

Making Other People Work:
Appropriations of Speech and Spectacle in Measure for Measure

By
Michael Jeremy Mandiberg

Thesis Advisor: Professor William Keach

Second Reader: Professor Stephen Foley

Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts
In the Honors Program in the Department of English
At Brown University

March 17, 2000

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis.

I authorize Brown University to lend this thesis to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

I further authorize Brown University to reproduce this thesis by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose
of
scholarly research.

Brown University requires the signatures of all persons using or photocopying this thesis.
Please sign below, and give address and date.

Introduction

Measure for Measure has been a popular play in recent Shakespeare studies, particularly among Feminist, New Historicist, and Psychoanalytic Critics, and Queer Theorists, because of its focus on power and sexuality.¹ These critics have analyzed the play's construction of authority and how it impinges on the disempowered, especially women. Many of these essays consider the importance of speech², but few consider the role of the visual³, and none consider the interrelationship of the two within the deployment of power in the play.

There are three important points of reference to an investigation of visibility and its interrelation with speech in the play: recent New Historicist analysis of power and spectacle on stage and in court, contemporary scientific theories of vision, and the disguised ruler plot. In his book *The Illusion of Power*, Stephen Orgel details the role of spectacle in court masques of Kings James and Charles.⁴ Orgel describes how these royal spectacles create and secure power on both sides of the proscenium arch: on stage through classical symbolism and acting, in the seating by creating a hierarchy of

¹ For examples of feminist criticism which inform my argument see, Kathleen McLuskie, "The patriarchal bard: feminist criticism and Shakespeare: *King Lear* and *Measure for Measure*," *Political Shakespeare*, eds. J. Dollimore, and A. Sinfield Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985. For examples of Cultural Materialist and New Historical Criticism which inform my argument see, Jonathan Dollimore, "Transgression and surveillance in *Measure for Measure*," *Political Shakespeare*, eds. J. Dollimore, and A. Sinfield, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985; Leonard Tennenhouse, "Representing Power: *Measure for Measure* in its Time," *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*, S. Greenblatt, ed. Norman, Oklahoma: Pilgrim Books, 1982. For a Psychoanalytic analysis of male power in the play, see Janet Adelman, "Marriage and the Maternal Body: On Marriage as the End of Comedy in *All's Well That Ends Well* and *Measure for Measure*," *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to The Tempest*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

² See for example, Alberto Cacicedo, "'She is fast my wife': Sex, Marriage, and Ducal Authority in *Measure for Measure*," *Shakespeare Studies*, 1995, 23, 187-209; Amy Lechter-Siegel, "Isabella's Silence: The Consolidation of Power in *Measure for Measure*," *Reconsidering the Renaissance*, Mario A. Di Cesare, ed., Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1992, 371-380; Marcia Riefer, "'Instruments of Some More Mightier Member': The Constriction of Female Power in *Measure for Measure*," *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Volume 35, Issue 2 (Summer, 1984): 157-169

³ See for example, Carolyn E. Brown, "The Wooing of Duke Vincentio and Isabella of *Measure for Measure*: 'The Image of it Gives [Them] Content,'" *Shakespeare Studies*, 1994, 22, 189-219.

⁴ Stephen Orgel, *The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

importance based on proximity to the king's privileged vantage point on the perspectival set, and in the well lit audience, which watched the King and themselves, (the court,) watching the play as much as they watched the action on stage. His analysis empowers both seeing and being seen, describing them as active looking and showing. The king's act of showing — his ideas on stage, himself in the audience — is an important source of his power. Equally important is his own perfect perspectival looking, and the almost perfect looking of those seated near him, as it is a way of including others in the spectacle while insuring they are not fully empowered with the king's perfect vision.

In my analysis I will parallel Orgel's model with the model of visual power in *Measure for Measure*. I will equate the Duke's invisible gaze with James' perfect perspective; I will parallel James' spectacle in the audience and on stage with the Duke's royal spectacles in the play and, problematically, with the disempowered spectacles of legal punishment; finally, I will equate the middle position of the people in James' audience who see the same play, but not as perfectly, with Shakespeare's audience, who see the same play as the Duke, but not invisibly. It is this overlooked middle visual position which will aide in the final explanation of the mechanics of power in the play.

A similar equality between the power of looking and the power of being seen can be found in the scientific conception of vision. At the turn of the Sixteenth century scientific notions of vision were split between two unchallenged ancient theories termed extromission and intromission. As David Lindberg argues in his book, *Theories of Vision: From Al-Kindi to Kepler*, these two theories remained of fairly equal weight from their articulation in the late First Millennium until Kepler wrote on vision in 1604.⁵ Argued by Al-Kindi and Pecham, extromission held that the eye sends out rays which determine how a scene looks. Intromission, which was argued by Alhazen and is closer to our notion of vision, held that the objects sent rays into the eye, which forms a picture

⁵ David C. Lindberg, *Theories of vision: From Al-Kindi to Kepler*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976. See also, Nicholas J. Wade, *A Natural History of Vision*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1998, esp. 11-28.

of how a scene looks. The Biblical source for the play's title speaks in Extromissive visual terms. In the Sermon on the Mount, Christ says,

Judge not, that ye be not iudged. For with what iudgement ye iudge, ye shalbe iudged, and with what measure ye mete, it shalbe measured to you again. And why seest thou the mote that is in thy brothers eye, and perceivest not the beame that is in thine own eye?... Hypocrite, first caste out that beame out of thine owne eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.⁶

Kepler argued for a more modern version of Intromission as one of his side points in his treatise *Astronomia pars Optica* ("The Optical Part of Astronomy,") which was published in 1604, the same year *Measure For Measure* was performed. Arguing that the supposed flourishing of experimental Renaissance thought was more supposed than actual, Lindberg shows how the three centuries between Pecham and Kepler saw only reprintings and recapitulations of the previous debate. It seems fair to assume that Shakespeare, and the audience for which the play was written, did not have access to the treatise which had just been published in Prague. Thus Shakespeare and his audience would have a scientific notion of vision that corresponds to Orgel's analysis of vision, where both looking and being looked at could both be active: seeing and showing.

The disguised ruler plot is a central feature of *Measure for Measure*. As Lever points out, the plot resonates with the story recounted in George Whetstone's *A Mirrour for Magistrates of Cities* (1584) of the Roman emperor Alexander Severus' disguised reconnaissance on his state.⁷ It also relates to stories of the recently crowned King James' unsuccessful secret visit to the Exchange.⁸ As Leonard Tennenhouse has pointed out, *Measure for Measure* was one of several other plays with a disguised ruler in its plot published between 1604 and 1606.⁹ As the disguised ruler plot manifests itself in *Measure for Measure*, there is a split focus between the power of seeing and the power of

⁶ Matthew, 7:1-3, 5, The Geneva Bible, 1602, ed. Gerald T. Sheppard, New York: Pilgrim, 1989.

⁷ Lever, "The Disguised Ruler," xlv-li.

⁸ Lever, xxxiii-xxxv

⁹ Tennenhouse, 140. He cites Middleton's *The Phoenix*, Marston's *The Malcontent*, and *The Fawn*, Day's *Law Tricks*, Dekker and Webster's *Westward Ho!*, Dekker's *Honest Whore II*, the anonymous *London Prodigal* and Sharpham's *The Fleire*.

showing, or reappearing. Where Orgel and the scientific theories focus on a balance between two equal positions of visual exchange, the disguised ruler plot introduces a third: invisibility. In *Measure for Measure* there is a split focus between being seen (the Duke's reappearance, and the shame of the paraded prisoners) and seeing (on stage, and in the audience), and the ultimate power of the Duke's seeing *without being seen*.

Parallel to these analyses of vision is the history of critical debate over the role of silence in the play, particularly Isabella's silence at the end of the last scene. Isabella's silence has been a central scholarly subject, especially since John Barton's 1970 Royal Shakespeare Company production where Isabella silently refused the Duke's proposal and walked off the stage.¹⁰ Carolyn Asp has followed this assertion that the silence is to be seen as a form of resistance. She argues that Isabella's "silence to his proposal must not be taken as assent, but perhaps as just the opposite, a more of power and independence, a stepping out of the circuit of desire."¹¹ Jerald W. Spotswood takes up a similar bent. He argues from Foucault that "We must come to view silence not merely as an act of submission, but, as Michel Foucault urges, as a tactical element within discourse."¹² He continues his argument through Lyotard, arguing that silence is a subversive "negative phrase,"¹³ where "she turns to silence to phrase her discontent."¹⁴

In opposition to reclaiming Isabella's silence as resistance, Jean Howard argues that Isabella's silence is a submission to male power, however distasteful such a submission may be to late 20th (or early 21st) century tastes. She points out how the male characters in the play at times "refuse to be pawns in someone else's tidy playscript,"

¹⁰ Lamb, p. 129.

¹¹ Carolyn Asp, "Desire, the Gaze and the Woman in *Measure for Measure*," *Shakespeare Newsletter*, 1984, 34, 40.

