 1.5.41-43. The only time Goneril uses any kind of motherly conceit associated with tenderness, it is to bid Edmund success in his schemes when she says: “conceive, and fare thee well” (4:2:24). In this instance, Goneril hopes to plant her ideas into

Edmund's fertile mind, where they will quicken. Otherwise, she prefers to use the maternal relationship to expose weakness and helplessness. For instance, she insults Lear when she declares: "Now by my life/ Old fools are babes again" (1.3.18-19). She sustains her metaphor when she forces Lear to give up some of his knights, scolding thus:

The shame itself doth speak
 For instant remedy. Be then desir'd
 By her, that else will take the thing she begs,
 A little disquantity to your train,
 And the remainders that shall still depend,
 To such men as may besort your age,
 Which know themselves and you (1.4. 246-252)

Lear is incensed at this unnatural reversal of roles, cursing her "ingratitude! thou marble-hearted fiend/More hideous show'st thee in a child/ Than the sea-monster" (1.4.259-261). By calling her a sea monster, marble-hearted and hideous, he draws attention to her emerging fiend-like qualities, recognizing them for the first time.

Once Lear's ideal image of his daughter is destroyed, Lear is lead to wonder what a daughter is. He questions: "Are you our daughter?" (1.4.218), because his foundation is so shaken by Goneril's rebellion. The events are surreal to him and he cannot grasp what he is experiencing. He says in disbelief: "I should be false persuaded/ I had daughters" (1.4.233-234). He struggles with the notion that not only is Goneril refusing to act as a woman, but she also fails to behave like a daughter. As Goneril moves further and

further away from the behaviour a Renaissance audience would expect of an ideal woman, the shape-shifting spreads like wildfire in the language of the play, picking up her dark nature (Muir 27).

Following her appearance as a sea-monster (1.4.261), Goneril's transformation into a wolf is perceived by Lear, who comments on her "wolvish visage" (1.4.308). Because Goneril demands that Lear reduce the size of his retinue (1.4. 248-252), he curses:

Darkness and devils!
Saddle my horses; call my train together!
Degenerate bastard, I'll not trouble thee;
Yet I have left a daughter (1.4. 253-256)

In this instant, Lear becomes so disgusted with his eldest daughter that he bastardizes her. Lear's language identifies Goneril's transformation into the she-wolf archetype. It is a form in which Goneril re-appears when Lear calls her and Albany "the wolf and owl" (2.4.210), respectively. The She-wolf is an archetypal character which can be described as:

a character convention that emerges in the late 1580s in the wake of the fashion for Senecan plays and represents the male fear of women at its most extreme. She is beautiful and womanly in appearance but lacks the gender qualities usually associated with her sex and instead tends to acts of gratuitous and excessive evil. (Mann154)

Goneril seems to be beautiful: both her husband Albany and Edmund are attracted to her. But behind this beautiful façade, none of the virtuous qualities associated with her gender are there as she engages in evil deeds such as the plotting of Albany's death (4.4.262-271) and

the murder of Regan (5. 3.96). Her beauty can only mask her true nature: as Albany remarks when he finally sees through Goneril, “a woman’s shape doth shield thee” (4.2.67). This is typical of the she-wolf archetype, for whom “the feminine is all surface and the inner personality is male” (Mann 156).

Other characters realize just how dangerous Goneril is as her bestial side comes into focus. Gloucester, for one, witnesses her transformation into a wild boar: “Because I would not see thy cruel nails/ Pluck out his poor old eyes, nor thy fierce sister/In his anointed flesh [rash] boarish fangs” (3.7.56-58). The boar appropriately illustrates her savagery in this phase of her metamorphosis. Albany sees Goneril and Regan as “tigers, not daughters” (4.2.40), adding yet another carnivorous beast to their menagerie. Albany later claims that “Proper deformity shows not in the fiend/ So horrid as in woman” (4.2.60-61), implying that Goneril is even worse than a demon. As these animals – the she-wolf, vulture, boar, tiger and the supernatural demon— burst out of Goneril’s body, she gives birth to a new breed of grotesque. Her femininity is bestial, as she is not a woman, but an unnatural and bloody creature.

The completion of Goneril’s metamorphosis is anticipated when Lear declares her “most serpent-like, upon the very heart” (2.3.161). At this point, Goneril is stripped down to her essence. She has shed all feminine, human qualities and the “real” Goneril, the “gilded

serpent” (5.3.83), writhes free. As snake, much like Lucifer, Goneril takes on the ability to tempt others. This is apparent when she convinces her sister to join her in the destruction of Lear.

Regan also hides behind a beautiful façade. Matthews explains that “gorgeousness [is] not wrong in itself, any more than was Goneril’s beauty, but it was as treacherous because below her human clothing Regan was in fact no better than a beast” (Matthews 147). After Lear’s discovery of Regan’s inner beasts, he says in anger “then let them anatomize Regan, see what/ breeds about her heart” (3.4.76-77). He suggests that an animal has been propagating inside of and poisoning her. Given Goneril’s influence over Regan and her eventual poisoning of Regan, I would argue that it is Goneril that has bred about Regan’s heart. In fact, Regan appears very often to be another one of Goneril’s victims rather her equal.

Even the Fool perceives that Regan is a lesser threat than Goneril. For example, when Lear warns him “Take heed, sirrah— the wip” (1:4:110), the Fool ignores Lear’s authority. Yet with one dirty look from Goneril he says: “Yes, for/ sooth, I will hold my tongue; so your face bids me, / though you say nothing” (1:4:194-196). Goneril alone is forbidding enough to silence the Fool. He perceives her as a danger to Lear and attempts to warn him of her viciousness:

For you know, nuncle,
 “The hedge-sparrow fed the cuckoo so long,
 That it had it head bit off by it young.”
 So out went the candle, and we were left darlking. (1:4:214-217)

The message he is trying to get across to Lear is to watch out before Goneril bites his head off. No such warnings come about Regan alone. However, when Regan is under Goneril's influence the pair are referred to as "unnatural hags" (2:4:278), "she-foxes" (3:4:21), "dog-hearted daughters" (4:3:45) and "Centaur's, / Though women all above" (4:6:124-125).

Regan's role as a follower is also evident when she piggybacks on Goneril's words when lying to Lear in 1.1. She is skilful at mimicking villainy rather than being its source. She says "I am made of that self metal as my sister, / And prize me at her worth" (1.1.69-70). Regan betrays a fear of falling short of her sister when she asks to be prized at the same worth, perhaps motivated by rivalry to be Lear's favorite daughter.

Regan repeats this behavior in 2.4 when Goneril questions Lear's need for any knights: "What need you five and twenty? ten? or five?" (2.4.261). Goneril lays out the groundwork for the argument so that it is easy for Regan to pick up where she left off. Regan is quick to do this, asking Lear, "what need one?" (2.4.263). She effectively strips Lear of his entire retinue, leaving him defenseless. While it appears as though Regan has had the final say in this argument, she simply followed Goneril's lead. She is best remembered for this ability to follow through with a scheme by going to the extreme and taking sadistic delight in her villainy (Coe 90).

