



## Counting by Threes:

### Sounding the Maternal in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*

Elise Denbo

Queensborough Community College,  
City University of New York

#### ABSTRACT

This paper opens with Mary Beth Rose's question, "Where are the mothers in Shakespeare?" Although Shakespeare's plays often dramatize the emotional bonds between fathers and sons or fathers and daughters, mothers are generally presented as threatening, dangerous, or remarkably absent. Although there are no mothers in *As You Like It*, embedded within the structure and 'sounding' of Arden there is a powerful maternal voice, the Latin *anima* or Greek *psyche* as animating spirit or breath of the greenwood. Ironically access to the maternal voice can be understood through Julia Kristeva's notion of 'the imaginary father,' a 'mother-father-conglomerate,' which she revises from Freud's 'father of individual prehistory.' Unlike what most readers may think, such a 'father' is not a father but a metaphorical *process* – a 'becoming' – offering a means to consider how psychoanalytic approaches can lead us to current theories of embodied cognition, ecofeminism, and the ecological nature of play.

**Keywords:** Julia Kristeva, Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, Early Modern Theatre, Primary Narcissism, Psycholinguistic-Ecofeminist-Embodiment Approaches.

**To cite as:** Denbo, Elise 2022, "Counting by Threes: Sounding the Maternal in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*," *PsyArt* 27, pp. 1-28.

“Where are the mothers in Shakespeare?” Given the absence of mothers and the abundance of fathers in most Shakespeare plays, Mary Beth Rose’s oft-quoted question remains readily applicable to portrayals of gender and “the plotting of motherhood” on the early modern stage.<sup>1</sup> Such a question prompts consideration of the family as the earliest social unit through which a child comes to know him/herself as the third term within the Oedipal triangle, what Freud would later coin the ‘family romance.’ Although Shakespeare’s plays dramatize the emotional, often too intense familial bonds between fathers and sons or fathers and daughters, mothers are generally presented as threatening, dangerous, or remarkably absent. It is not surprising, therefore, that in alignment with Shakespeare’s green comedies, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and *Twelfth Night*, there are no mothers in *As You Like It* despite the fact that fathers and brothers abound. However, if one takes a bodily ‘look,’ perhaps listens sideways, embedded within the structure and ‘sounding’ of Arden, there is a powerful maternal voice, the Latin *anima* or Greek *aneomus* (*psyche*) as animating spirit or breath of the greenwood.<sup>2</sup> As such, I’d like to assess Rose’s question by means of what may seem an anamorphic or trick perspective, a father who is a mother, or – if you like – a mother who is a father. Ironically access to the maternal voice can be understood through Julia Kristeva’s notion of ‘the imaginary father,’ a ‘mother-father-conglomerate,’ which she revisions from Freud’s ‘father of individual prehistory.’<sup>3</sup> Unlike what most readers may think, such a ‘father’ is not a father but a metaphorical *process* – a ‘becoming’ – offering a means to consider how psychoanalytic approaches can lead us to current theories of embodied cognition, ecofeminism, and the ecological nature of play.<sup>4</sup> Rather than codifying language within an abstract system of rules, Kristeva returns to a more semiotic (presymbolic) ‘text,’ the *triadic* realm of *primary narcissism*, whereby the image not yet divided between subject and object is enfolded through the body.<sup>5</sup> An argument of this paper is that Rosalind, as offspring of the imaginary, not only plays upon the polyphonic diversity within Arden’s maternal *and* cultural landscape, she embodies the creative – and *ethical* – nature of the ‘thirdness’ she resounds and performs.

This may seem a play on words, yet unlike a fixed position in language, the metaphorical exchange between the imaginary ‘father-mother’ speaks to a pre-subjective activity associated with theories of enactive cognition, whereby consciousness and perception are emergent processes involving sensorimotor, neural, and kinesthetic capacities “not simply embedded in and constrained by the surrounding world” but adding “to the

enactment of this surrounding world.”<sup>6</sup> Although Rose maintains Shakespearean comedy represents desired society as “unambiguously” motherless,<sup>7</sup> her analysis – while crucial to an understanding of literary and literal depictions of motherhood in early modern England – calls attention to categories of representation that rely on a symbolic system of language that posits an already existing reality privileging mind over matter, discourse over embodiment.<sup>8</sup> If readers, however, are expecting a challenge to Rose’s eminent analysis, they will soon be disappointed. To be clear, *As You Like It* offers no symbolic representation of motherhood. This paper turns instead to the material/semiotic domain of Arden to consider the ‘response-ability’ to otherness, to a *prior* sounding, enfolded within emergent processes of subjectivity.<sup>9</sup> While critics may argue maternal presences are objectified or limited to nature, such presences call forth significant voices that ecological theorists and feminists are not ready to disavow.<sup>10</sup> “Shakespeare,” Michael Witmore tells us, “does not so much dissolve the human body as make it a co-production of the phenomena that come to define and maintain it: movement, voices, feelings, music and what Spinoza will call affection.”<sup>11</sup>