¹² Jerald W. Spotswood, "Isabella's 'Speechless Dialect': Subversive Silence in *Measure for Measure*," *Explorations in Renaissance Culture*. 1994, 20, 111-112.

¹³ Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Différend: Phrases in Dispute*. Trans. George Van Den Abbeele. *Theory and History of Literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press: 1988, p 13, in Spotswood, p 112.

¹⁴ Spotswood, p. 115.

while Mariana and Isabella never offer such resistance.¹⁵ Marcia Reifer takes this analysis one step further, to describe the play's silencing of Isabella as "Isabella's tragedy"¹⁶. As she says,

In the course of the play, Isabella changes from an articulate, compassionate woman during her first encounter with Angelo (II.ii), to a stunned, angry, defensive woman in her later confrontations with Angelo and with her imprisoned brother (II.iv and III.i), to, finally, a shadow of her former articulate self, on her knees before male authority in Act V. As the last and one of the most problematic of the pre-romance comedies, *Measure for Measure* traces Isabella's gradual loss of autonomy.¹⁷

Reifer concludes her description of Isabella's silencing with an analysis of act five. As she says of the last moments of the play, Isabella "remains speechless, a baffled actress who has run out of lines. The gradual loss of her personal voice has become, finally, a literal loss of voice."¹⁸ Amy Lechter-Segal has also advanced a reading of Isabella's silence based around Reifer's analysis, which updates the argument aligning James' rhetoric in the Basilicon Doron with the Duke's rhetoric in the play to include Isabella's silencing.¹⁹ In my analysis, I will follow Reifer's analysis, to show that the progressive silencing of Isabella is not limited to her, and is linked to a parallel progression of making her visible to the royal and public gaze.

In *Measure for Measure* the teleological investigation into power centers on the progression from a balanced belief in the power of seeing and showing, to an imbalanced belief in the power of looking and the disempowerment of being looked at. Because of this development, part of my analysis will follow the establishment of the themes, through their manipulation, to the play's thematic resolution. This conflict between Isabella's sovereignty, and male visual and verbal power crystallizes in four moments in

¹⁵ Jean E. Howard, "Measure of Measure and the Restraints of Convention," *Essays in Literature*, 1983, 10, 151-152.

¹⁶ Reifer, p. 167.

¹⁷ Reifer, p. 158.

¹⁸ Reifer, p. 167.

¹⁹ Lechter-Seigel, Amy. Isabella's Silence: The Consolidation of Power in *Measure for Measure*," *Reconsidering the Renaissance*, Mario A Di Cesare, ed., Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1992, 371-380.

the play. In I.i., male power is introduced in joined visual and verbal terms through the stamp metaphor; in I.iv. the feminine space of the cloister is introduced in explicitly separated visual and verbal terms; in II.i. and II.iv. Isabella joins the visual and verbal in her petition to Angelo, and is silenced *by* Angelo; in the final scene she silences herself before the Duke, completing the process of her own submission to male power. Isabella is made a silent spectacle, while the Duke becomes an invisible voice.

As an invisible voice, the Duke is an author. William Empson has described the Duke's "brutal flippancy," describing his way of treating "his subjects as puppets for the fun of making them twitch."²⁰ Reifer has described the Duke as a competitor playwright to Shakespeare through the terms of Northrup Frye's "comic drive."²¹ Mary Ellen Lamb takes up a similar argument, moving from Lucio as the instigator of theatricality through Claudio, Isabella, Angelo to the Duke. She describes first Lucio's, and later the Duke's meta-theatrical role by the divergent words "critique," "manipulat(ion)," "education," "coaching," "stage manager," "supervising," one who "creates a role," one who "set(s) up these ideal roles," and finally they both are the "playwright."²² Lodged in these nine subtly differentiated words are two different actions, directing and authoring; supervising a role is different from creating or setting up a role.

Along with acting, Lucio, Angelo²³, and the Duke seem to engage these three stage actions differently. Lucio does all three. He certainly acts — as Lamb has aptly pointed out, he is perpetually acting different roles:

In his brilliant portrayals of a bewildering succession of contradictory roles — cynical tavern wit, reverent admirer of the chaste Isabella, worldly intimate of a lecherous Duke, upright admonisher of Pompey the bawd, stalwart defender of the Duke against slanderous statements that

²⁰ W. Empson, "Sense in *Measure for Measure*" in *The Structure of Complex Words*, New York: New Directions, 1951, p 283.

²¹ Northrup Frye, *A Natural Perspective: The Development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance*, New York: Harcourt-Brace, 73, in Reifer, 159.

²² Mary Ellen Lamb, "Shakespeare's "Theatrics": Ambivalence toward Theater in *Measure for Measure*." *Shakespeare Studies*. 1987, 20, 133, 133, 133, 135, 138, 138, 139, 139, and 141.

²³ Lamb neglects Angelo's role as an author/director

had, in fact, been uttered by him — Lucio offers not complexity of identity but loss of identity.²⁴

He writes the script when he intervenes at the cloister, and directs his actor when Isabella petitions Angelo.

Angelo follows to its conclusion the premise that to be seen working on stage is disempowering. He does not act, choosing to hide off stage most of the play. He writes the action that begins the dramatic action of the plot, condemning Claudio to death. He is also directs his actors, coaching Escalus to act for him when he does have to come on stage.

It seems that the Duke does not act or direct, but only authors the play, but these are only appearances. The Duke only appears to not do the theatrical work. The Duke, as Friar Lodowick, does more acting than anyone. He takes on a second role in the play, and delivers 861 of the 2712 lines in the play, nearly twice the next most vocal character, Isabella, who speaks 476 lines. The Duke works this hard in order to make it *appear* as if he does no work, or has to do no work — as if his reappearance in the last scene as the true authority *just is* without having to act, direct, or write it. To this end he displaces his work onto other characters, Escalus, Friar, Thomas, the Provost, and especially Friar Lodowick, to appear not to do any theatrical work; he appears invisible. When he is onstage as himself (in his return in V.i.) he makes it appear like he is staging himself in a royal spectacle, yet in his spectacle, he directs the gaze of the audience away from himself onto the tools of his reempowerment, his deputies and reprobates.

He is the invisible author of the final scene before it begins, and thus does not have to direct it any more than speak the lines he knows will prompt his characters to speak without realizing they are being prompted. He is a director, but he conceals his hand in a way Lucio and Angelo do not. He directs his characters without them knowing it. He creates the script of the last scene based on the dramatic characteristics of the characters; Because he knows Mariana's love grew "more violent and unruly" with

²⁴ Lamb, p 137-138

Angelo's "unjust unkindness" (III.i.243, 240) he knows that if he even more unjustly consummates and formalizes their marriage, only to sentence Angelo to death, he can expect Mariana's love to grow even more violent, and for her to do anything to plea for Angelo's life, including turning to Isabella. Based on the reactions the Duke expects from his actors, he creates an improvisational drama which his actors are unaware they are acting in, and which appears to all involved, both acting and watching, to be a work of true, divine authority.

This drama, acted by unwitting servants of those empowered by the drama, becomes a theatrical enactment of bureaucratic power. Tennenhouse has argued that "the disguised ruler plays dramatize an important literary change. To represent on stage a political apparatus run by deputies is to imagine the possibility that there may not be such an interdependence" between the monarch and the state.²⁵ As the government of *Measure for Measure* is run by a hierarchy of deputies, so is the stage itself in the play.

²⁵ Tennenhouse, p. 142.

Female Submission and the Silent Spectacle

Measure for Measure presents a conflict between Isabella's sovereignty and male royal power through verbal and visual terms. The play tentatively asserts the equal power of seeing and being seen at the start, but by the end of the play the act of looking rules over the silenced objects of the royal gaze. The first scene introduces the relation of speech and vision to power. In the very first words of the play the Duke says,

Duke. Escalus.
 Esc. My lord.
 Duke. Of government the properties to unfold
 Would seem in me t' affect speech and discourse
(I.i. 1-4)²⁶

The Duke asserts that the proper governor rules by "speech and discourse." But the Duke only "seem(s)" to think power resides in speech. The two verbs the Duke employs hint at the importance of vision; "to unfold," means "to lay open to the view; to display,"²⁷ implying an unveiling like those of the final scene; "t' affect" means to act. Here in the first lines, implied visuality encroaches on the explicit speech through the structure of the sentence itself, showing the Duke's doubts about the power of speech, and belief in the power of vision.

When Angelo enters, the Duke invokes the stamp metaphor in praise of Angelo's worth. This metaphor, which is repeated throughout the play, is that of the stamped seal or coin, both symbols of authority.²⁸ It is worth noting that Angelo's name references this coin metaphor, as an Angel was "An old English gold coin, called more fully at first the

²⁶ All *Measure for Measure* quotations are taken from *The Arden Shakespeare, Measure for Measure*, J.W.Lever, ed, Richard Proudfoot, gen. ed., New York: Methuen, 1965.