Even though Regan may be portrayed as a less cunning version of the she-wolf, she still “defies the Elizabethan conventions of feminine behavior” (Hamilton 120) and is judged accordingly. During the period, male anger was:

frequently inappropriate and often condemned as excessive, but it was also appropriate to their gender. Silence, obedience and cold malice were culturally linked to women. Women were repeatedly classified in binary opposites – in terms of sexuality and character they were defined as ‘Madonna’ or ‘whore’; in terms of general behaviour they were meek, passive and good or resentful, vengeful and wicked. (McMahon 113)

Regan defies feminine conventions by expressing anger and delight in physical violence; Goneril’s cold and calculated malice is more typical of female wickedness. For instance, Regan takes sadistic pleasure in torturing Gloucester. While servants bind the old Earl, Regan commands “Hard, hard. O filthy traitor” (3.7.33). It is not satisfying enough for her to see Gloucester tied down; she wants to see him hurt. Regan continues her barrage of insults, plucking his beard and taunting “So white, and such a traitor?” (3.7.37). Cornwall then proceeds to squash Gloucester’s first eye, but what is astounding is that Regan decides to take out the other eye: “One side will mock another; th’ other too” (3.7.71). The direct violence of blinding Gloucester completely is a horrific demonstration of physical violence made all the worse in the eyes of a Renaissance audience because a woman commits it. Bloodlust seems to overtake her as she then uses Cornwall’s sword to kill the servant who wounded him in 3.7.80.

Regan's final act of cruelty is when she decides Gloucester's fate, commanding her servants to "Go thrust him out at the gates, and let him smell/ His way to Dover" (3.7.93).

After Cornwall's death, Edmund vocalizes Regan's last transformation when he says "to both these sisters have I sworn my love: /Each jealous of the other, as the stung/Are of the adder" (5.1.55-57). In her final moments Regan is a snake along with Goneril. It is no surprise that Goneril, the bigger snake and the "better soldier" (4.4.3), is the victor.

Arguably, Regan deserves her death. Her death by poison says as much about Regan as it does about Goneril. According to McMahon, men were typically poisoned by their wives or female servants because poison was one means for physically weaker women to gain the upper hand over the strength of men (McMahon 108). Considering Regan's torturing of Gloucester and removing his second eye, she has demonstrated strength and physical prowess unusual in a woman. This makes her "probably the most horrible figure Shakespeare ever created— certainly one of the very few for whom one feels a quite unmitigated loathing" (Coe 91). Goneril's decision to poison Regan may be evidence that Goneril feared her sister's brute strength. By acting like a man, Regan earned herself a man's death — not on the battlefield— but at the hands of a clever woman.

Shaken by his daughters' behavior, Lear experiences a complete loss of faith in women. This is among many things that contribute to his going mad. He wants nothing to do with women, going to such extremes that he declares: "divorce me from thy mother's tomb, / Sepulchring an adulteress" (2.3.131-132). He turns his blameless, dead queen into a villain. He blames her for their daughters' viciousness.

The play provides an antidote to the villainous Goneril and Regan: Cordelia. Cordelia alone stands for the ideal woman and restores belief in the existence of such a woman. Never once does she appear, even at the height of Lear's anger, dehumanized as a fearsome creature like Goneril or Regan. This is because Goneril and Regan's transformations reflect their greediness and base pursuits. Cordelia's loftier notions of duty, love and devotion are apparent in the tendency to elevate her to such heights that characters (such as Kent and Lear) fully expect that Cordelia can perform wonders and that she will be able restore the kingdom.

Cordelia's command of silence immediately sets her apart from her sisters. She is a virtuous woman, inside and out as:

Throughout the play, Cordelia's speech, figured as emanating directly, though with great difficulty, from the insides of her body, is portrayed in stark contrast to the empty words and 'professed bossoms' (1.1.271) of her sisters...this inseparability of language and the interior body that Lear cannot bear. (Hillman 127)

Cordelia explains her silence when she says: “what shall Cordelia speak? / Love, and be silent” (1.1.62-63). She identifies love as a silent devotion rather than something that can be articulated for gain. She continues to use language sparingly when she insists simply that she “cannot heave/ My heart into my mouth” (1:1:91-92).

At first glance, Cordelia’s refusal to meet her father’s wishes could be perceived as self-indulgent disobedience. However, Lear is the one behaving wrongly when he creates his competition, asking his daughters which one loves him the most. As Hays points out, this question is usually used in chivalric romances and is answered by suitors, not daughters (Hays 193-94). The question becomes misdirected, suggesting “adultery in two cases and incest in all three” (Hays 194). Furthermore, we forget that Cordelia is answering in the presence of *her* suitors, France and Burgundy. Possibly, neither would want to marry a woman who loved her father more than her husband. Elizabethan law “gave husbands and fathers property-like rights in wives and daughters” (Sokol and Sokol 106), but once married ownership and obedience belonged to the husband. For Cordelia to love her father more than her husband, she would have to ignore the counsel of common conduct manuals. Should Cordelia answer Lear and participate in the game, she “might on top of that have to say that she loves France more than Burgundy, or vice versa” (Taylor 54). Therefore, when Cordelia says “sure I shall never marry

like my sisters, /To love my father all” (1.1.105-106), she is acting within the confines of her role as the virtuous woman— she is supposed to love her husband more than her father. Lear vengefully lashes out at Cordelia, punishing her by stripping her of both lands and dowry. Her worth is thereby diminished: “when she was dear to us, we did hold her so, / But now her price is fallen” (1.1.196-197). She has been commodified and priced exactly now at nothing.

Burgundy, like Lear, is a firm believer in the Renaissance value system in which women were considered hoardable property (Woodbridge 268). He thereby refuses Cordelia because he will not gain any additional lands or riches by marrying her. France proves to be the nobler lord, worthy of Cordelia when he declares:

Fairest Cordelia, thou art most rich being
 poor,
 Most choice forsaken, and most lov'd despis'd,
 Thee and thy virtues I seize upon
 Be it lawful I take up what's cast away.
 My love should kindle to inflam'd respect.
 Thy dow'rless daughter, King, thrown to my chance,
 Is queen of us, of ours, and our fair France.
 Not all the dukes of wat'rish Burgundy
 Can buy this unpriz'd precious maid of me. (1.1. 249-259)

To his credit, France has realized that “the only true nobility is virtue” (Vives 71), taking Cordelia for herself. France is being kind and good, but even he has not managed to avoid using the language of value in his praise and acceptance of Cordelia. When he speaks of her virtues, the only way he can articulate his appreciation of them is to describe them as ‘rich’, ‘unpriz'd’ and ‘precious’, as if she were a priceless

treasure. While seeming to distance himself from the commodification of women, his language betrays him.

Thus Cordelia's worth is perceived in the same way as Marina's and Thaisa's: jewel-like. Cordelia has more in common with Marina, as both of these daughters shed their identities as children to take on the role of the redeemer. Accepting this role burdens them with the responsibility of becoming their fathers' sole saviors. Cordelia's name itself suggests restorative qualities, resembling the word "cordial". Hillman also makes an interesting suggestion that Cordelia is Lear's heart, her very name being so close to "cor de Lear", literally Lear's core (Hillman 127).

There is even more pressure on Cordelia than just her name implies because other characters expect her to perform awesome Christ-like feats. Kent, for one, has always believed there is something intrinsically good and sacred about Cordelia. This is so much the case that he plans to shelter her among the gods when he prays, "the gods to their dear shelter take thee, maid/ That just think'st, and has most rightly said" (1.1. 184-85). The gods are the only guardians worthy of Cordelia. Kent also believes in a connection between miracles and Cordelia when he claims "nothing sees miracles/But misery, I know 'tis Cordelia" (2.2.165-166), associating miracles and Cordelia.

Kent serves Cordelia like an apostle. While Kent is in the stocks, he waits for the coming of dawn to read Cordelia's letter:

Nothing almost sees miracles
 But misery, I know 'tis from Cordelia,
 Who hath most fortunately been inform'd
 Of my obscure course; [reads] “—and shall find time
 From this enormous state—seeking to give
 Losses their remedies. (2.2.164-170)

By combining the reading of the letter with the sunrise, the letter and the sun compliment each other as symbols of light and hope. It lends him strength and he uses it to fortify the moral of others with religious zeal. He reassures a Gentleman “if you shall see Cordelia/ (As fear not you shall), show her this ring” (3.1.46-47). In the sub clause “as fear not you shall” he promises the Gentleman that Cordelia will come. Through the gospel of Kent, Cordelia’s return is anticipated.