Rather than focusing on discursive practices that set up an opposition between the ‘pure semantic’ over the ‘pure phonic,’ between the reasoning aspect of language and the relational aspect of speech, Kristeva, like Adriana Cavarero, points to the primal resonance of the maternal/material voice that invokes a “rhythm of reciprocity,” not simply as a call to “infantile regression” but as it “re-discovers or re-members the power of a voice that still resounds in logos.”<sup>12</sup> Although this is surely open for debate, Kristeva assures us the concern about whether “mummy” or “daddy” is a matter of semantics caught within the enclosure of symbolic discourse that disregards the reciprocal exchange inherent in a loving otherness (‘thirdness’) whose mediation sublimates the destructive passions but does not disallow their creative energy.<sup>13</sup> What interests me, however, is how Kristeva’s conception of primordial thirdness applies to the Shakespearean corpus, not only the early modern family as a site of conflict and change, but also the variable environments characters cross over and encounter, the movement of bodies, the transferences and counter-transferences, that travel back and forth between stage and world, between psyche and soma, between the ‘I’ and the ‘not I.’<sup>14</sup>

Drawing on the sylvan landscape of *A Midsummer’s Night Dream* as well as the passionate core of *Romeo and Juliet*, Shakespeare’s *As You Like It* explores the alchemy of amatory attraction, its corporeal rhythms,

idealizations, and transgressions transferred from a world of politics to a pocket-like space of play. Although Arden summons child-like origins of a pastoral garden as well as imminent dangers lurking in political and natural landscapes, rather than critiquing human impositions that anthropomorphize the natural world, this paper will explore Arden within Kristeva's elaboration of primary narcissism, a dimension, I believe, Shakespeare draws upon in his creation of psychic space, the affective interplay that circulates between stage and audience, the illusionary *locus* and the border-like *platea* where the illusion is broken.<sup>15</sup> Engaging the primordial gap of the in-between – what Kristeva refers to as the “instinctual intermediary” of the *chora*<sup>16</sup> -- invites consideration of ‘thirdness’ prior to any division between subject and object, calling forth the ‘animating’ breath, the “flora and fauna,” of Arden. Stacy Alaimo reminds us that the space-time of trans-corporeality, the “interconnections of human corporeality with the more-than-human world,” is a site of pleasure as well as danger.<sup>17</sup> Although referencing a psychoanalytic rather than environmental approach, Kristeva's notion of the imaginary as a site of risk and renewal applies to Shakespearean characters such as Rosalind, who return, whether through holiday or exile, trauma or play, to an archaic dimension (Arden) that offers compassionate support to renovate psychic space and enrich a corporeal ‘eye’ before transitioning once again to what may seem conventional roles. Rosalind's ability to inhabit and cross between multiple personas enacts a new form of agency, a counter-tale that puts forth the ‘alchemical vitalism’ of early modern natural philosophy on the threshold of the Cartesian divide.

Of course, either term, ‘narcissism’ or ‘father,’ conjures up negative connotations of self-enclosure or patriarchal oppression, terms which I believe Kristeva exploits to highlight yet expose the very dualities that need to be reevaluated and addressed. Because Shakespeare exposes rather than defends cultural concerns, he dramatizes the dialogic interplay of power with the choric and more personal voice. Drawing on the *Metamorphoses*, Shakespeare reconfigures the myth of Narcissus, altering Ovid's belief that art – preserved in a painting or object – offers the only permanence in a world of shifting and repressive political values. Shakespeare's adaptation of Ovid supplements the double bind of transformation whereby mortals are altered in response to some peril only to be anchored in place as a different creature or ‘object’ (Narcissus into a flower, Echo into sound, Daphne into a laurel tree, Actaeon into a deer, the hunter now the hunted).<sup>18</sup> Embedding mythic tales within Arden's landscape opens a space of metaphorical motility whereby art, nature, and identity are not fixed but continually in process,

co-evolving and open to psychic, social, and environmental change. As such, Shakespeare's Rosalind engages Ovidian alterity as the wonder and renewal of play. Interestingly, although Freud's Oedipal narrative dominates Western culture, Oedipus is 'glaringly absent' from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* while Narcissus (and his inability to embrace Echo) is notably present.<sup>19</sup> Both narratives (Oedipus and Narcissus) are linked, ironically, through the blind prophet, Tiresias, whose history as both man *and* woman, conjoin the erotic with the tragic, sound with (in)sight, the very qualities of Kristeva's imaginary, or what Merleau-Ponty would call an *entre-deux*, the middle way.<sup>20</sup> Ironically, the dissolution of Echo's body into sound, however, not only "releases" her from the narrative plotline embedded in Book 3 of Ovid's text, but calls forth the polyphonic motility of 'voiced' breath, a "flickering materiality" that enables "a more capacious definition of female agency."<sup>21</sup>