²⁷ Oxford English Dictionary, Online edition, definition 3, http://www.stg.brown.edu/templates/oedresults.epl?mode=entry&type=entry&byte=523232551&debug_level=

²⁸ Lever points out the use of "coin imagery" in the scene in a footnote to lines I.i. 48-50.

angel-noble, being originally a new issue of the Noble, having as its device the archangel Michael standing upon, and piercing the dragon.”²⁹ The Duke says,

Angelo:
There is a kind of character in thy life
That to th’observer doth thy history
Fully unfold.

(I.i. 26-29)

Here the verb used, “unfold,” is one of the two visual verbs used in the first lines cited above. (The other, “affect,” will be repeated at line 72.) His appearance, or physiognomy, is figured as text, a “character,” or single letter to be read, yet “th’observer” is not reading text, but looking at an image. Twenty lines later Angelo repeats the stamp metaphor,

Now, my good lord,
Let there be some more test made of my metal,
Before so noble and so great a figure
Be stamped on it.

(I.i. 47-50)

The stamp on the seal and the coin is represented in the word “figure” both as an image, Angelo’s face, and as text, the denomination of the coin. Through this metaphor for authority, Angelo’s power is figured as confusingly both verbal and visual, but not explicitly either.

After the Duke’s exit, the deputies’ confusion about their temporal power is paralleled by a confusion in their language of vision and speech. The two confer:

Esc. I shall desire you, sir, to give me leave
To have free speech with you; and it concerns me
To look into the bottom of my place.
A power I have, but of what strength and nature
I am not yet instructed.
Ang. ‘Tis so with me. Let us withdraw together,
And we may soon our satisfaction have
Touching that point.

(I.i. 76-83)

As Escalus says, he has “A power” but he does not know “of what strength or nature.” By “nature” he refers to what form that power takes. His verbs which describe how he

²⁹ Oxford English Dictionary, Online Edition, definition 6, <http://www.stg.brown.edu/templates/>

will find out this “nature” indicate its verbal and visual nature: he requests “free speech” with Angelo and says he will “look into” his position. Angelo agrees with his confusion between the verbal and visual source of their power, saying “ ‘Tis so with me.” Then he suggests they “withdraw together” to figure out this problem of the interrelation of speech and vision in their deputized power out of sight of the people, the court, and the audience, making his first steps towards invisibility. Neither deputy will be seen until II, i., after having worked the invisible reestablishment of authority through the “proclamation” (I, ii. 85) Claudio’s arrest, his trial, and his death sentencing.

In the separate territory of the Sisterhood of St. Clare a different set of rules govern the exchanges of speech and sight. This order of nuns, known as the “Poor Clares” was founded in 1212 at Assisi.³⁰ In their circa 1263 Rule titled *Menouresses Enclosid*, referred to as the *Rule of the Second Order*, the vows are defined as obedience, chastity, poverty, and silence: “I Suster... bihote to god & owre ladi blissid mayde marie & to seynt Fraunces, to myne ladi seint Clare & to alle seyntis... be alle be time of myne life, In obedience, In chastite, wibowte properte or voyse in be Cloyster.”³¹ Though their vows prohibit all speech in the Cloister, there is another passage which gives specific rules for when a Sister can speak.

Silence, be it all Sustres holden in soche maner, bat bey speke nat wiboute licence no one to ober, ne to none ober, sauynge befebal & Ive syke. But alle gates bat be Abbesse, or presedente take kepe ententifliche in whoche place, whan, & how sche schal gif licence to sustris for to speke... Whan anybodi to any of be Sustris schal speke, First schall be Abbes be warnid... And allegatis bat be sustris whiche haue for to speke to any straunger, bat bey be welware Ivat Ivey aboudyn nat hem for to speke in vayne wib owtyn profit & houre longe.³²

Here there is a great concern with governing the verbal interaction with visitors, but there is no mention of governing their visual interaction with visitors. In Shakespeare’s

[oedresults.epl?mode=entry&type=entry&byte=11963848&debug_level=](#)

³⁰ Lever, footnote to line 5.

³¹ *The Rule of the Second Order*, in Jessica Slights and Michael Morgan Holmes, “Isabella’s Order: Religious Acts and Personal Desires in *Measure for Measure*” *Studies in Philology*, Summer 1998, Volume 95, Issue 3, 270.

³² *The Rule of the Second Order*, in Slights and Holmes, P. 273

version of the Claires, the focus is on both visual and verbal interaction, which are controlled by their separation. As Sister Francisca tells Isabella,

When you have vow'd, you must not speak with men
 But in the presence of the prioress;
 Then, if you speak, you must not show your face;
 Or if you show your face, you must not speak.
 (I.iv. 10-13)

Male power is figured as the synthesis of speech and vision in I.i, so to prevent the incursion of male power, the rules of Shakespeare's cloister explicitly separate speech and vision; when watched by the prioress, the sisters may either speak or show their face, but not both. (The prioress is unbound by these restrictions, and like the Duke she serves as an overseer of exchanges between the sexes.) The cloister explicitly separates the two forms of power which were so closely linked in male power that the words and metaphors of power carried both verbal and visual meanings: either women speak or they are seen.

Isabella is not yet a sworn nun, and urged by Francisca, she lets the caller into the cloister. Admitting Lucio, the central figure of sexual license, into the cloister is a symbolic deflowering of the closed off feminine space and presages Isabella's loss of feminine autonomy. Letting herself become engaged in Lucio's verbal and symbolic assaults furthers her loss of autonomy in the symbolic terms the play has set up. Lucio's first words upon entering address her virginity and its loss.

Hail virgin, if you be — as those cheek-roses
 Proclaim you are no less — can you so stead me
 As to bring me to the sight of Isabella
 (I.iv. 16-18)

He acknowledges her based on her position in, (which is to say outside of³³), the sexual exchange by jokingly doubting her virginity. After pausing (“—”) for her to blush, he claims “those cheek-roses / Proclaim” her virginity. Here her visual reaction is figured in the verbal term “to proclaim.” He is joining the visual and verbal registers for her.

Isabella doubts her ability to help, but Lucio argues and convinces her to go to Angelo. Lucio begins his argument speaking directly about Isabella's "power," which she doubts. He tells her that just her words alone will convince Angelo, as "when maidens sue, / Men give like gods," but if she shows herself as well — makes herself available to his gaze in addition to seducing his mind — she can get anything she wants, as "all their petitions are as freely theirs / As they would owe them." In her acquiescence to Angelo's argument she says she will "see" what she can do and will send "certain word" of her victory, uniting the prohibited visual and verbal in the words which describe her victory.

When he enters the cloister and spurs Isabella to petition Angelo, Lucio is both re-writing the plot, as well as directing his actor when he coaches her on style. Angelo has begun to author the dramatic action, and Lucio has responded with his own authorial changes. Lucio's intervention as an author and director begins the series of symbolic exchanges between the cloister and the court which will undermine the feminine power of the cloister and test the nature of ducal authority.

When Isabella petitions Angelo for her brother's life she begins with a wordy speech requesting that Angelo punish the fault but not the actor, which Angelo quickly dismisses. As she is "[*Going*]" Lucio argues with her to stay and keep petitioning. He says,

Give't not o'erso. — To him again, entreat him,
Kneel down before him, hang upon his gown;
You are too cold. If you should need a pin,
You could not with more tame a tongue desire it.
To him, I say.

(II.ii. 43-47)

Lucio tells her to act more — to be more visual. He tells her to "kneel down before him" which is both a submissive position, and a religious position. As she argues she 'wins over' Angelo (in Lucio's sense). Angelo says

³³ For a Queer reading of Isabella's virginal resistance see, Theodora A. Jankowski, "Pure Resistance: Queer(y)ing Virginity in William Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* and Margaret Cavendish's *The*

Ang. [*aside*] She speaks and 'tis such sense
 That my sense breeds with it. — Fare you well. [*Going*]
 Isab. Gentle my lord, turn back.
(II.ii. 142-144)

Her speech is such powerful sense, or reason, that Angelo's sense, or lust, is the logical product.³⁴ He says this in an aside, presumably with his back to her, as she calls for him to "turn back" and look at her while she speaks to him. He even tries to leave, saying "Fare you well. [*Going*]" but her call to look back and hear has enough power over him that he does not leave. After her interview, when Angelo speaks in soliloquy, he says

What, do I love her,
 That I desire to hear her speak again?
 And feast upon her eyes?
(II.ii. 177-179)

In this sentence Angelo defines the reason he loves her as her speech and spectacle, which is the way Lucio has framed her for Angelo. While other critics have analyzed his seduction as a result of her puritan virtue, it is the synthesis of her virtuous speech, and her submission to his gaze, a submission which joins religion and sexuality, that seduces him.