Other characters also perceive Cordelia similarly. For example the Gentleman in act 4 alludes to Cordelia’s powers while speaking to Lear. He declares “thou hast [one] daughter/ Who redeems nature from the general curse/Which twain have brought her to” (4.6.205-207). He identifies Cordelia as the redeemer. In his eyes Cordelia can save Lear and the kingdom. When the Gentleman reports Cordelia’s return he declares that, upon her discovery of what Goneril and Regan have done to their father, she cried and “she shook/ The holy water from her heavenly eyes” (4.3.29-30). In his description, her eyes are “heavenly” and produce “holy water” implying that there are Christ-like attributes to Cordelia.

Casting her as a savior is an echo of the earlier play staged from 1588 to 1594, entitled The True Chronicle History of King Leir. In this earlier version of the story, virtue and vice are more starkly contrasted. In the first act, King Leir makes it known to a gathering of Nobles that he plans to divide his kingdom equally among his three daughters, Gonorill, Ragan and Cordella. Once Leir exits, Gonorill expresses the jealous disgust she shares with Ragan over Cordella's goodness:

I maruell, *Ragan* , how you can indure
 To see that proud pert Peat, our youngest sister,
 So slightly to account of vs, her elders,
 As if we were no better then her selfe!
 We cannot haue a quaynt deuice so soone,
 Or new made fashion, of our choyce inuention;
 But if she like it, she will haue the same,
 Or study newer to exceed vs both.
 Besides, she is so nice and so demure;
 So sober, courteous, modest, and precise,
 That all the Court hath worke ynough to do,
 To talke how she exceedeth me and you. (1.94-105)

Gonorill complains that Cordella is nice and demure. These are qualities conduct manuals encouraged young women to develop. Barnabe Rich preached in his manual, The Excellency of Good Women, that a virtuous woman “must have modesty, bashfulness, silence, abstinence, sobriety” (Rich 32). Cordella, as Gonorill and Ragan describe her, is Rich's ideal Renaissance woman. Rich also tells men to be wary of the woman “that is smooth of tongue and subtill in her heart” (Rich, The Excellency of Good Women 28). He

stereotypes this kind of woman as the harlot. By using language to coerce and plot secretly, Gonorill and Ragan represent this stereotype, similar to that of the she-wolf Shakespeare drew on.

Cordella is exiled when she fails to perform to Leir's liking in the love competition, but she is saved by the Gallian King (an earlier version of France). He recognizes her virtues and calls her "deare Cordella , cordiall to my heart" (1. 690). His words imply that she is a cordial, as Shakespeare's Cordelia's name implies. Shortly thereafter, Leir has a dream while in the wilderness in which:

...fayre *Cordella* ,
 Came with a boxe of Balsome in her hand,
 And powred it into my bleeding wounds,
 By whose good meanes I was recouered well,
 In perfit health, as earst I was before. (1.1445-1449)

The dream identifies Cordella as Leir's healer, just as Kent does in King Lear. She does not disappoint her husband or father; Leir's life is saved with the drink Cordella blesses with these words:

And may that draught be vnto him, as was
 That which old *Eson* dranke, which did renue
 His withered age, and made him young againe.
 And may that meat be vnto him, as was
 That which *Elias* ate, in strength whereof
 He walked fourty dayes, and neuer faynted. (1. 2116-2121)

By invoking a blessing that draws on a Biblical reference, Cordella continues to act as someone guided by divine grace. Her blessing also results in the successful rejuvenation of Lear, who then proceeds to restore the kingdom. This ending ensures that those considered

virtuous are rewarded, while the vicious are punished. Within this scope, Cordella's role as the ideal woman and savior is clearly defied. Shakespeare's King Lear maintains this expectation of Cordelia, however her success is thwarted.

In King Lear, Cordelia does not shy away from the expectations placed upon her; she never betrays any doubts that they are beyond her scope. Instead, she exudes confidence in her role, truly believing that she can heal Lear:

O my dear father, restoration hang
 Thy medicine on my lips, and let this kiss
 Repair those violent harms that my two sisters
 Have in thy reverence made. (4.7.25-28)

She channels restorative powers, transmitting them to Lear in a kiss. Her use of the words "restoration," "medicine" and "repair" opposed to the "violent harms" is curative; she sees herself as medicinal. To Cordelia, her sisters are clearly the cause of Lear's suffering, and she calls them the "shame of ladies" (4.3.27).

Because of her confidence, Cordelia's ability to act curatively and her tendency to frown on un-ladylike behavior, Cordelia again recalls Pericles' Marina. Not only are the two daughters similar, but so are their fathers. Both kings, Pericles and Lear, succumb to madness which can only be cured by their daughters (*Per.* 5.1; *Lr.* 4.6). When Cordelia is finally recovered, Lear cannot trust his senses. He questions whether or not she is the real Cordelia and not a ghost when he asks, "you are a spirit, I know; [when] did you die?" (4.6.48).

Lear mirrors Pericles' disbelief when Pericles questions Marina: "but are you flesh and blood? / Have you a working pulse and are no fairy?" (5.1.145-46). Yet Marina is real and it is her life that enables Pericles' recovery from madness. Likewise, despite Lear's disbelief, Cordelia cannot be a "soul in bliss" (4.6.45) because it is crucial for his recovery that Cordelia is there physically by his side.

In her capacity as savior, Cordelia needs to be "real" for her emulation of Christ to be authentic. Christ's ultimate demonstration of love is the sacrifice of his body, symbolized by the Eucharist. Jesus took pains to demonstrate that he was not a ghost when he said to those who witnessed his resurrection "look at my hands and feet. It is myself! Touch me and see; a ghost does not have flesh and bones, as you see I have" (Luke 24:38-40). In order for Cordelia to save Lear from insanity, she must materialize as a body for the dual purpose of "revoking a curse and the rejoicing in love manifest in forgiveness" (Wittreich 27), thereby healing Lear and restoring the kingdom to its former glory.

Cordelia is expected to deliver humankind from the evil of Goneril and Regan, but also to heal Lear by forgiving him. Lear's human flaws were vanity, hubris and greed, all of which Goneril and Regan used against him. His exile unto the storming heath garners sympathy but what ultimately wins the reader over is the humanity Lear gains when he humbles himself before Cordelia. He atones for

his original sin when asks Cordelia to absolve and forgive him: “pray you now forget, and forgive; I am old and foolish” (4.6.84). Lear’s need for absolution from Cordelia projects a holy aura on to her.

As Lear is carried into Cordelia’s presence, soft music is called for in the stage directions (4.7). It seems as though the music soothes Lear’s storming. When the Doctor calls for “Louder the music there!” (4.7.24), the reviving of Thaisa (3.2.87-90) is recalled. Just as music had curative properties in Pericles, here it enables Lear’s physical recovery. But ultimately his recovery hangs on Lear’s confession to Cordelia. To be cured he must admit that he was wrong and that he is willing to atone for his treatment of her:

If you have poison for me, I will drink it.
I know you do not love me, for your sisters
Have (as I do remember) done me wrong:
You have some cause, they have not. (4.6.71-74)

She, as the benevolent savior, forgives him and turns the other cheek when she replies “no cause, no cause” (4.6.75).