While Arden brings forth the semiotic motility of a maternal *chora*, Duke Senior embodies the role of an affectionate, somewhat foolish, father who oversees yet mediates the forest's liberties and dangers. As whimsical and loving guide of the forest, a threshold character more than an active participant in narrative events, Duke Senior unwittingly supports Rosalind's pleasure and magical play, granting her the space to inhabit different roles and personas. While the good duke appears not to recognize his daughter, Rosalind herself maintains noteworthy distance, telling Celia, "I met the Duke yesterday and had much question with him. He asked me of what parentage I was. I told him of as good as he, so he laughed and let me go. But what talk we of fathers when there is such a man as Orlando?" (3.4.31-35). Associated with the popular rural outlaw Robin of Old,<sup>22</sup> the good duke assists Rosalind indirectly as he comforts Orlando in his exile from Oliver's murderous threats, offering the needed gentleness and friendship that release Orlando's inarticulate self upon first meeting Rosalind, "What passion hangs these weights upon my tongue" (1.2.224). Sustained by his newly enriched "bonds between brothers," Orlando is more ready to hear Rosalind-as-Ganymede's critique of his Petrarchan verses (3.3), more ready to assimilate Ganymede-as-Rosalind's lessons on love (4.1). While Duke Senior's threshold position later evolves into the symbolic father of act 5, he offers a site of idealizing distance coupled with affordances and constraints of the maternal greenwood, a hybrid space through which Rosalind will negotiate complex layers of nature as well as art. As such, Rosalind plays with the heterogeneity of imaginary 'thirdness': she is both cynic, "men have died...but not for love" (4.1.91-92), and lover, "O coz, coz, coz...how many fathom deep in love am I" (4.1.175-

176), at once “saucey lackey” and young woman who swoons at the sight of Orlando’s blood. Within the resonant voices of Arden’s landscape (the mother tongue) and guided by Duke Senior’s benevolent ‘eye,’ Rosalind explores the fluid dimensions of an emerging ‘I’ by sounding out its echoing otherness.<sup>23</sup>

Given the illusionary and material nature of the stage and the theatrical environment – the traversal of bodies as well as the fictional roles that engage the ‘I/not I’ of the actor/audience – the early modern public theatre might be said to correlate with the affective site of primary narcissism. Unlike the dyadic structure of the Lacanian imaginary or Descartes’ mind-body divide, Kristeva’s “two-sided and double gendered figure of kinship” invokes a metaphorical *process* involving three terms: “two poles, the maternal and the third party, and the emerging subject who vacillates between each.”<sup>24</sup> Rather than interpreting the Freudian *fort/da* as an attempt to control the mother’s absence through language, Kristeva emphasizes the imaginary exchange between movement and sound as a “signifying space of practice,” replicating presence (*fort/here*) as well as absence (*da/gone*) through bodily activity and vocalic gestures. The correlation of primary process activity in formation of the psychic life of an individual (a subject-in-process) or the shaping of an aesthetic text (a literary-work-in process) resonates with Shakespeare’s presentation of the imaginary and his use of theatrical space. The *As You Like It* world of Arden presents an archaic inscription of fatherhood within the material/maternal disposition of the greenwood that destabilizes power relations within court and courtship through the internalization of psychic/creative space. As such Arden – like Shakespeare’s Globe – offers a domain of polymorphous pleasure and form-giving play, dramatizing maternal and paternal functions (and borders) not yet fixed in symbolic positions of gender or cultural order.

Although Duke Senior and the maternal landscape of Arden illustrate intra-acting processes of the imaginary, Rosalind becomes the central ‘consciousness’ of the play, the character through whom we, as audience, identify but whose three-dimensional activity elicits a counter-response, a mode of listening through which a psychosomatic transaction occurs. On the one hand, we, as audience, are transferred toward the embodied actor and the fictional persona (Rosalind), but on the other hand, we are positioned within a countertransference, a dynamic exchange through which to apprehend the sensory stirrings of our own unconscious anxieties and desires. By placing the ‘forest’ within a *third* site of return, Shakespeare unfastens the threshold to Arden as a site

of creativity, an intra-action between maternal and paternal dispositions that enables Rosalind to enter, assimilate, and retroactively shape psychic space. Disguised and concealed to father, lover, and native inhabitants of Arden but not to audience or co-mates in exile (Celia and Touchstone), Rosalind enters and thereby opens a space through which to apprehend – to take on and put off – the various re-positionings she occupies, a space we, the audience, are privy to enter and experience.