In II, iv, after his drawn out legal proposition to Isabella, Angelo finally confronts Isabella with his confession of his desire and his 'offer'. He says,

Ang. I do arrest your words. Be that you are,
 That is, a woman; if you be more, you're none.
 If you be one — as you are well express'd
 By all external warrants — show it now,
 By putting on the destin'd livery.
 Isab. I have no tongue but one; gentle my lord,
 Let me entreat you to speak the former language.
 Ang. Plainly conceive, I love you.
(II.iv. 133-140)

He phrases his assault on her virginal sovereignty by attempting to silence her. He "arrests" her words both *laying claim* to her earlier admission of "frailty," and *stopping*, or silencing her words which have so threatened his control over himself. In a last effort to explain her rhetorical power, he questions if she "be more" than her "external

Convent of Pleasure," *Shakespeare Studies*, 1998, 26, 218-255.

warrants” show her to be. As David Sundelson argues, when faced with “his own weakness” in contrast to Isabella’s “female potency,” Angelo “fears that Isabella may really be a man.”³⁵ Isabella denies her manliness by saying “I have no tongue but one,” as in she has no penis, only a tongue in her mouth, but because the words are phrased in a double negative, (“no... but”), the kernel of her statement is a self silencing: “I have no tongue.” She is made further visual by the stamp metaphor: He demands that she “show” her womanliness by submitting to his demands to “Plainly conceive,” or bear his child. The stamp metaphor, which defines Angelo’s power in I.i. is repeated here, but here the textual half of the act of stamping has been removed, leaving Isabella’s impression only visual.

Having arrested her words, and left her visibly a woman, Isabella’s words no longer have any power. She declares she will “proclaim” him, she will “tell the world aloud / What man thou are,” unless (in words) he “Sign me a present pardon for my brother.” He has arrested her words. She has left the cloister, engaged the male form of power, and has been manipulated out of her power. As Angelo says,

Who will believe thee, Isabel?
My unsoil’d name, th’austereness of my life,
My vouch against you, and my place i’t’h’state
Will so your accusation overweigh,
That you shall stifle in your own report,
And smell of calumny.

(II.iv. 153-158)

Angelo has overcome her. She has been silenced by his masculine verbal authority. Though she has been overcome, she still resists. It will take the invisible force of the Duke’s ostensibly benevolent machinations to fully disempower her by making her offer up her own spectacular silence.

Isabella’s final submission to male authority in V.i. becomes her self silencing, her last words. Though her speech is prompted by Mariana’s request for help in her plea

³⁴ Empson, p 274.

³⁵ David Sundelson, “Misogyny and rule in *Measure for Measure*,” *Women’s Studies* 9 (1981): 83-91

for Angelo's life, Mariana only wants Isabella to kneel next to her. She asks Isabella to "kneel by me... will you not lend a knee?" and "Hold up your hands" in prayer, but tells her to "say nothing: I'll speak all." (V.i.434-440) Mariana has repeated the separation of speech and vision of the cloister, where

if you speak, you must not show your face
Or if you show your face, you must not speak
(I.iv. 12-13)

Phrased in the same visual and verbal terms, Mariana asks Isabella to join her in separating the two in her plea. If Mariana's desire to separate speech and vision is an attempt to recreate the now absent feminine space of resistance, the cloister, can a separation of these powers have any effect outside of the cloister, and can the lost space of the cloister be reclaimed?

We never find out if the cloister can be reclaimed, as Isabella kneels *and* speaks in opposition to Mariana's move to separate the two discourses. Her speech begins

Isab. [<i>kneeling</i> .]	Most bounteous sir: Look, if it please you, on this man condemn'd As if my brother liv'd. I partly think A due sincerity did govern his deeds Till he did look on me. Since it is so, Let him not die.
	(V.i. 442-446)

In the terms of Mariana's request for a separation, Isabella's uniting of visuality and speech becomes her final self-imposed denial of the cloister's structure of feminine resistance. She emphasizes the visual submission of her act and destruction of the feminine space of religious resistance by "[*kneeling*]" in prayer. She offers her words of prayer for the life of the man whom she believes took her brother's life. Having joined the prohibited speech and vision she places the blame upon herself for visually inciting Angelo's lust. She says that Angelo was governing properly until "he did look on" her; she figures the responsibility as hers, and begs the Duke to "let him not die." Read in these terms, this speech is the final symbolic destruction of separate feminine power and space in the visual and verbal terms of male political power. Final in that after Isabella's

speech and Mariana's three word "Merely, my lord" comment, neither woman speaks again; they are finally mute pawns in the Duke's power games. Final as there are no stage directions for either woman to get up from their knees; they remain the kneeling center of visual attention until the close of the play. Final because where Angelo silenced Isabella forcefully in II, iv, she has silenced herself; giving in to male power, she has done the work for the Duke.

This moment seems conclusively to align power with looking and speaking, and disempowerment with being looked at and being silenced. This disempowerment parallels the shameful parading of the figures of vice before the audience, and the spectacles of silent resurrection at the end of V.i. where the Duke shows Claudio, Juliet, and Barnadine.

In these arrests a similar spectacular silencing takes place. Parading and silencing criminals is shown to be an essential part of the theatrics of power. When Pompey is arrested the first time with Master Froth (II.i.), and the second time when he is imprisoned (III.ii.1-80), he is brought forth by the law to be shown as a prisoner. When Mistress Overdone is arrested, an even more drastic showing and silencing takes place. Escalus enters separately from the Provost, Officers and Mistress Overdone. The first words spoken when she enters are Escalus' directions for her to leave the stage, precluding any speech on her part: "Go, away with her to prison" (III.ii.184). Escalus repeats this call for her silencing more explicitly, saying

Away with her to prison. — Go to,
no more words. (III.ii.184)

Mistress Overdone is paraded onto the stage as a mute token of royal authority, and great effort is made to keep her spectacle silent. When the Duke rules against Isabella's petition in V.i., he mock reacts against what she "speak'st" (V.i.108). When he dismisses her, he says

To prison with her! An officer!
[Isabella is placed under guard.]

Shall we thus permit.
A blasting and scandalous breath to fall
On him so near us?

(V.i.123-126)

It is her words, her “breath,” that threaten power; having made a spectacle of herself by interrupting the Duke’s procession with a kneeling plea, the Duke sends her to prison to silence her. The Duke himself, as Friar Lodowick, is subject to an almost identical silencing. Having accused the Friar of “Slander to th’ state!” (V.i.320) and ordered him to prison 20 lines earlier, Escalus repeats himself:

Such a fellow is not to be talked withal. Away with
him to prison! Where is the Provost? Away with
him to prison! Lay bolts enough upon him: let him
speak no more.

(V.i.342-345)

Here Escalus twice silences and orders the Friar to prison. Lucio highlights the element of visual shame, by trying to pull the Friar’s cowl off. He repeats his need to show the Friar’s guilty face to the world, saying “Show your knave’s visage... Show your sheep-biting face” (V.i.351-352). Even in the Friar’s aborted arrest, he is silenced and shown to the world.

Something different happens in Claudio’s arrest — Claudio talks. There is a history of speeches confessing guilt before a public execution. In his analysis of this history, J.A. Sharpe argues from Foucault, who says that, “the public execution is to be understood, not only as a judicial, but also as a political ritual. It belong, even in minor cases, to the ceremonies by which power is manifested.”³⁶ Sharpe details the theatrical power constructed through these “set-pieces.”³⁷ He says of the executed,

They were the willing central participants in a theatre of punishment...
When felons stood on the gallows and confessed their guilt not only for
the offence for which they suffered death, but for a whole catalogue of
wrongdoing, and expressed their true repentance for the same, they were

³⁶ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon, 1977, p. 47.

³⁷ J. A. Sharpe, “Last Dying Speeches: Religion, Ideology and Public Execution in Seventeenth-Century England,” *Past and Present*, 107, 1986, p. 145. See p. 150 for a discussion of the “stereotyped form” of the speeches, and pp. 161-166 for a discussion of the shift in importance, from religious, to political aspects of the confession and execution.

helping to assert the legitimacy of the power which had brought them to their sad end.³⁸

Thus, though he speaks, Claudio's speech is supposed to have a similar edifying effect on royal power as keeping him silent.

When Claudio is arrested he is paraded through Vienna in shame. He speaks out against the provost, complaining "why dost thou show me thus to th'world" only to find out that Angelo has ordered it "by special charge." (I.ii.108-111) Angelo has specifically aligned this parade with Claudio's penal shame. It is both a measure to prohibit another offence, but also a display of his control over his subjects' bodies, and actions. By parading Claudio in the traditional politico-theatrical genre, Angelo effectively prompts his confessional speech. Angelo has written and prompted Claudio's confession while remaining invisible.