Cordelia disappoints in the last scene of the play, revealing that she was only human after all. Lear

uses his failing powers to carry in his arms the child he has himself sacrificed, like an Abraham for whom there is no ram allowed in the thickets, to lay her on the ground and mourn for her, before he dies in the spiritual insight that her life and death have brought him. (Matthews 142)

Quickly, devastatingly, Lear’s perception of Cordelia is shattered when he and the other characters must face her humanity and her

mortality. Lear cannot give up and desperately demands that someone “lend me a looking-glass,/ If that her breath will mist or stain the stone,/ Why then she lives” (5.3.262-264). All hold their breath waiting for Cordelia to stir. This moment of suspense is prolonged, as Lear refuses to release her body and with it, hope: “this feather stirs, she lives! If it be so, /It is a chance which does redeem all sorrows/That ever I felt” (5.3.266-268). Lear wastes away his last breaths, persistently looking for signs that Cordelia still lives “do you see this? Look on her! Look her lips, / Look there, look there!” (5.3.311-312). Lear focuses his attention on Cordelia’s body, on the lips that once administered a healing kiss. Yet, no matter how desperately Lear tries to animate the body through language, resurrection is denied. His expectations for resurrection will not be fulfilled because, for one, this is not a Christian world, and secondly, Cordelia is not Christ, she is only the human daughter of a madman who was once king.

The last act of King Lear “consists of a relentlessly sustained splitting and cracking of the protagonists’ bodies, whether they belonged to the so-called good characters or to the bad” (Hillman 149). It is also the first time since Act I that all three sisters once again share the stage. The multiple broken bodies form a tableau of female corpses which are used to emphasize again, and for the last time, the difference between the virtuous woman and the vicious

woman. At Albany's grotesque request, servants are commanded to "produce the bodies, be they alive or dead" (5.3.231). The corpses of Goneril and Regan are dragged out as spectacles. The bodies are produced, but their faces are covered (5:3:243). This is in keeping with their linguistic dehumanization. Here, at the end of the play, their identities are being completely blanketed. These dead bodies are instructive instruments which serve as a warning to others against vicious behavior.

By contrast, Cordelia's body is revered. As Hillman notes, she is the only one who remains intact (Hillman 149). Upon seeing her body, Kent reacts by declaring "Is this the promis'd end?" (5.3. 263).

Throughout the play, his faith that Cordelia will save Lear and restore the kingdom has been unwavering. To see his savior dead in Lear's arms prompts him to wonder if it is a sign of the end of the world. Edgar replies, "Or the image of that horror?" (5.3.264). He wonders if the end of the world will mirror the sad scene before him.

As lofty as these notions of salvation and redemption might be, they rely heavily on the body. The survivors react with sadness and dismay to Cordelia's death and treat her body with reverence. Critics such as Hamilton have claimed that the difference between the treatment of Goneril and Regan's bodies, in contrast to Cordelia's, is that "we watching this bloody spectacle are, like Albany, moved to awe but not pity" (Hamilton 124). This is because they are portrayed as

vicious, according to the standards of their time, and therefore do not deserve to be mourned as Cordelia does. This refusal to mourn their bodies supports the argument that Goneril and Regan have become unhuman and solidifies the image of Cordelia as an ideal woman.

In Pericles, the restoration of ideal women to their husband or father resolves all issues so that the play ends happily. In King Lear, Cordelia cannot cross the boundaries between the living and the dead. She cannot redeem her father and bring salvation. Because of the resurrection denied Cordelia, the play, the kingdom and Lear's sanity cannot be restored. Macbeth is devoid altogether of any Marina/Cordelia figures. Instead, the world of Macbeth is one in which the bodies of women must disappear altogether to cleanse the kingdom of the evils that brought darkness and chaos to Scotland.

Chapter III

Bargain Bodies:

Supernatural Power and Female
Bodies in Macbeth

Bodies and ghosts are central to Macbeth. There is no shortage of female bodies, living and dead. Yet no female phantoms co-exist with the male ghosts and apparitions that inhabit the world of Macbeth. The restrictions on women become increasingly severe so that they eventually do not have a choice whether to live or die; they are completely denied existence in both the realms of the spiritual and the physical. This is not to say that the women have not attempted to create a place for themselves. In their attempts, the women use the only thing of value they have as leverage to strike a bargain with the beings who can empower them: their bodies. The pact seems harmless enough at first, but Lady Macbeth and the Weird Sisters are tricked into servitude: in order to gain power they must become vessels for power, and in order to be vessels, they must first be emptied of everything, including their femininity.

Power can only be gained on the condition that Lady Macbeth and the Weird Sisters violate their femininity by relinquishing their womanly traits. Only then the supernatural powers can be channeled through the hollow female bodies. However, dark, underworld beings are the masters of these powers and “in the world of the demonic pact, the devil, not the witch [is] in control” (Peters 127); control never resides with Lady Macbeth and the Weird Sisters. The truth of their servitude becomes apparent much too late, and the only way for these

women to free themselves of possession is to destroy the original bargaining tool, the body. Macbeth takes such pains to eliminate the qualities revered in the virtuous women of Pericles and King Lear and then goes one step further. By destroying the body of Lady Macbeth and by making the bodies of the Weird Sisters vanish, a physical resurrection is not only improbable, it is undesirable. These women would most likely bring about ruin rather than redemption should they be brought back from death. Only “none of woman born” (4.1.80) can restore the kingdom, such is the emphasis placed on removing any and all female bodies. In her madness, Lady Macbeth wonders what happened to the Thane of Fife’s wife (5.1.40). Macbeth may as well be the story of that wife; she represents all wives, witches, and women because they all come to the same terrible fate: total destruction. The only kind of “good” woman is a dead woman. To emphasize this, Lady Macduff is brutally murdered even though she is innocent.

When Macbeth and Banquo meet the Weird Sisters, their appearance causes confusion: Banquo muses “you should be women, / And yet your beards forbid me to interpret/ That you are so” (1.3.45-47). Their beards are a sure sign that a pact with evil had been made as “the beard was in Elizabethan times the recognized characteristic of the witch” (Spalding 99). This is the first sign that the Weird Sisters work for sinister spirits. Instead of asking to be made

more of a man on the inside, as Lady Macbeth will do, the Weird Sisters resemble men physically. In appearance and attitude, the Weird Sisters and Lady Macbeth could not be more different. However, they are “indirectly identified with each other by their departures from prescribed female subordination, by their parallel role as catalysts to Macbeth’s actions” (Neely 56), and they are unified by their relationships with Macbeth.

By way of their contracts in which their bodies were traded for power, however, all four main female characters can be identified as witches: “the Weird Sisters as ‘old’ witches, and Lady Macbeth as a ‘young’ one” (Shamas 40). The Weird Sisters appear answerable to no one and their only agenda seems to be to pursue mischief, yet this perception of the Weird Sisters could not be more wrong. Far from being all-powerful sorceresses, the Weird Sisters are mortal women at the mercy of higher beings who dole out miserly portions of power to their underlings.

The gritty, earth-bound qualities of the Weird Sisters’ powers reveal that they are “intended to be merely witches” (Spalding 105) rather than fantastical enchantresses like Circe or Medea or Sycorax in The Tempest. Rather than melt away into nothingness, they must “hover through fog and filthy air” (1.1. 12). There is no glamour associated with their powers. They go through the same elements as non-magical human beings and get just as grimy. Banquo does not

question whether or not they have the ability to perform magic: they clearly do. He qualifies these powers instead, identifying them as a brand of earth-magic: “the earth hath bubbles, as the water has, / And these are of them” (1.3.79-80). When the initial fear of their power fades, Macbeth addresses them as if they were not much more than old crones badly in need of a bath, calling them “secret, black and midnight hags!” (4.1.48). While Banquo shows more reserve, “there is quite enough in Banquo’s description to suggest neglect, squalor and misery” (Spalding 98). Both he and Macbeth paint a picture of the Weird Sisters that is earthly, muddy, black, neglected and decrepit. The strength of the Weird Sisters as witches is questionable as they fail to impress or astound. They appear to be little more than frail shells through which limited power can be funneled.