### **Rosalind and thirdness**

More than any other character in Shakespeare, Rosalind *embodies* thirdness (Rosalind-Ganymede-Rosalind), inhabiting a fluid and polyphonic ‘site’ carried beyond the narrative frame of the play when *she/he/she* reappears in the Epilogue and addresses the audience from a fun-loving yet highly ambiguous gender (and theatrical) position. An innovation not found in Thomas Lodge’s *Rosalynde*, Rosalind situates herself near the edge of the stage to speak to playgoers not in verse but in provocative prose. Stepping outside yet staying within the illusion of play, Rosalind transgresses borders: “I charge you, O women, for the love you bear to me, to like as much of this play as you please. And I charge you, O men, for the love you bear to women.” I expect most audiences are enthralled. Romeo’s earlier infatuation with a lady named Rosalinde is surely recovered in the wit and activity of Rosalind, who has transformed the Petrarchan ideal from silent passivity into a capacity for complexity and depth. Her cross-dressed and ‘triangularized’ play – her play *within* a play – opens the potentiality of a ‘third term,’ a blended space that blurs borders of subjectivity with performance and designations of place.

Rosalind’s protean ability to engage human and nonhuman nature, to don and discard roles, enables her to inhabit a new-found freedom. Although there is little information on the popularity of the play as performed in Shakespeare’s theatre, Rosalind remains one of Shakespeare’s most enduring and charming heroines. “Her theatrical power,” Steve Mentz notes, “is political and public, she creates marriages and alliances. She also indulges in multiple identities – court lady, exile, traveler, pageboy, mistress, magician – without insisting on a clear hierarchical relationship among them.”<sup>25</sup> As Ganymede, she tells Orlando how she, enacting the role of a woman, cured another fellow in love:

I set him every day to woo me; at which time, I, being but a moonish youth, grieve, be effeminate, changeable, longing and liking, proud, fantastical, apish, shallow, inconstant, full of tears, full of smiles,

for every passion something and for no passion truly anything...that I drave my suitor from his mad humor of love to a living humor of madness...and to live in a nook merely monastic (3.3.366-372).

While playing Rosalind-as-Ganymede in a mock-marriage scene in 4.1, she crosses species barriers, at once highlighting the agency and significance of matter while extending her 'as if' facility to numerous environmental and animal behaviors that she applies to herself with ease,

Maids are May when they are maids, but the sky changes when they are wives. I will be more jealous of thee than a Barbary cock-pigeon over his hen, more clamorous than a parrot against rain, more new-fangled than an ape, more giddy in my desires than a monkey...and I will laugh like a hyena (4.1.127-133).

When she tells Orlando, "I am your Rosalind" (4.1.56), she expresses the complexities of love enacted in misogynistic views of the female scold as well as the distant mistress, both of which affirm yet paradoxically challenge contemporary views of women as constructed by male desire.

Within the nourishing space of nature's forest as well as her father's idealizing 'eye,' Rosalind's movement, like the play itself, turns inward, at once taking in and putting off the sensory pleasures of Arden while her imaginary 'I' moves outward to love and to Orlando. Although Orlando's excessive poetic verse is parodied by Rosalind, Celia, and Touchstone – "some of them had in them more feet than the verses would bear" (3.2.151) – Ganymede/Rosalind will poke fun at Orlando's appearance, one that is too 'point device' in self-regard, for as she/he tells him, he carries none of love's marks.

A lean cheek, which you have not; a blue eye and sunken, which you have not; an unquestionable spirit, which you have not; a beard neglected which you have not...Then your hose should be ungartered, your bonnet unbanded, your sleeve unbuttoned, your shoe untied... But you are no such man. (3.2.337-44)

Of course, the irony is that Rosalind herself, combining the wit of both Touchstone and Jacques, is rather 'point device' in her description, at once parodying the very love Orlando does not 'show' in his rather too healthy appearance, while she conceals the presence of her woman's heart beneath her disguise. Rosalind's earlier melancholy at her uncle's male-dominated court in act 1 has clearly altered once she finds herself in Arden "Come woo me, woo me, for I am in a holiday humour" (4.1.59-60). In the meantime, Rosalind will keep her disguise

and allow herself to experience various forms of love as she performs the *fort/da* of courtship and practice. Critical of Silvius's idolized wooing of Phoebe, Rosalind wishes to remain part of its play, telling Celia, "O come, let us remove/The sight of lovers feedeth those in love...I'll prove a busy actor in their play" (3.4.50-54). Ganymede as Rosalind plays upon the ambiguity of Orlando's (and the audience's) desire: during the love play in Arden, it becomes evident that not only Orlando but quite likely, we, the audience, desire each of them.<sup>26</sup>