Another strange thing happens with Claudio. After performing his requisite confession, the provost orders Claudio to leave the stage for prison (I.ii.130), but Claudio continues his conversation with Lucio. They make plans for Isabella to "assay" Angelo, (I.ii.171), directly in front of the provost and officers. After 50 more lines of conspiring against Angelo, Claudio orders his own exit from the stage to the prison: "Come, officer, away" (I.ii.184). The Provost, Angelo's agent on stage, is strangely impotent in his own office, which Claudio dispenses for him on his own terms. This is the problem with invisibility: though not being seen is the most potent power, relying on deputies to do all your work does not always work. Where Angelo actually hides off stage, the Duke only appears to hide. When the Duke's deputies do not act the way he expects, as in IV.iii. where Angelo does not send Claudio's pardon, he is present without seeming to be onstage in order to make sure the plot turns his way, showing the ultimate power of appearing invisible.

³⁸ Sharpe, p. 156.

The Instability of Angelo's Invisible Voice

Looking back at Angelo's presence in *Measure for Measure*, he is almost never seen. He is only in six of the seventeen scenes, (I.i., II.i., II.ii., II.v., IV.iv., and V.i.) and delivers only 303 of the 2712 lines in the play. These numbers would not be as significant if he were not one of the three central characters, and one of the two characters behind most of the dramatic action of the play, (the other being the Duke.) Angelo has two particularly large absences, between I.i. and II.i., and between II.v. and IV.iv. In I.i. he is given his deputized power and, he "withdraw(s)" from sight to meditate on this power (I.i. 81); between his exit and reappearance he has proclaimed his new enforcement of the law, and arrested, tried and sentenced to death Claudio, his test case. These are the acts which start the dramatic action of the play, and they are created without ever coming on stage, or even sending a formal message or proclamation. Everything is related, or told, by others. Even more amazing is his absence for all of act III, and nearly all of act IV, during which time Isabella complies with his demand, the bedtrick takes place, and Claudio is supposedly executed. Power is invisibility, or not to have to do the work of acting.

In contrast to Angelo's officially deputized invisible power, Lucio's refusal to remain visible, to act the same character is his subversion. Where the Duke puts on another costume, Lucio changes person in nearly every scene without changing his appearance. Thought not invisible, he is not visible; he never is what he seems to be — from outward appearances.

When Angelo is on stage he makes an effort to speak as little as possible. As mentioned before, Angelo only speaks 303 of the 2712 lines in the play. Highlighting his fear of speaking publicly, only 145 of these lines are delivered in official settings, and the other 158 lines are delivered in private, 69 in soliloquy and 89 in private to Isabella

during his confrontation with her in II.iv. Even to analyze in terms of lines spoken is inaccurate, as the quality of speech changes drastically from the curt public single, half, or even one words lines to the probing, full lines and passages delivered in private. In his first interview with Isabella he exchanges one truncated line for every two to three (to ten) of hers:

Isa. Must he needs die?
 Ang. Maiden, no remedy.
 Isab. Yes: I do think that you might pardon him,
 And neither heaven nor man grieve at the mercy.
 Ang. I will not do't.
 Isa. But can you if you would?
 Ang. Look what I will not, that I cannot do.
 Isa. But might you do't, and do the world no wrong,
 If so your heart were touch'd with that remorse
 As mine is to him?
 Ang. He's sentenc'd, 'tis too late.
 Lucio. [*to Isab.*] You are too cold.
 Isab. Too late? Why, no. I that do speak a word
 May call it again. — Well believe this:
 No ceremony that to great ones longs,
 Not the king's crown, nor the deputed sword,
 The marshal's truncheon, nor the judge's robe,
 Become them with one half so good a grace
 As mercy does.
 If he had been as you, and you as he,
 You would have slipp'd like him, but he like you
 Would not have been so stern.
 Ang. Pray you be gone.
 (II.ii.48-66)

Only one of his five lines is a full line, and even as such it is a short line; the other four lines are curtailed into three to five word responses. His dependence on shortened sentence structure and grammatical contractions shows the calculated nature of his terseness. In the sentence fragment “Maiden, no remedy” the comma replaces the verb “there is” in order to speed the delivery of the line, and speed her departure from the courtroom. Likewise “do it” becomes “do't” and “He is sentenced, it is too late” becomes “He's sentenc'd, 'tis too late.” His only uncontrorted sentence “Pray you be gone” is his demand for her to leave, which has been the goal of his shortened speech all along.

This brevity of Angelo's public speech is contrasted by the fullness of his private speech. He begins the soliloquy at the end of this same scene by repeating the same passage twice, "What's this? What's this?" That he repeats the phrase in order to more fully express his confusion is almost beside my point — the Angelo of the public dialogue would never say anything twice, even for effect. He restates himself again in his next phrase: "Is this her fault or mine?" is virtually synonymous with "The tempter or the tempted, who sins most, ha?" As exclaimed by the "ha?," Angelo's language here is far from his spartan public speech. Almost as if forgetting the audience was still there to hear him, he has (d)evolved into an honest confusion about his character that he is at pains to silently hide in public.

Starting at the first scene Angelo makes an effort to avoid speech and curtail his time onstage. Though there are two focuses of the first scene, the nature of government and the transfer of power to Angelo, the former subsumes the later. Angelo is the point of the scene, yet he speaks only 11 of the 83 lines, and no more than three at a time; his lines are the same number as Escalus' 11, and significantly less than the Duke's 61. Nearly half of his lines are merely the formalities of his entrance (I.i.25-26) and the Duke's exit (I.i.60-61, 73). The two times he does speak for 'extended periods' he appropriates the rhetorical work of the Duke and Escalus. When he mock-protests against the Duke's choice of him (I.i.48-50), he does so using the stamp metaphor the Duke introduced when he called for Angelo's entrance and repeated throughout his address to Angelo (I.i.16, 27, 36-39). After the Duke leaves Escalus speaks first, and articulates the problem of their deputization (both the literal terms of their temporal power, and the symbolic terms discussed earlier). Angelo claim's Escalus' five lines of sincere concern with the short " 'Tis so with me," and then immediately proposes they leave the public view to solve their problems. By replying within the Duke's rhetoric and making Escalus speak for him, Angelo reduces his presence on stage, and as soon as he is empowered, he makes a motion to leave the stage and become invisible.

When he is required to speak as the deputized voice of the law, Angelo directs Escalus to speak for him. Where the Duke has made Angelo do his work, Angelo gets Escalus to do his. In II.i., where he and Escalus hear Elbow's complaint against Froth and Pompey, Angelo begins the interrogation brought before him asking "How now sir, what's your name? And what's the matter?" After he responds briefly to Elbow's first malapropism, and Elbow speaks a second contorted comment, Escalus interjects a joking aside to Angelo about the "wise officer" before them. To this interjection Angelo tells Escalus to "Go to," or take up the interrogation. Angelo asks one more question, bringing Pompey into the scope, before Escalus takes over the voice of the law from Angelo. Escalus performs the remaining 216 lines of inquiry, only interrupted by Angelo when he announces his boredom with the proceedings that "will last out a night in Russia," and his departure, leaving Escalus "to the hearing of the cause." By engaging his deputy to speak for him, and then actually exiting the stage, Angelo keeps himself from being noticed and even seen, yet keeps the awareness of his power present. Even here, though, he has to tell Escalus directly to "Go to." It will take the Duke in the last scene to get his subjects and deputies to offer up their speech and spectacles to him, in order to fully hide his hand.

Angelo appears with Escalus as the legal apparatus in V.i. as well. Just prior to the scene he expresses his anxieties about the potential for his discovery by Isabella, and appropriately so, as within the first 20 lines Isabella has begun her accusations. That Angelo speaks to direct the Duke's proceedings at lines 35-38 shows the beginning of his loss of control, but his confidence and remaining power is shown by his silence for 160 lines, until line 198. He speaks at line 198 out of confusion over Mariana's veiled appearance, and requests and is granted his redeputization "To find this practice out." (V.i.238) Reempowered by the Duke Angelo returns to silence and, as in II.i, it is Escalus who does the actual legal work. Angelo doesn't speak again until line 322, 85

lines later. During this silence Escalus has questioned Lucio, brought back Isabella for more questioning, and interrogated, accused and sentenced Friar Lodowick to prison.

Angelo doesn't have to speak at all, as Escalus has already accused the Friar of "Slander to th'state" (V.i.320) and ordered him sent "to prison!" (V.i.321) the two lines before. It seems surprising that the public Angelo would speak and call attention to himself now, of all times, when he knows he is in desperate peril of being discovered. Yet it is precisely because of his desperation to scapegoat the Friar that he speaks to direct Lucio's accusations at the Friar; he speaks twice more to call attention to the Friar's apparent guilt, and direct Lucio to help detain the Friar physically. Angelo directs justice himself, rather than directing Escalus to direct the inquiry, because he is at pains to include all the evidence against the Friar as possible. To be disempowered is to have to talk for yourself, and his precarious position has forced him to talk.