Typically, animal familiars are “given to the witch by the devil upon conclusion of their compact” (Shamas 66). These familiars shadow the witch. Even the familiars accompanying the Weird Sisters are, with perhaps one exception, unremarkable, common and earthy creatures just like their charges. The first is Graymalkin, a cat (1.1.8). The second, Paddock, is a toad (1.1.9). There is nothing unusual or awe-inspiring about these run of the mill familiars found in abundance in Elizabethan witch-lore: it was generally believed that “the witch would have an animal familiar, whether cat, ferret, toad or

bumblebee” (Peters 107). The familiar of the third Weird Sister cannot be identified with certainty. The creature’s name, Harpier (4.1.3), may be a clue that it is a harpy: a killer and a carrion eater like the vulture (Spalding 37). While this is a true creature of myth, it is a rather foul one. But Harpier may not be as exotic as Spalding suggests. As Muir notes, Harpier is most probably an owl, because “there are references to the owl before the three murders of Duncan, Banquo, and Lady Macduff” (Muir, *Macbeth*, 105 n35), and the owl was a recognizable symbol of Satan according to King James I (Shamas 66). If this collection of slimy, earthy and dirty demonic pets are gifts from the devil for service, the devil must not think highly of the Weird Sisters; the familiars do little if anything to enhance the Weird Sisters’ rag-tag reputation as they are standard familiars and nothing to marvel at.

The Weird Sisters lack glamour and finesse because they are limited witches. They are indebted to the one who gave them their power and what little potency they have must be earned through consistent service. They are not equals to the higher beings as their fear of Hecate in 3.5 indicate. Their bodies are used to channel evil, never to possess it in their own right. As vessels, they get only the power they are given, nothing more. For the ability to do little more than vanish into dirty air, the Weird Sisters bargained with their bodies, selling themselves to the devil cheap: Hecate’s promised spoils for service amount to nothing, as will be discussed later in this

chapter (Curry 6). They let Macbeth know they do not answer to him as they respond to his demand “speak, I charge you” (1.3.78) by disappearing. The Weird Sisters may not be accountable to Macbeth, but they certainly are to a higher being. Banquo very nearly hits the nail on the head when he says, “what! Can the Devil speak true?” (1.3.106), implying that the Devil speaks through the Weird Sisters. Banquo also warns that evil will always use trickery when he says to Macbeth: “to win us to our harm, / The instruments of Darkness tell us truths; / Win us with honest trifles, to betray’s/ In deepest consequence” (1.3.123-126). He identifies the role of the Weird Sisters as instruments of power and not as a source, belittling their grand prophecy into trifles. Banquo perceives that the Weird Sisters are merely “channels through which the malignity of evil spirits might be visited upon human beings” (Curry 6); they answer to the source, a higher being with formidable powers.

The Weird Sisters become even less powerful when “the bard undercuts their strength by presenting their Mistress Hecate” (Shamas 46). The wellspring of power is not the Devil as Banquo supposed; instead it is the underworld goddess Hecate. As the order of the evil hierarchy begins to unfold, it becomes clear that the Weird Sisters are at the bottom of it. As her subordinates, the Weird Sisters fear Hecate’s disapproval: “why, how now, Hecate? you look angrily,” they worry (3.5.1). The Weird Sisters and Hecate enter 3.5 to the cue

of thunder, which mirrors Hecate's foul mood and emphasizes the strength and terror of her magic. As "the mistress of [their] charms"(3.5.5), Hecate berates her servants but gives the Weird Sisters a chance to "make amends now"(3.5.14). After her threats are made, Hecate vanishes to the cue of song, distinguishing her exits from those of the Weird Sisters; she is above hovering in fog and filth and retreating into the bubbles of the earth. Anxious to please and to appease Hecate's wrath, the Weird Sisters jump on the opportunity to regain favor: they say, "come, let's make haste: she'll soon be back again" (3.5.36). They hasten to leave before Hecate's return, indicating that they are fearful of encountering Hecate once again until they have corrected their mistakes.

The Weird Sisters do not serve Hecate out of a true sense of loyalty. As we have just seen, they act out of fear for their master. Furthermore, they also serve for reward, although reward is pettier than the powers they receive. When Hecate is finally pleased, she praises the Weird Sisters and promises some kind of payment for services rendered: "o, well done! I commend your pains, / And every one shall i'the'gains"(4.1.39-40). Hecate has already shown how scary she can be when displeased in 3.5. The compensation for serving such an irascible master would have to be great to make it worth the risk. But the risk is not worth anything, as Hecate's promise is an empty one. Nothing can be gained by Macbeth's downfall, and it is

thus nothing that Hecate promises to split four ways. Knowing their greed and fear, promise of gain is enough to bribe the Weird Sisters and to ensure that they will obey Hecate's next set of commands. She orders them "now about the cauldron sing, / like elves and fairies in a ring, / Enchanting all that you put in"(4.1.41-43), thereby using them to do all the labor. They handle the filthy and necromantic ingredients that go into the hell-broth, so that Hecate can gain free labor while they gain nothing in her service.

Hecate proceeds to use the bodies of the Weird Sisters in a different way for the rest of 4.1. Their bodies are first used as bait to lure Macbeth. When he finds the Weird Sisters and demands that they answer his question, they hand him over on a silver platter to the more powerful spirits by tricking him. They ask him, "say, if thou'dst rather hear it from our mouths, / Or from our masters?" (4.1.62-63). Somewhere, off-stage, Hecate must be very pleased as Macbeth takes the bait for the second time by agreeing to meet the "very devils themselves, the masters of the witches and the sources of their evil power" (Spalding 106). Hecate then uses the Weird Sisters as mouthpieces for her dark army of spirits. An apparition is channeled through each Sister until, lastly, a show of eight kings appears. This royal parade is such grandiose magic that it requires the combined strength of all three Weird Sisters to project it successfully:

1 *Witch*. "Show!"

2 *Witch*. "Show!"

3 *Witch*. "Show!"

All. "Show his eyes, and grieve his heart;
Come like shadows, so depart." (4.1.107-111)

The "number three was always associated with [Hecate]—possibly because she ruled over the three elements of heaven, earth and hell" (Shamas 274). As a part of her association with the number three, it is within the scope of her power to divide herself into three, thereby possessing all of the Weird Sisters simultaneously.

Once the three apparitions and the vision of the kings depart, Macbeth demands to know more: "what! is this so?" (4.1.124), he asks echoing his response at their first meeting in 1.3.79. The Weird Sisters react once more by vanishing. The act of vanishing is different this time because music is cued right before it occurs (4.1.132). Music has so far been something particular to Hecate's exit at the end of 3.5. The sounds used cue the reader to Hecate's presence. For example, the thunder used in the cauldron scene, sounding before the first apparition (4.1.68) is also a noise associated with Hecate. In 1.1, before the Weird Sisters rush off because their familiars call, the thunder sounds. In 3.5, thunder is a result of Hecate's anger. It thus seems safe to assume that the thunder in 4.1 is a sign that Hecate is presiding over this meeting between the Weird Sisters and Macbeth. The repeated use of music and thunder confirms that the masters to whom the Weird Sisters refer in 4.1.62-63 are Hecate and her brood of evil spirits.

Witch 1's final speech further indicates Hecate's mastery. Her last words at 4.1.125-132 do not seem to be her own; they are too rhetorically marked to be hers. Up to this point there is a

difference in the meter between the Weird Sisters and Hecate [that] is significant: What is more, the meter of these speeches of Hecate – dull, mechanical, regular, touched with favor and prettiness, is in striking and almost amusing contrast with the grotesqueness, the freedom, the bold roughness of colloquies and incantations of the weird sisters. (Shamas 47)

Witch 1's use of more elegant, regularly metered language would suggest that not only has Hecate been presiding over the whole affair, but that she is capable of possessing the body of this Witch completely so that she can speak through her.