Rosalind, whose name means 'beautiful rose, remains central to the action as Hamlet, yet unlike Hamlet, she is "master mistress of the situation."<sup>27</sup> Having the longest female role in any of Shakespeare's fictions she articulates "comic pleasure itself," the liberating freedom of saucy and "irrepressible" play. Ruth Nero points out: "Rosalind discovers nature and rejoices in the occasion for the expression of her own ebullient, versatile and polymorph energies...she/he is all things to all men [and women] and enjoys every moment of this androgynous ventriloquist's carnival."<sup>28</sup> While characters such as Duke Senior and Celia are content in Arden, Rosalind "thrives in it so completely" that she shapes not only her own but "everyone else's happy paring."<sup>29</sup> Rather than marring or imposing her own 'likening' on Arden's landscape (in contrast to her father and Orlando), Rosalind's more hands-on approach toward the greenwood enables her to practice two kinds of convertible husbandry; environmental, on the degraded sheep farm she buys from Corin's master; and romantic, on Orlando's culturally encoded Petrarchism."<sup>30</sup> Jonathan Bates references her affinity with the fairytale magic of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* as well as her relation to Prospero in *The Tempest*; she not only orchestrates the action but is given the agency to grant wishes. She is, William Kerrigan notes, the "wittiest woman in the canon."<sup>31</sup>

Rather than minimizing audience awareness of Rosalind's disguise, Shakespeare calls attention to her concealment, alternating between layers of polymorphous identity "with lightning speed." The immediacy of such staging evokes the "spectator's dual consciousness" and plays upon various expressions of desire. Michael Shapiro notes "these multiple layers of identity and the swift movements from one to another produced a theatrical vibrancy that engaged audiences in the illusion that an amalgam constructed of multiple and discrete layers of identity represented a unified character."<sup>32</sup> Such gaps of metaphoric motility allow for emergent forms of expression. Rosalind not only reveals the cynicism of love, "But these are all lies: men have died from time to time and worms have eaten them, but not for love" (4.1.91-92), she is ready to swoon at mere mention of

Orlando's presence in the forest, rushing to an overflow of questions for Celia: "What did he when thou sawest him? What said he? How looked he? Wherein went he? What makes he here? Did he ask for me?" Celia responds by comparing Rosalind's overabundance and lack of delay in her speech to Rabelais's giant: "You must borrow me Gargantua's mouth first" (3.2,200-04), alluding to Rosalind's disruption of the chaste female body as the closed mouth rather than the sexual incontinence of an open doorway, the Bakhtinian-like 'grotesque' body of excessive female speech.<sup>33</sup> However, Rosalind will play within the maternal space of the forest to inhabit a thirdness through which other 'positions' emerge. As Willian West notes, "Ganymede does not simply put on Rosalind" nor at the end of the play simply take off Ganymede. "The Rosalind she becomes by becoming Ganymede is not the same one she was."<sup>34</sup> As Rosalind teaches Orlando -- and her audience -- about love, she also teaches herself.

Such an oscillation of borders between body, actor, and audience within the stage-world of the theatre enacts what Mark Turner and Gilles Fauconnier might refer to as a "blended" or third space between target (tenor/world) and source (vehicle/stage) that activates a cross-domain mapping of selected 'parts,' each overlapping, altering spaces whereby something 'other' emerges.<sup>35</sup> Prior to crossing over to Arden, Celia chooses the name *Aliena* (Latin for 'stranger' or 'the lost one'), while Rosalind selects Ganymede. In Greek legend, Ganymede, a beautiful boy, was captured by Jove and chosen to be cupbearer to the gods. Although Shakespeare follows Lodge's *Rosalynde* in this name, it would be hard to imagine he was unaware of its frequent use as a pastoral convention, but especially for its mobile gender connotations: the name, as Stephen Orgel notes, could "hardly be used in the Renaissance" without homoerotic connotations.<sup>36</sup> In 3.2, after learning of Orlando's presence in the forest Rosalind bemoans the impersonation of her male dress: "what shall I do with my doublet and hose!" (199); "But doth he [Orlando] know that I am in this forest, and in man's apparel?" (207-08). Rosalind's costume alludes to other portrayals, for example Drayton's description of Maid Marion in *Poly-Oblion* as 'chiefe Lady of the Game,' with "Clothes tuck'd to the knee," braids, and "Bow and Quiver arm'd," further aligning Rosalind with the rural legend of Robin Hood that challenged traditional law.<sup>37</sup>