When Isabella meets with Angelo at II.ii. and II.iv. she speaks to him directly, forcing him out of silence. Where I divided his few lines before based on their public and private contexts, I can also divide them into the 102 lines Angelo speaks when not involved with Isabella, and the 191 lines he speaks in their two interviews in Act II. As discussed above, the outcome of these meetings disempowers Isabella by turning her into a silent spectacle. To effect this disempowerment, he has to speak with her. Because his power is based in an invisible, non interpreted, 'objective' law by manipulating the words of the law — giving a human voice to the law, however perverse a voice it is— he undermines his own invisible power. As much as Angelo is part of the force behind her disempowerment, he is also loses his invisible, silent power in the process.

Seeming to Act

In *Measure for Measure*, Isabella's spectacular silencing, and Angelo's invisibility, mark a shift from the mutual empowerment of seeing and being seen to the empowerment of looking and the disempowerment of being looked at. Though it seems that royal spectacle in the Duke's return in V.i. problematizes this interpretation, his two returns only appear to be royal spectacles, and likewise they only appear to be the Duke's source of empowerment. These spectacles actually serve to divert visual attention from the Duke onto the characters he manipulates, proving ultimately that to act without appearing to is even more empowering than not acting at all. In order to appear not to work on stage the Duke displaces his work onto the other characters.

The Duke's power is defined as his power to see. He is "late come from the See." (III.ii.213) He is "a looker-on here in Vienna," and he has "seen corruption boil and bubble." (V.i.315-316) His motive for his disappearance and surveillance is to

If power change purpose,
See
(I.iii.53-54)

As the Duke's power is defined as the ability to look, so is justice itself. When Angelo requests to be allowed to interrogate Isabella and Mariana in V.i. he asks the Duke to "give me the scope of justice." (V.i.233) Lucio adds invisibility to the power of the gaze when he counsels Escalus on the advantage interrogating Isabella out of sight:

Marry, sir, I think if you handled her privately
she would sooner confess; perchance publicly she'll
be ashamed
(V.i.274-276)

To complete this equation of power with the invisible gaze, "scope" is the word the Duke uses to describe his problematic empowerment of his people. He says " 'twas my fault to give the people scope." (I.iii.35) Likewise, when the Duke as Friar Lodowick is being interrogated in V.i., Escalus defines his transgressions in terms of seeing.

And then to glance from him
 To th'Duke himself, to tax him with injustice?
 (V.i.307-308)

Power is defined as the ability to see without being seen, and the goal of the Duke's plot is to recover that "scope" from his subjects.

The power of looking seems to be undermined by the Duke's display of royal spectacle, both as the returning Duke in the first half of V.i. but especially as the uncrowned duke in the second half of the scene. The Duke very carefully plans his re-entry in the last scenes of Act IV. He gives instructions to the Provost, Isabella, Friar Peter, and his group of noblemen Varrius, Flavius, Valencius, Rowland, and Crassius, all ostensibly to insure that his dramatic entry in the last scene successfully stages his return to power. Success then is the "cold gradation and well balanced form" (IV.iii.99) of Orgel's royal spectacle, where the Duke's self staging will be so visually awesome that he will be the embodiment of true authority.

In his actual return in V.i. he proceeds with the appearances of a royal spectacle. He begins by reclaiming his appearance, or "his own habit" (V.i.SD) and his royal "we." He continues to reclaim the appearances of his power by publicly resubsuming his deputies under himself as he praises the work they have done in his place. By giving away his power only to take it back he proves the existence of, (or even creates,) that power and claims it as his own. By praising them he is in effect praising himself, or *his choice* of them, and *his justice* which they have been exercising. This construction of power is foregrounded by the performance of this transfer. He takes both of his subsumed deputies in his hands in front of the crowd of "Citizens" (V.i.SD) in order to

let the subject see, to make them know
 That outward courtesies would fain proclaim
 Favors that keep within.
 (V.i.15-17)

The Duke teaches the people his power by showing the outward appearances of his power and grace.

Both older critics, and New Historicists have viewed this spectacle as the embodiment of both real and theatrical renaissance authority. J. W. Lever as claimed that in the resolution of the play “Extraordinary emphasis is laid upon the role of true authority, whose intervention alone supplies the equipoise needed to counter the forces of negation.”³⁹ Mullaney has deconstructed this authority through a New Historicist lens, arguing that “The Duke allows the counterfeit to be exposed, but only at the point where the issue of his defrocking will be new and inescapably theatrical economy of awe and apprehension.”⁴⁰ Where Lever takes the Duke’s spectacular return at face value, and Mullaney says it’s façade is allowed to break only when a new spectacle can take its place, I want to argue that the Duke’s reempowerment does not come from his spectacle, or his exposure of the spectacle to create a more powerful one, but from his invisible seeing, and that the Duke makes every effort to undermine his own spectacles.

The Duke’s grace may have been convincing for a first time spectator of the event, both in the Duke’s hypothetical onstage audience, and in the theater audience (on the 12th Night in 1604 or now,) but from a critical standpoint, the theatrical power of this exchange is problematic. If this spectacle of royal power exchange is the Duke’s source of power, and is successful, why does he redeputize Angelo and Escalus (V.i.237-258) in order to create another royal spectacle? Furthermore, why is the second reappearance so much more convincing than the first, both to the characters on stage, and to the audience watching the play?

The Duke has to rectify his two roles in the play. He redeputizes Angelo and Escalus so he can return as Friar Lodowick, the subject of the law, in order to clarify his role as the Friar who has become part of the investigation of V.i. By reappearing from underneath the Friar’s cowl the Duke stages himself as the authentic power behind the legal apparatus in process. He is in power without being the interrogator, thus he is the

³⁹ Lever, lx.

⁴⁰ Steven Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988, p. 104.

authentic power behind the law. Thus it seems his second royal spectacle is so much more convincing than the first because of the authenticity of his appearance from under the Friar's cowl. From this visual empowerment he moves directly to command his servants and citizens with a confidence and authority not present until now: "First, Provost... [to Lucio.] Sneak not away, sir... Lay hold on him." Yet, this shedding of roles could easily be taken one step further, and undermine the authenticity of his royal spectacle; the effect of Lucio pulling off one costume is close to that of stripping the actor naked — if his Friar's act is false, so his is Duke's act.

Though his uncowling is his unduking, it still serves to consolidate his power. The Duke's power is not secured through royal spectacle, and Angelo's response to the his uncowling begins to touch on the real source behind the Duke's reauthorization. Angelo says,

O my dread lord,
I should be guiltier than my guiltiness
To think I can be undiscernable
When I perceive your Grace, like power divine,
Hath looked upon my passes.

(V.i.364-368)

Here the Duke's real power is having "looked upon" Angelo's transgressions like an invisible "power divine." Angelo's belief that he could act unseen, "undiscernable" to anyone is the fault for which he "should be guiltier than" for his "guiltiness," or his abuses of power. Repeating his understanding of theatrical royal power, Angelo indicates that true authority is not the power to see, or the power to show yourself, but the power to be invisible.

Invisibility is the source of Angelo's power, but as his example shows, actual invisibility is impractical, as well as not resistant to corruption. Where Angelo fears acting, the Duke spends most of the play in a second costume. By staying on stage he can control the action; by seeming to be invisible, or not to act, it makes his control even more miraculous. The Duke recognizes both that this is a play, and that royal power is theatrical; though Orgel's spectacle may not be the source of power, it is a necessary part

of the construction of power by seeming to be the source. Power is not invisibility, but appearing to be invisible — not making other people do his work, but using other people to hide his work. Seeming to be invisible is just as empowering as actual invisibility, and it is more effective and more stable.

On stage, the Duke creates the appearances of a royal spectacle through the “well-balanc’d form” (V.i.99) detailed before, yet by constantly directing the audience’s gaze elsewhere he never lets himself become the center of attention. Even in the royal spectacle he insists that Escalus and Angelo join hands with him, which has symbolic political purposes, but is a way of partially diverting the audience’s attention away from himself. The real royal spectacle only lasts for 19 lines before Isabella interrupts calling attention to herself and her grievances. From that point on, the Duke directs the attention of the audience to Isabella, Friar Lodowick, the veiled and unveiled Mariana, Angelo, and Friar Peter with regular interruptions to silence Lucio, but he never brings himself into the center of attention. He keeps himself out of the focus, and minimizes his role as the narrator by reducing his use of the first person pronoun “I.” When he reappears after from under Friar Lodowick’s cowl the Duke immediately begins speaking to other people. In the space of six lines he has called attention to the reactions of the Provost, Friar Peter, Mariana, Isabella, Lucio, Escalus, and Angelo — everyone onstage besides himself. The Duke’s closing oration follows this same pattern, moving through every character on stage, only bringing attention to himself when he proposes marriage to Isabella. Again, he falsely emphasizes the mutuality of the marriage: “What’s mine is yours, and what is yours is mine.” (V.i.535) In reality, she will be doing the reproductive work, just as she is doing the theatrical work now.