Witch 1's words (4.1.125) are the last lines uttered by any of the Weird Sisters in Macbeth. They never return to the stage; there is no need for them to. They have accomplished what their master had wanted, which was to lure Macbeth into believing himself invincible. The reader cannot know if they live on or displease Hecate enough for her to decide to destroy them. One thing can be certain: Hecate is the one with whom they struck a bargain and their physical presence is entirely dependent on her pleasure or need. They have fulfilled their role and served Hecate's purposes. Even though they are witches, their power has done them little good and their bodies have no place in the text once their purpose is accomplished. In this respect, they resemble all the other women in the play, including Lady Macbeth.

Shortly after meeting the Witches for the first time, the reader encounters a contrasting woman: Lady Macbeth. Lady Macbeth is strong, resilient and warrior-like. She is presented as nothing less than Macbeth's "partner in greatness" (1.5.11) and as the goddess of war: before his first appearance, Macbeth is referred to as "Bellona's bridegroom" (1.2.55). Far from being equals then, Macbeth seems to be her inferior as he is identified through his relationship with Lady Macbeth. In a reversal of roles, it is she who is identified as the warrior (Blits 44). We believe in Lady Macbeth's strength as she appears to be made up of only fiery courage like her divine counterpart, Bellona. After all she is the one who initiates the murder by devising the plan to murder Duncan (1.762-73).

Although Lady Macbeth inspires a comparison to the goddess of war, she does not regard herself or her sex as godly. None of the other characters, least of all Macbeth, has proclaimed women to be weaker. It is Lady Macbeth who makes the initial judgement of her sex and finds women deficient. The moment of judgement coincides with the moment she begins to bargain her body for power. She says:

Come, you Spirits
 That tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here,
 And fill me, from the crown to the toes, top-full
 Of direst cruelty! Make thick my blood,
 Stop up th'access and passage to remorse;
 That no compunctious visitings of Nature
 Shake my fell purpose, nor keep peace between
 Th'effect and it! Come to my woman's breasts,
 And take my milk for gall, you murth'ring ministers,
 Wherever in your sightless substances

You wait on Nature's mischief. (1.5.40-50)

This speech is full of bodily language. Lady Macbeth wishes to be altered "crown to toe" (1.5. 42) so that no part of her body will go untouched, making this as much a physical unsexing as a spiritual one. She bares her skin by offering the spirits her "woman's breasts" (1.5.47) to suckle, feeding them milk soured into gall. The act of inviting the spirits to feed at her breasts is something the Weird Sisters might do since it was believed that witches suckled their familiars as part of a blood sacrifice to the devil (Johnstone 15). Thus the suckling of the spirits makes it seem like Lady Macbeth is finalizing a pact with the devil. By offering her body for use, she is agreeing to

the absolute and voluntary barter of the body and soul to the Evil One, for the purpose of obtaining a few short years of superhuman power, to be employed for the gratification of the culprit's avarice, ambition, or desire for revenge. (Spalding 82)

Lady Macbeth does not have a positive opinion of her own sex. She believes that being a woman is synonymous with "lack of courage and foolish, unrealistic responses to a challenge" (Dash 185). Lady Macbeth wishes to destroy the qualities she believes prevent women from harnessing the power of a fierce goddess like Bellona to such an extent that she wishes to be unsexed. The limited picture of womanhood that Lady Macbeth has does not allow women to be multifaceted; they cannot be nurturing mothers, daughters and wives

while simultaneously being strong and courageous just as Marina and Cordelia have been. For Lady Macbeth, cruelty, remorselessness and murderous intent are opposed to femininity and they cannot exist as long as her feminine virtues remain in place. In this way she recalls the transformations of Goneril and Regan from women to beasts. From the moment Lady Macbeth makes a pact with the spirits to kill the woman in her, she identifies herself as a witch. As Spalding writes, individuals become witches by “invocation or conjuration of any evil or wicked spirit” (Spalding 117), which as we have seen, Lady Macbeth has done. The birth of such a woman heralds “characters of another kind, who bear the form without the nature of women” (Spalding 144). It is at this moment, when Lady Macbeth becomes a woman in appearance only, when she has been unsexed from the inside, that she becomes “the fourth witch of the play” (Wills 79).

Becoming unwomanly fulfills Lady Macbeth’s initial desire. Perhaps becoming too sure of herself, she goes a step further and endeavors to lose her humanity as well. Bragging about how cruel and unmerciful her unsexing made her, she declares that she would not hesitate to murder her children at the first sign of weakness:

I have given suck, and know
 How tender ’tis to love the babe that milks me:
 I would, while it was smiling in my face,
 Have pluck’d my nipple from his boneless gums,
 And dash’d the brains out, had I so sworn
 As you have done this. (1.7.54-59)

Moreover, by pouring metal into her very soul, as if it were a mould, she forges her body into a weapon. In this dehumanizing attempt she parallels the effect caused by the beards on the Weird Sisters and the transformations of Goneril and Regan into beasts. Whether being transformed into one thing or another, the bodies of these women are altered as a mark of how far they have strayed from concepts of the ideal woman.

This metallic transformation is a moment of great pride for Lady Macbeth. She achieves her objective with this speech, earning Macbeth's approval. When he says, "bring forth men-children only/ For thy undaunted mettle should compose/ Nothing but males" (1.6.73-75), he makes it clear that he is pleased with her. She perverts concepts of motherhood through the "unnatural abrogation of her maternal function" (Adelman, "Born of Woman" 57). Her words are alchemical, turning the pun about her mettle into a reality and suggesting she is truly made of metal. Lady Macbeth is claiming that while she might not appear to be a warrior, she does not need to wear armor or carry a sword: her body itself is her armor. She yearns to be warrior, to be Bellona incarnate. As a warrior, Lady Macbeth is a far cry from the merciful, redeeming figures of Thaisa, Marina, and Cordelia who represent ultimate forgiveness. She is an entirely different kind of woman modeled after a fallen angel rather than the Virgin Mary or Christ, bringing about darkness and death instead of

peace and restoration. Her unsexing “seems to challenge the witches’ exclusive right to the title instruments of darkness” (Dash 162).

The spirits Lady Macbeth summoned and unleashed on her body are not only powerful, but also of the blackest kind. As a result, she inhabits a world of her own: Lady Macbeth is neither a woman nor is she Bellona reincarnated. The effects are also irreversible; in summoning the spirits and allowing them to feed from her, Lady Macbeth becomes answerable to their mistress who does not lend out her spirits for free. Little does Lady Macbeth realize that the mistress of all the dark spirits in Macbeth is Hecate and that “once Hecate has been addressed in prayer there is no return to normal living” (Shamas 40). The pact is irreversible. Whether or not she intended to be a witch, Lady Macbeth made a pact, trading her body for power when she asked to be unsexed, and this is not something the spirits intend to forget.

Dionyza, Goneril, and Regan serve as reminders of the fate that awaits Lady Macbeth. Lady Macbeth willingly hands over her body and soul to the spirits, believing that if they drive out her female characteristics, pity and remorse could never take root again. Without these feelings, she would be free to murder and do whatever else it might take for her to ensure Macbeth obtained his kingship. What she failed to realize is that even the greatest warriors have feelings and experience regret. Macduff is an example of such a man. He defends

emotion as the human side of manhood when he reacts to the murder of his family. He says “but I must also feel it as a man:/ I cannot but remember such things were,/ That were most precious to me” (4.3.221-223). The error Lady Macbeth made—believing that warriors are unfeeling— cost her mind, body and soul.