As shepherdess, Rosalind also embodies numerous "shaping fantasies" of the early modern imaginary that respond to the royal body as well as its mythic associations with the garden of England, a reified site that

posits the image of 'Eliza' (mapping her body as a type of *chora*-graphy) as its central and glorified shepherdess. Elizabeth's persona signified a metaphorical site of competing yet corresponding discourses, gender/desire, monarch/power, nation/family, associating her rule not only with a patriarchal eye, the image of sight and the spectacle, but also with a feminized and listening ear. Joel Fineman interprets Elizabeth's "Rainbow Portrait" in relation to iconic configurations of authority and desire: not only does the painting reveal innumerable eyes on the elaborate dress Elizabeth wears, but also "places an exceptionally pornographic ear over the genitals" whereby the "ear has a vulva-like quality" that is at once lewd and desirous but also commanding, pointing to vigilance and listening as forms of governance. Elizabeth understood the power of performance ("We kings are set on stages") and engaged in a role of mutual love with her subjects. Before the battle of the Spanish Armada in 1588, Elizabeth visited her troops, pointing to her own body containing feminine and masculine attributes, the body of a "feeble woman" but with the heart and "stomach of a king," positing both her monarchal and maternal role that paradoxically depends upon her virginal status, whereby English subjects are her children, whom she as Mother England will guide and continually nourish. Not only does Elizabeth embody a 'thirdness' that informs Shakespeare's *As You Like It*, her paternal authority and maternal sympathy become a 'dialogized' site of the early modern imaginary.<sup>38</sup>

### **Cross-dressing Shakespeare's Globe: Jacques, "All the World's a Stage"**

Unlike modern theatre, Elizabethan playhouses, especially Shakespeare's theatre, call attention to their fictions, dialogizing forms of direct and indirect address as well as positions on stage (the *locus* and *platea*) to actively engage actor and audience in the decentering movement of play. Jacques's "All the world's a stage" (2.7.139) and Duke Senior's "wide and universal theatre" (2.7.136) coalesce in the hypothetical "if" of a Shakespearean greenwood that activates cross-exchanges between stage and world. Living in the "purlieus" or "skirts of the forest, like fringe upon a petticoat" (3.2.304-05), Rosalind's ambiguous persona plays upon gender anxieties in Elizabethan England and challenges a structure from within the fault-lines of the symbolic. As such, Rosalind's cross-gendered apparel and "doubled-voiced" discourse at the heart of the play engages a dialogic eye that not only critiques society from without but also recognizes her own part from within the system.<sup>39</sup> Valerie Traub comments, "by means of her male improvisation Rosalind leads the play into a mode of desire neither

heterosexual nor homoerotic, but both heterosexual and homoerotic.” Even while displaying her “desire for Orlando, she also enjoys her position as male object of Phoebe’s desire: thus initiating a “deconstruction of the binary system.”<sup>40</sup> Anti-theatricalists such as Phillip Stubbes address deep seated fears about the protean quality of the theatre, its ability to ‘pollute’ not only by infecting the body through sensory portals but also to counterfeit and destabilize social positions of gender and class, men as women, actors, once ‘masterless men,’ as nobles arrayed in gentlemanly or kingly apparel: “There is such a confuse mingle mangle of apparell . . .so, that it is verie hard to knowe, who is noble, who is worshipfull, who is gentleman, and who is not.”<sup>41</sup>

Similarly, cross-dressing (women as men) in the streets of London – and on the stage (boys as women) – not only exacerbated anti-theatricalist protests against the topsy-turvydom of order but were the focus of sumptuary laws that carefully regulated apparel, the color and fabric of clothing, to designate class and gender positions. The preoccupation with appearance and dress “in the period from roughly 1580-1620,” as Jean Howard notes, “signaled a gender system under pressure.”<sup>42</sup> Concerns about gender stability and women as disruptive to order not only aggravated misogynistic beliefs but were exacerbated by extraordinary social and economic change. As a means to centralize its authority yet be part of this change, the Tudor state issued guidelines of order; however what Louis Montrose refers to as the Elizabethan imaginary fostered a reflective but embodied presence on Shakespeare’s stage.<sup>43</sup> The interplay between the royal image and the gendering of art inherent in the Queen’s two bodies (natural and public; woman and monarch) draws on fundamental tensions in gender and status, associating the “oxymoronic one sex-model” with the paradox (and play) of the theatre. As mentioned, Rosalind’s mastery in the Forest of Arden connects her with Elizabeth, the royal ‘shepherd/shepherdess’ who cares for her English flock.

Although critics have often explored cross-dressing within known patriarchal structures, Sara Gorman notes even as cross-dressing interacts with “patriarchal society in complex, and often transgressive ways,” such a practice may sidestep “gender categorizations.”<sup>44</sup> It is quite possible women were not simply victimized but empowered by such an ‘in-between doubleness’ on stage. The “cross-dresser is in a constant state of transformation,” a third space neither masculine nor feminine, rather a potentiality in transition. Within the imaginary dimension of primary narcissism, cross-dressing is not limited to fixed positions or binaries but

performs a metaphorical process or motility engaging the play of otherness that crosses borders. Given that Ovid was Shakespeare's favorite author, it is not surprising he was fascinated by the *energeia* inherent in alterity. As noted earlier, while Ovid's *Metamorphoses* dramatizes violations of power that change mortals into objects but not back again, Shakespeare's Arden is a place of renewal that reconfigures patriarchal, gendered, human/nonhuman norms. Although Steven Greenblatt considers the subversion/containment debate, whereby at the play's end, couples are married and a converted Frederick gives the dukedom back to his brother, Ferdinand, Montrose points to a window of openness that challenges, disrupts, and alters the dominant discourse.