The Duke hides himself as he brings others into the focus, and he also hides his hand in this manipulation of the plot. Throughout the play the Duke hides his work in other characters, or actually gets them to do his work. His work is the re-authoring of the play, which Lucio and Angelo have written off course. The Duke rewrites the action so

that in his return he will not have to appear to direct the action. The Duke (as Friar Lodowick), Lucio and Angelo have taught the characters how to act; the Duke stages an improvisational drama with the other characters playing/performing their newly learned selves. Where Angelo, Lucio, and the earlier Duke had to coach, coax, and direct their actors to achieve their desired goal, the Duke has done so much preparatory work he has to do very little apparent work during the scene itself. The scene appears to ‘just happen’ without any work on his part, which is part of the reason the Duke has been read as an embodiment of true authority.⁴¹ Where Lucio, Angelo and he previously had to coach their characters’ acting, in the last scene the Duke’s characters give each other cues and respond to them without realizing that their drama has been scripted.

When the Duke is his royal self he takes care to displace the audience’s gaze onto his fellow actors; by putting on a second costume and becoming Friar Lodowick he effectively is no longer ‘his royal self,’ and no longer needs to worry about concealing his acting — it is inherently concealed, displaced onto the figure of the Friar. In the last scene he speaks of Friar Lodowick in the third person repeatedly (V.i. 129, 145, 247-8, 252), and then speaks of the Duke when he appears as Friar Lodowick (V.i.292-339) As much as it is a dramatic joke for the audience — “I love the Duke as I love myself” (V.i.339) — the insistent dramatic joking creates two characters (even as it destroys the reality of both characters). The Friar Lodowick really should appear in the *Dramatize Personae* — FRIAR LODOWICK, *the Duke* — I say this both as a joke, but also seriously. The Duke is at pains to create the Friar’s separateness in order to displace his work onto him. By displacing his work onto Friar Lodowick, the Duke is free to write, direct, and act in the plot he creates.

In the first and last scene, the Duke has to be onstage publicly as the Duke, and acting at the center of and directing a royal spectacle, or at least the appearances thereof. Because he cannot displace his work onto Friar Lodowick, to hide himself and his work

⁴¹ See page 36 for a summary of the history of this analysis.

He hides his prompt at the beginning of the four line sentence, and here the Friar seems to almost honestly want to hear why. The second prompt is much less subtle:

Duke. Now, pious sir,
 You will demand of me, why I do this.
 Friar. Gladly, my lord.

(I.iii.16-18)

His request to be asked his motives does not hide its directorial prompting of the Friar. The Duke's actions are best described by what he wants the Friar to do: it is a "demand" for the Friar, ordering the Friar with the commands "You will" and "Now." The Friar's response seems less earnest than before; he doesn't actually ask the Duke to continue speaking, but acquiesces to his demands. The Friar merely satisfies the Duke's need for another person to speak *at*. Engaging the Friar to request his confession attempts to make a 25 line monologue seem like two sets of ten lines of queried dialogue. Though it looks like false dialogue after this analysis, on stage it will achieve its effect. The Duke uses the other character to achieve the effect of a soliloquy without appearing to do the work of acting on stage alone.

In order to have Isabella and Mariana brought before him in the last scene the Duke uses Friar Peter to direct the two women. Friar Peter himself explains his role as Friar Lodowick's deputy, saying

Upon his request,

 Came I hither
 To speak, as from his mouth, what he doth know
(V.i.154-157)

Thus Friar Peter's only role is to speak for Friar Lodowick, or the Duke — to serve as figure onto which the Duke can displace his work. Mullaney has noted that "Among disguised monarchs of the Jacobean stage... Shakespeare's Duke is unique in the disguise he adopts: he takes off one mantle of authority to put on another."⁴² That second mantle is that of the church. It is interesting that the religious figures in the play, Friars Thomas, Lodowick, and Peter, and even Isabella, serve primarily as tools in the Duke's

consolidation of power. The Duke makes the church work for him, creating his power over it as he asserts this power.

In order for the Duke to achieve his ends, or as Friar Lodowick says, to “much please the absent Duke” (III.i.202) the Friar has to convince Isabella to work for him. He needs her to agree to Angelo’s demands, and add several of his own demands to the agreement. This achieved, he needs to get Isabella to get Mariana to work for her. Mariana’s interaction with Angelo is even more scripted than Isabella’s. As Isabella directs her,

Little have you to say
When you depart from him, but, soft and low,
‘Remember now my brother’.
(IV.i.68-70)

Here the Duke displaces his work in three levels through Friar Lodowick, and Isabella, onto Mariana.

In the last scene the Duke secures his power over Angelo by creating an improvisation where Angelo is forced, or prompted, to take action and work for the Duke. When the veiled Mariana is brought before the Duke and Angelo, the Duke asks her to unveil herself. She refuses to comply “Until my husband bid me.” (V.i.172) Acting surprised, the Duke asks her if she is “married,” “a maid,” or “a widow then” (V.i.172, 174, 176) creating even more suspense around her hidden “nothing”ness. (V.i.179) It is this lack of definition that the Duke sets up for Angelo to define by claiming her as his wife by directing her to show herself. When he orders her to show her self, she speaks

[*unveiling*] My husband bids me; now I will unmask.
This is that face, thou cruel Angelo,
Which once thou swor’st was worth the looking on:
This is the hand which, with a vow’d contract,
Was fast belock’d in thine: this is the body
That took away the match from Isabel
(V.i.205-210)

⁴² Mullaney, p 104.

Here Mariana's un-objecthood, her position of exchange as a entity with no definition, prompts her to lunge for the role of a spectacle of shame, as she demand that Angelo look at her "face," her "hand," her "body." The Duke, of course, speaks little in this exchange, calling little attention to his invisible hand and the power it creates. Angelo occupies the middle position. He acts in an effort to control his fate yet he is already inscribed within the Duke's invisible power/plot.

Trumping Angelo's extended disappearance from view, the Duke has completely disappeared from view, or so it appears. He has "strewed it in the common ear," that he has gone to Poland; he says "I have strew'd it" but his terminology of direct information: 'I, the Duke, told the "common" people myself' belies that it is through the indirectness of informing a deputy who informs a page, who informs a friend, etc. that he has spread his information. It is precisely by using their speech that his false story is authenticated.

The provost also does the Duke's work in order to hide the Duke's hand. As the Duke says to Friar Peter, his other accomplice, "The Provost knows our purpose and our plot." (IV.v.2) It is the Provost who delivers Ragozine's head to Angelo, authenticating the Duke/Friar's manipulations. (IV.iii.91) It is the provost who delivers the letters calling for the public exchange of power. (IV.iii.92-100) Most importantly, it is the Provost who miraculously produces the saved Claudio with Barnadine when the Duke wishes he saved Claudio — "I would thou hadst done so by Claudio"(V.i.466) — literally allowing the Duke's authority to appear so power that his graceful and just wishes revive the dead.

In the source plays the Provost is the one who frees Claudio in rebellion against the Duke. As Lever has pointed out,

The Provost at first refuses to obey the supposed Friar in the matter of the substituted head: by this he gives proof, not of his independence, but of his reliability as a loyal officer: once shown the hand and seal of the Duke, he is happy to do his master's bidding. Unlike Whetstone's Gaoler or Cinthio's Captain of Justice, Shakespeare's counterpart is allowed no real initiative."⁴³

⁴³ Lever, xcv-xcvi.

Where Lever interprets the Provost's actions as a weakness, in light of Tennenhouse's bureaucratic analysis, the Provost can be seen both as portraying on stage the role of a bureaucratic deputy, and taking part in the bureaucracy of the stage. All power — including the Gaoler/Captain of Justice's benevolent rebellion — is subsumed in the Duke's theatrical appropriation of other people's work.

Conclusion

Measure for Measure is concerned with making the same act, arranging a sexual union for example, into two deeds: the Duke is exercising “the love I have in doing goo” (III.i.197, while in the very next scene (a scene change where the Duke never leaves the stage) the Duke calls Pompey “a wicked bawd” and he curses him for “The evil that thou causest to be done,” (III.ii.18-19) when they are performing essentially the same act. Similarly, Claudio and Juliet’s marriage vow is the same as Angelo’s vow to Mariana. At the time, such a vow was roughly equivalent to a formal marriage.⁴⁴ Thus there is little difference between the two couples’ consummations, yet the Duke repeatedly talks of Claudio and Juliet’s “sin,” while he tells Mariana

He is your husband on a precontract:
To bring you thus together ‘tis no sin.
(IV.i.72-73)

In the last scene the Duke enacts the greatest differentiation of one act into two deeds. The Duke turns the four marriages at the close of the comedy into four completely different meanings. Angelo’s marriage is a reprieve, Claudio’s is a resurrection, the Duke’s is an empowerment over the feminine and religious forces in the play, and Lucio’s is a punishment.