Lady Macbeth’s behavior in 5.1 seems to be the result of reflection during her absence from the stage since 3.4. She is very different from the Bellona-like woman first presented. She is unsure of herself, scattered, and vulnerable. For example, in 2.2.55, she takes charge of the situation by taking the daggers from Macbeth and smearing Duncan’s blood on the grooms. It is her presence of mind that saves them when Macbeth is fixed to the spot looking at his bloody hands. Only when Lady Macbeth assures him that “a little water clears us of this deed” (2.2.66) and urges him to put on his nightgown, can he behave according to plan. All of her composure is lost in 5.1. There she is unable to wash her hands clean of Duncan’s blood. In her madness she says: “here’s the smell of the blood still: all/ the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand./ Oh! oh! oh!” (5.1.47-49). In 5.1 the spirits decide to collect what they were promised, asking Lady Macbeth to surrender her body. This seems to scare her and her guilt sets in. The spirits wish to possess her and to “deprive [Lady Macbeth] of all self-control, and render [her] a mere automaton under the command of the fiends” (Spalding 61), using her

body for their purposes. It is only right that the spirits should expect payment in full as they have honored their part of the deal: Lady Macbeth successfully earned the praise of her husband and helped him steal a kingdom. Lady Macbeth wanted to be like an empty vessel to be possessed and empowered. Now that she has got what she wanted, she does not want to give up the body with which she bartered. Rather than be quietly possessed, she struggles.

Lady Macbeth did not value her body. First, by selling it to a devil as earlier indicated. Secondly, Lady Macbeth required that her humanity be hardened by cold, rigid metal. Nothing of this sort could have been done to her body had she not asked for it. In 5.1, Lady Macbeth has lost control of her body. Like most women who make pacts with the devil, she was able to choose the “victim of her maleficium, but in her relations with the supernatural she was under control of the male devil” (Peters 127). Macbeth observes the tradition in the context of witchcraft and sorcery of using the name of Hecate interchangeably with that of Satan (Spalding 126). In Macbeth, the male devil is replaced with the female devil – Hecate –, but the result is the same. Lady Macbeth, like the Weird Sisters, has lost the right to her body. When Lady Macbeth appears naked, the reader is being asked to pay close attention to the body. Her eyes may be open but the Doctor tells the Gentlewoman that “their sense are shut” (5.1.24). By stripping Lady Macbeth of her clothing and her senses, she

becomes all body, a vacant vessel; this is what the spirits and their master Hecate demand as payment.

Believing her ailment is beyond his ability to cure, the Doctor claims “more needs she the divine than the physician” (5:1:71). The Doctor’s diagnosis reveals that he believes Lady Macbeth’s symptoms are indicative of demonic possession. The reader/audience in “Shakespeare’s age would undoubtedly have pronounced Lady Macbeth’s sleep-walking an instance of demonical somnambulism” (Curry 29). It is the price the body pays for the transgressions of the spirit (Neely 47). In Elizabethan exorcisms, the holy flame of piety was used by priests to dispel evil spirits (Spalding 79). Lady Macbeth is not prepared to just hand her body over, instead, she does put up a fight by requesting that “she has light by her continually” (5.1.21). The taper is a symbol of the holy flame. It is Lady Macbeth’s attempt to dispel the darkness that has spread throughout the play. It represents her yearning for divine grace through absolution.

There is no way for Lady Macbeth to wash her hands of accountability even though she tries when she cries “out, damned spot! out I say!” (5.1.33). Unwilling to witness or cause more death, Lady Macbeth summons up what is left of her courage, showing the reader that a little bit of Bellona’s spirit in her has survived. Rather than allow the spirits to possess her completely, she destroys her body by committing suicide.

Lady Macbeth's death is associated with pain, as we know from the sound heard on stage at the moment of her death: "wherefore was that cry?" (5.5.15). The cry indicates that "Lady Macbeth has not died a natural death" (Muir 138). Her death takes place off-stage like the deaths of Lady Macduff, Goneril, Regan, Cordelia and the fictional death of Marina. In Pericles the "good" female bodies are resurrected, as is the case with Thaisa and Marina. In the case of Cordelia, the failed resurrection is the cause of the tragedy in King Lear. Resurrection is not in the stars for Lady Macbeth. Not only would it be unexpected, it would be undesirable. A physical resurrection for Lady Macbeth would mean her return to a body possessed by evil spirits. Such a female body cannot restore Scotland nor can it absolve Macbeth of his sins. Her body cannot be treated in the same way as the "good" female bodies.

However, she is held a notch above the "bad" female bodies of Antiochus' daughter, Dionyza, Goneril and Regan through Macbeth's association of light and Lady Macbeth. Macbeth reacts to his wife's death with the words: "out, out, brief candle!" (5.5.23), echoing her last request for a taper. Nothing has phased Macbeth since Duncan's murder. He is only sorry about Banquo's death because the ghost appears, but he never shows remorse for any of the other deaths. This brief comment about his wife is all that Macbeth seems to be emotionally capable of in his advanced state of madness, and while it

is not much, it is something. In the darkness that has engulfed the world of Macbeth, perhaps her presence was to Macbeth what the taper was to her: the only remaining source of light. This makes Lady Macbeth stand apart from the other bodies: none of them are ever paid this kind of compliment. Lady Macbeth goes to her death repentant and brave through her self-sacrifice. While this is not enough to earn her a place among the saintly, good women whose bodies are permitted to return to the stage, she is granted one small but significant grace. Unlike Banquo, whose spirit cannot seem to rest, Lady Macbeth never reappears as a ghost. Such supernatural phenomena would indicate that Lady Macbeth had been unable to break the demonic pact as it was commonly believed that “ghosts are diabolical” (Spalding 61) and the work of the devil. It is a bittersweet victory for Lady Macbeth.

The effects of darkness are not limited to Lady Macbeth’s body and soul. Darkness and unnatural events occur all over Scotland because the dark spirits and Hecate have been summoned and they are not content just to possess a few bodies. Hecate is referred to as “black Hecate” (3.2.41). This “is not a literal reference to the witch-queen of the *dramatic personae* but instead to the Ovidian association of Hecate Nox, so that Hecate becomes imagistically synonymous with Night” (Shamas 41). Through Lady Macbeth’s incantation, Hecate is invited from the underworld to take her place in the world of Macbeth:

Come, thick Night,
 And pall thee in the dunnest smoke of Hell
 That my knife see not the wound it makes,
 Nor Heaven peep through the blanket of the dark,
 To cry, 'Hold, hold!' (1.5.50-54)

Lady Macbeth summons Hecate when she summons Night and asks her to cloak the world and hide her sins from the powers of Heaven. The effect is almost immediate. The animals have become cannibalistic: horses “eat each other” (2.4.19). Even the course of the sun is altered so that “the night is long that never finds the day” (4.3.240), literally making the world of Macbeth an eternal night. The spirits have exceeded expectation in carrying out their end of the bargain so much so that they exceed the control of their summoner, Lady Macbeth, by snuffing any remaining light they can find.

The evil spirits do not stop causing strife even after turning Scotland into an underworld through the spread of darkness. Pursuing the guilty and innocent alike, the malignant powers extend themselves into “both the cosmos and the family” in their search for other female bodies (Sinfield 57). They search and find their next victims within the family unit. Although her part is small, Lady Macduff's is significant. She is a woman and suffers the fate of all women in Macbeth when she is murdered. She and Lady Macbeth have often been interpreted as “direct opposites—one conspiratorial, the other open, and honest” (Dash 195). Even as the opposite of Lady

Macbeth's unsexed character, as a woman, Lady Macduff cannot be allowed to live and is killed at the end of 4.2.

The only woman who can survive this play is Hecate; however she is not really a woman. Hecate is traditionally female, and other characters refer to her as such, but Hecate cannot be treated like the other female bodies. The bodies of spirits or gods were believed to be "composed not of fleshy matter but spiritual, such as air or fire" (Weyer 174). As an element she is ultimately sexless although she chooses to appear as a female. She is untouchable as an immortal and as a sexless spirit. Even so, the play limits her. She has demonstrated, as a "goddess associated with ghosts, black magic and crossroads" (Littleton 161) the ability to bring forth apparitions, command thunder, and summon the dead.