Rosalind's 'ternary' figure unsettles the very ground of contemporary arguments as her person disputes religious, cultural, and anatomical discourses about the feminine body and the nature of women, the erotic 'toying' and deception of Eve within a lost Eden. Renaissance debates voiced in a proliferation of treatises call attention to marginalized discourses that not only questioned order but also provided powerful sources for affective fictions and their performance. Cited originally in Ambroise Pare's *Des monstres of prodiges* (1573), Montaigne refers to the case of Marie Garnier, a woman of twenty-two (fifteen in Pare's version), who, in the heat of running after swine suddenly changed into a man after which she, now he, was rechristened Germain. Pare notes four examples of such changes from female to male, but not the reverse: "We never find in any story that any man ever became a woman because Nature always tends toward what is most perfect and not, on the contrary, to perform in such a way that what is perfect should become imperfect."<sup>45</sup> Such reported 'events' and misogynistic beliefs take on a force and magic for the theatre, one that Shakespeare metamorphoses in new ways, reinforcing the limitation of a central perspective through the notion of paradox as that which confounds reason. Characters take on the ambiguity inherent in the anamorphic image: Viola, "I am not what I am" (*TN* 3.1.131); Oliver: "'Twas I, but tis not I" (*AYL* 4.3.134) play on the biblical Yahweh, "I am that I am" to dramatize the mysterious obscurity that resists classification in naming while intimating an unnamable yet resounding otherness, the predisposition of Shakespeare's imaginary. Situated at the margins, Arden evokes an interior space (a listening ear) that not only gives voice to semiotic loss but reconstructs the maternal imprint of language that precedes and helps access the image. The rhythms and disruptions of the natural body, negated at Frederick's Oedipal court and aligned with the incest taboo (Charles reference to Orlando, "Come, where is this young gallant that is so desirous to lie with

his mother-earth”: 1.2.166-7), find expression within imaginary ‘otherness’ as oscillations between life and death, pleasure and loss, manifested in the “sweet adversities” of Arden.

***Arden On and Off Stage: The Maternal, The Imaginary, and The Real***

Deeply rooted in Elizabethan culture, *As You Like It's* Forest of Arden exists beyond the frame of text, as a mythic yet topographical presence invoking the woodlands of a primeval forest, a “pool of associations like a pebble, creating concentric ripples.”<sup>46</sup> Although Duke Senior serves as a principle of harmony with the ecological framework of Arden, he embodies a fading imaginary ‘father’ on the cusp of the Cartesian Divide. While the good Duke’s gentility contrast with Frederick’s agonistic court, the biodiversity of Arden, its brambles, osiers, and oak trees call forth the place-attachments, the maternal rhythms, colors, and textures of Shakespeare’s own Warwickshire childhood as well as the ancestral intimations in his mother’s name, Mary Arden. For Shakespeare, Arden’s soil rooted in maternal as well as ‘native ground.’ “Within the old forest of Arden . . . is a cluster of four villages, Balsall, Baddesley Clinton, Wroxall, and Rowington . . . . In these villages, or in Coventry, lived all the Shakespeares who have been found before 1500 in Warwickshire.”<sup>47</sup> Significantly Shakespeare’s association with Arden was not only literary but personally as well as socially inspired: James Shapiro tells us when Shakespeare visited his Warwickshire home late in the summer of 1599, he was interested in recovering legal rights to his maternal origins: he and his father unsuccessfully attempted to extend the family’s coat of arms received in 1596 to include the Arden “connection,” an allotment of land comprising his mother’s inheritance, which his father had mortgaged years earlier to pay off debts. Although great areas of the forest had been cut down decades before his own birth, Arden was not only “central to the world of his ancestors, the stuff of family legends” but also native inhabitants of England.<sup>48</sup>

Arden’s landscape, at once nowhere and everywhere in place, sounds out varying debates in Shakespeare’s England, not only literary practices of the day but considerations of how individual and environmental rights cohere in response to contemporary practices such as primogeniture, land enclosure, animal husbandry, courtship and marriage.<sup>49</sup> As site of semiotic rhythms and textures that attach a speaker to the “embodiedness of his or her existence,”<sup>50</sup> Arden is not bound by monologic order nor judgment: retaining the drive affectivity of Kristeva’s *chora*, the forest allows a reconfiguration of the symbolic through the renewal

of the imaginary. While recalling (inter-textualizing) earlier pastoral romances, Virgil's *Eclogues*, Sidney's *Arcadia*, Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*, Lodge's *Rosalind*,<sup>51</sup> Shakespeare's invocation of Robin Hood and his legendary band of merry men underscores the elemental Englishness of the terrain not as an idealized *locus amoenus* but a vibrant environmental voice. Rather than presenting the forest as a darkly dense area or overfull with green trees, *As You Like It*'s four woodland and twelve pastureland scenes portray the landscape variety of the English Midlands, marking the "life-territory" where, as Randall Martin notes, "Shakespeare learned to think bioregionally." For most early moderns the Forest of Arden was "anything but a terra incognita in a remote corner of the kingdom," but an agentic, living force of all earthly life.<sup>52</sup>