The Duke’s ability to turn the same act into two deeds coincides with his ability to make the same look into two different powers. The limited visible gaze of the characters on stage and the court/public in the audience, is the same act as the Duke’s invisible gaze, but they are differently empowered. Joan Kelly has argued that in the subordination of women to patriarchy, “to men oppressed by the organization of labor and maldistribution of social wealth and power in society after society, the dual order of patriarchal society

⁴⁴ See Lever liii-lvii, and Henry Swinburne, *A Treatise of Spousals* 1688, 219-220, for a history of early modern marriage customs and vows.

provides many (but not all) instances the satisfaction of domination over women.”⁴⁵ As patriarchy uses a hierarchy of domination to satisfy, or subdue the oppressed men, the middle visual position of looking serves as a pseudo-empowering ideological buffer against revolt. As with Kelly’s model, women serve as the doubly oppressed tool of the empowered.

In *Measure for Measure* the balance between an empowering notion of vision as seeing and showing is replaced by the power of looking and the disempowerment of being looked at. By removing the female characters from their Cloisters and making them offer their own silent spectacles, the play presents a tangible vision of submissive female impotency. The final result of the Duke’s invisible gaze, in relation to the visible gaze of the pseudo-empowered oppressed men, and the spectacles of objectified women, is to turn the same animal into two unequal sexes, and to separate the empowered sex further into a hierarchy of class. The hierarchy of gazes in the play is an ideological justification of power, and a justification of class and sex distinctions between subjects of that power.

⁴⁵ Joan Kelly, “The Doubled Vision of Feminist Theory,” in *Sex and Class in Women’s History*, ed. Judith Newton, Mary Ryan, and Judith Walkowitz, History Workshop Series, Boston: Routledge, 1983, p. 268.

Bibliography

- Adelman, Janet. *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to The Tempest*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Armstrong, Nancy. Introduction to *Fiction in the Age of Photography: The Legacy of British Realism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 2000. In Course Packet for Professor Armstrong's Brown University Spring 1999 Modern Culture and Media Course MC0120, Feminism and Poststructuralism.
- Asp, Carolyn. "Desire, the Gaze and the Woman in *Measure for Measure*." *Shakespeare Newsletter*. 1984, 34, 40.
- Bray, Alan. "Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England." *Queering the Renaissance*, ed. J. Goldberg Durham, N.C. : Duke University Press, 1994.
- Brown, Carolyn E. "The Homoeroticism of Duke Vincentio: "Some Feeling of the Sport." *Studies in Philology*. Spring 1997, Volume 94, Issue 2, 187-221.
- Brown, Carolyn E. "The Wooing of Duke Vincentio and Isabella of *Measure for Measure*: "The Image of it Gives [Them] Content" *Shakespeare Studies*. 1994, 22, 189-219.
- Cacicedo, Alberto. " "She is fast my wife": Sex, Marriage, and Ducal Authority in *Measure for Measure*." *Shakespeare Studies*. 1995, 23, 187-209.
- Crane, Mary Thomas. "Male Pregnancy and Cognitive Permeability in *Measure for Measure*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 1998 Fall, 49:3, 269-92.
- Dawson, Anthony B. "*Measure for Measure*", New Historicism, and Theatrical Power." *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 1995 Autumn, 39:3, 328-341.
- Digangi, Mario. "Pleasure and Danger: Measuring Female Sexuality in *Measure for Measure*." *ELH*, Volume 60, Issue 3 (Autumn, 1993), 589-609.

- Dollimore, Jonathan. "Transgression and surveillance in *Measure for Measure*." *Political Shakespeare*, eds. J. Dollimore, and A. Sinfield. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985
- Empson, William. "Sense in *Measure for Measure*." *The Structure of Complex Words*. New York: New Directions, 1951.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon, 1977.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1990.
- Friedman, Michael. "'O, let him marry her!': Matrimony and Recompense in *Measure for Measure*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 1995 Winter, 46:4, 454-64.
- Friedman, Michael. "'Wishing a More Strict Restraint': Feminist Performance and the Silence of Isabella." *Selected Papers from the West Virginia Shakespeare and Renaissance Association*. 1996, 19, 1-11.
- Goldberg, Jonathan. "*Romeo and Juliet*'s Open Rs." *Queering the Renaissance*, ed. J. Goldberg Durham, N.C. : Duke University Press, 1994.
- Goldberg, Jonathan. *Sodometries*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Shakespearean Negotiations*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1988.
- Howard, Jean E. "*Measure of Measure* and the Restraints of Convention." *Essays in Literature*. 1983, 10, 151-152.
- Jankowski, Theodora A. "Pure Resistance: Queer(y)ing Virginit(y) in William Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* and Margaret Cavendish's *The Convent of Pleasure*." *Shakespeare Studies*. 1998, 26, 218-255.

- Kelly, Joan. "The Doubled Vision of Feminist Theory." In *Sex and Class in Women's History*. Ed. Judith L. Newton, Mary P. Ryan, and Judith R. Walkowitz. History Workshop Series. Boston: Routledge, 1983, 259-270.
- Kastan, David Scott. "Proud Majesty Made a Subject: Shakespeare and the Spectacle of Rule." *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 1986 Winter, 37:4, 459-475.
- Lamb, Mary Ellen. "Shakespeare's "Theatrics": Ambivalence toward Theater in *Measure for Measure*." *Shakespeare Studies*. 1987, 20, 129-146.
- Lechter-Seigel, Amy. Isabella's Silence: The Consolidation of Power in *Measure for Measure*." *Reconsidering the Renaissance*. Mario A Di Cesare, ed. Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1992, 371-380.
- Leggatt, Alexander. "Substitution in "Measure for Measure." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Volume 39, Issue 3 (Autumn, 1988), 342-359.
- Lever, J. W. Introduction. *Measure for Measure*. By William Shakespeare. London: Methuen, 1965.
- Lindberg, David C. *Theories of vision: From Al-Kindi to Kepler*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Lindley, David. "The Stubbornness of Barnadine: Justice and Mercy in *Measure for Measure*." *The Shakespeare Yearbook*. 1996, 7, 333-51.
- Liotard, Jean-François. *The Différend: Phrases in Dispute*. Trans. George Van Den Abbeele. *Theory and History of Literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press: 1988 (p. 46)
- McLuskie, Kathleen. "The patriarchal bard: feminist criticism and Shakespeare: *King Lear* and *Measure for Measure*." *Political Shakespeare*, eds. J. Dollimore, and A. Sinfield Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985
- Mullaney, Steven. *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988.

- Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Visual and other Pleasures*.
Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.
- Newman, Karen. "Measure for Measure II, ii 162-187." *Shakespeare's Rhetoric of Comic Character*. New York: Methuen, 1985.
- Newman, Karen. "Comic Plot Conventions in *Measure for Measure*." *Shakespeare's Rhetoric of Comic Character*. New York: Methuen, 1985.
- Orgel, Stephen. *The Illusion of Power: Political Theater in the English Renaissance*.
Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
- Riefer, Marcia. "'Instruments of Some More Mightier Member': The Constriction of Female Power in *Measure for Measure*." *Shakespeare Quarterly*, Volume 35, Issue 2 (Summer, 1984): 157-169.
- Rose, Jacqueline. "Sexuality in the reading of Shakespeare: *Hamlet* and *Measure for Measure*." *Alternative Shakespeares*, ed John Drakakis, New York: Methuen, 1985.
- Sharpe, J.A.. "'Last Dying Speeches': Religion, Ideology and Public Execution in Seventeenth-Century England." *Past and Present*. 107 (1986): 144-167.
- Slights, Jessica; Holmes, Michael Morgan. "Isabella's Order: Religious Acts and Personal Desires in *Measure for Measure*." *Studies in Philology*. Summer 1998, Volume 95, Issue 3, 263-283.
- Spotswood, Jerald W. "Isabella's 'Speechless Dialect': Subversive Silence in *Measure for Measure*." *Explorations in Renaissance Culture*. 1994, 20, 107-25.
- Sallybrass, Peter. "Patriarchal Territories: The Body Enclosed." *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourse of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*. Margaret Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, Nancy Vickers, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Sundelson, David. "Misogyny and rule in *Measure for Measure*." *Women's Studies* 9 (1981): 83-91.

- Swinburne, Henry. *A Treatise of Spousals*. 1688.
- Tennenhouse, Leonard. "Representing Power: *Measure for Measure* in its Time." *The Power of Forms in the English Renaissance*. S. Greenblatt, ed. Norman Oklahoma: Pilgrim Books, 1982.
- Traub, Valerie. "The (In)Significance of "Lesbian" Desire in Early Modern England." *Queering the Renaissance*, J. Goldberg ed. Durham, N.C. : Duke University Press, 1994.
- Wade, Nicholas J. *A Natural History of Vision*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1998.
- Waters Bennett, Josephine. *Measure for Measure as Royal Entertainment*. New York: Columbia, 1966.
- Wittig, Monique. *The Straight Mind, and Other Essays*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1992.
- Wrightson, Keith. *English Society, 1580-1640*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1982.