Hecate summons the dead when she makes Banquo appear and tell the future by showing Macbeth the line of kings to come. Although she possesses authentic supernatural powers, Hecate obeys the intrinsic guidelines of the play and cannot even conjure a female spirit. This is seen in the absence of Mary Queen of Scots from the pageant. The pageant is supposed to glorify James I's lineage and it is incomplete without Mary. By "omitting all mention of Mary, Queen of Scots" (Muir, Macbeth 114) from James I's line Hecate is not strong enough to create a place for women in Macbeth; they cannot exist

bodily nor can they exist as ghosts even when a female goddess is calling the shots.

Lady Macbeth and the Weird Sisters bring with them murder, chaos, and a world of night. They enter into bargains with dark beings, bartering their bodies for power. These exchanges lead to lives of servitude for the Weird Sisters and prove fatal for Lady Macbeth. The deaths of witches were often justified through the belief that since “witches were the cause of so much evil their extinction, it was argued, would make the world into a more prosperous and happy place” (Macfarlane 230). If all women in Macbeth were like Lady Macbeth and the Weird Sisters, who engage in sorcerous practices, then their deaths would be warranted. All sense of justice is lost, however, when Lady Macduff’s role is considered. Her death only serves to “further emphasizes women’s powerlessness” (Dash 207). Whether a woman is a virtuous woman or a vicious woman, Macbeth does not make a distinction between the two. Lady Macbeth’s question regarding the Thane of Fife’s wife: “where is she now?” (5.1.41) is a question that can be directed at all of Macbeth’s women who vanish one by one from the text until there are none left.

Bibliography

Adeleman, Janet. "Masculine Authority and the Maternal Body": The Return To Origins in Pericles. " Pericles Critical Essays. Ed. David Skeele. New York: Garland Publishing, 200. 184-190.

—. Suffocating Mothers, Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays. London: Routledge, 1992.

—. "Born of Woman: Fantasies of Maternal Power in Macbeth." Macbeth: Contemporary Critical Essays. Ed. Alan Sinfield. Houndsmills: Macmillan Publishers, 1992. 53-69.

Alfar, Christina Léon. Fantasies of Female Evil. London: Associated University Press, 2003.

Berry, Philippa. Shakespeare's Feminine Endings, Disfiguring Death in the Tragedies. London; New York: Routledge, 1999.

Bishop, T.G. Shakespeare and the Theater of Wonder. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Blits, Jan H. The Insufficiency of Virtue: Macbeth and the Natural Order. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1996.

Bristol, Michael D. Carnival and the Theater. New York: Methuen Inc., 1985.

Brown, Meg Lota and Kari Boyd McBride. Women's Roles in the Renaissance. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2005.

Busse, Claire M. "Profitable Children: Children as Commodities in Early Modern England." Domestic Arrangements in Early Modern England. Ed. Kari Boyd McBride. Pittsburgh: Dusquesne University Press, 2002. 209-243.

Chamberlain, Stephanie. "She is herself a dowry, King Lear and the Problem Of Profitable Children: Children as Commodities in Early Modern England." Domestic Arrangements in Early Modern England. Ed. Kari Boyd McBride. Pittsburg: Dusquesne University Press, 2002. 209-243.

Coe, Charles Norton. Demi-Devils: The Character of Shakespeare's Villans. New York: Bookman AssociatesInc., 1965.

- Cooper, Helen. "Pericles and Other Gowers." A Companion to Gower. Ed. Siân Echard. Cambridge: D.S. Brewster, 204. 99-113.
- Curry, Walter Clyde. The Demonic Metaphysics of Macbeth. Chapel Hill, 1993.
- Dash, Irene G. Women's Worlds in Shakespeare's Plays. London: Associated University Press, 1997.
- Duncan Baird Publishers. Mythology: The Illustrated Anthology of World Myth and Storytelling. Ed. C. Scott Littleton. London: Duncan Baird Publishers, 2002.
- Frey, Charles. "O sacred, shadowy, cold and constant queen" Shakespeare's Imperiled and Chastening Daughters of Romance." The Woman's Part. Ed. Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz, Gayle Greene and Carolyn Thomas Neely. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1983. 295-313.
- Hamilton, Sharon. Shakespeare's Daughters. London: MacFarland, 2003.
- Hays, Michael L. Shakespearean Tragedy as Chivalric Romance. New York: D.S. Brewer, 2003.
- Henderson, Katherine Usher and Barbara F. McManus. Half Humankind. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1985.
- Hillman, David. Shakespeare's Entrails: Belief, Scepticism and the Interior of the Body. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Hull, Suzanne W. Chaste, Silent & Obedient: English Books for Women 1475-1640. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1982.
- . Women According to Men, The World of Tudor-Stewart Women. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 1996.
- Johnstone, Nathan. The Devil and Demonism in Early Modern England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Macfarlane, Alan. Witchcraft in Tudor and Styart England. London: Routledge, 1970.

- Mann, David. Shakespeare's Women. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Matthews, Honor. Character and Symbol in Shakespeare's Plays. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.
- McMahon, Vanessa. Murder in Shakespeare's England. London: Hambledon and London, 2004.
- Muir, Kenneth. The Great Tragedies: Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth. Essex: Longman Group LTD, 1966.
- Neely, Carol Thomas. Distracted Subjects: Madness and Gender in Shakespeare and Early Modern Culture. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for None and All. Trans. Walter Kaufman. New York: Penguin Group, 1966.
- Novy, Marianne. "Multiple Parenting in Shakespeare's Romances." Domestic Arrangements in Early Modern England. Ed. Kari Boyd McBride. Pittsburg: Dusquesne University Press, 2002. 188-208.
- Peters, Christine. Women in Early Modern Britain. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Pitt, Angela. Shakespeare's Women. New Jersey: David & Charles, 1981.
- Quilligan, Maureen. Incest and Agency in Elizabeth's England. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.
- Rich, Barnabe. The Excellencie of Good Women. London: Thomas Dawson, 1613. Early English Books on line. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1999 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>
- . The Honestie of this Age. London: For T.A., 1615. Early English Books on line. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1999 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>
- Sacks, Elizabeth. Shakespeare's Images of Pregnancy. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.
- "Introduction." Shakespeare, William. Pericles. Ed. Suzanne Gosset. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2004. 1-163.

- . Macbeth. Ed. Kenneth Muir. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2005.
- . Pericles, Prince of Tyre. Ed. Suzanne Gosset. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2004.
- . The Riverside Shakespeare. Ed. G. Blackmore Evans. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Shamas, Laura. "We Three" The Mythology of Shakespeare's Weird Sisters. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2007.
- Skeele, David. Thwarting the Wayward Seas: A Critical and Theatrical History of Shakespeare's Pericles in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. London: Associated University Press, 1998.
- Sokol, J. and Mary Sokol. Shakespeare, Law and Marriage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Spalding, Thomas Alfred. Elizabethan Demonology. London: The Folcroft Press, 1880.
- Taylor, Mark. Shakespeare's Darker Purpose a Question of Incest. New York: AMS Press Inc., 1939.
- Thomas, Keith. Religion and the Decline of Magic. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- The True Chronicle History of King Lear. Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1605. Early English books online. Chadwyck-Healey, 1994
<<http://lion.chadwyck.com>>
- Vives, Juan Luis. The Instruction of a Christen Woman. Ed. Virginia Walcott Beauchamp, Elizabeth H. Hageman and Margaret Mikesell. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002.
- Weyer, Johann. Witches, Devils and Doctors in the Renaissance. New York: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1991.
- Wills, Gary. Witches and Jesuits: Shakespeare's Macbeth. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Wittreich, Joseph. "Image of that Horror": History, Prophecy, and Apocalypse in King Lear. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1984.

Woodbridge, Linda. Women in the English Renaissance. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1945.