By the sixteenth century A. Stuart Daly tells us, the "Forest or Woodland of Arden had become a famous and storied region covering over two hundred square miles in the heart of England... far from being a continuous expanse of woodland."<sup>53</sup> Occupying an animate presence in the hearts and minds of the people, William Camden's *Britannia* (1586) maps the country as follows:

The Feldon lieth on this side Avon southward, a plain champagne country, and being rich in corn and green grass yieldeth a right goodly and pleasant prospect to them that look down upon it from an hill which they call Edgehill. . . . Now let us enter into the woodland, which above the River Avon spreadeth itself northward much larger in compass than the Feldon, and so is for the most part thick set with woods, and yet not without pastures, cornfields, and sundry mines of iron."<sup>54</sup>

In his chorographic poem *Poly-Oblion*, Michael Drayton, who like William Shakespeare was native to Warwickshire, dramatizes the fens, meadows, and forests of Arden as living reservoirs of cultural memory. *Poly-Oblion*'s rivers, mountains, and woodlands embody human and nonhuman elements, maternal and paternal intonations, that bemoan the cutting down of forests as well as the enclosure of land that disrupts Arden as a shared environment.<sup>55</sup> Rather than personifying 'voices' of the forest, however, Shakespeare embodies the injury (or primal wound) to the green tissue and corpus of Arden enacted by enclosure and rampant deforestation. Situating the play's personal encounters (Rosalind, Orlando, Celia, Corin, Phoebe, etc.) within Arden's disputed "landscape-identities and -relationships," *As You Like It* invites early modern audiences to regard environmental and social controversies that affect their everyday lives. Portraying Arden as a 'landscape mosaic' while echoing

its material (maternal) beginnings, Shakespeare's play takes on a "distinct ecological orientation" whereby the playwright's "biocentric, or more than human-focused framework positions Arden to speak as a 'geographical terrain and a terrain of consciousness'"<sup>56</sup> Such correlations between land, body, and mind suggest phonic and semantic crossings, for example, *ligna* (Latin for 'woods) and *lingua* (Latin for 'tongue), at once speech, language, and the mother tongue.

It may seem paradoxical to consider one of Shakespeare's most literary plays as evocative of a world that precedes language. Frank Kermode comments "there is no play of Shakespeare's, apart from *Love's Labor's Lost* that requires the reader or spectator to have more knowledge of the Elizabethan culture and especially of its styles in literature."<sup>57</sup> While critics point to the relative 'plotless-ness' of the comedy, Rosalie Colie maintains that the "perspectivism...built into the play" is in fact the "play's method" whereby parallels and juxtapositions of events provide rhythmic ways of listening, articulating in eclogue-exchanges. Given each character's 'reading' of the forest, there is no fixed meaning or hierarchical dichotomy set forth in Arden, rather a gathering of perspectives reflected in Touchstone's "whether wisely or no, let the Forest judge" (3.2.109-10). Arden's episodic 'plot' takes on the shifting contexts of what Kristeva might liken to a pre-narrative envelope. Within the domain of Arden, differing perspectives ('readings') and cognitive affective models ('styles') illustrate what Kristeva might refer to as a process of free association, 'underwater' (unconscious) narratives that draw on semiotic inscriptions in language, the role of the maternal as foundational to expression and otherness. Although highly rhetorical, Arden's various modalities and 'songs' resemble "non-narrative shreds," "indexes" or "thing-presentations" through which a psychological experience is deciphered:<sup>58</sup> Music whether presented in songs (ayres), voices or thing representations of the forest nourish the spoken word, a belief that held significance for Shakespeare's theatre.

### **Modalities of Perception: The Animating Breath and Vocalization of Logos**

Articulating various forms of nature, *As You Like It* represents one of Shakespeare's most balanced, interactive, and ecological romances: nature and culture, art and language are challenged yet reaffirmed within a complex system of networks that engage communal and political practices of the day. Framed by an outer court of envy and power, Arden is both pastoral and literary, a domain of "brooks" as well as "books," a locus where

primal and sacred intonations inhabit mysterious yet material space. Voices like “tongues in trees” replicate preverbal speech not only as movement and music in Arden’s “running brooks,” but also as an oral event metamorphosed into the ‘permanency’ of a written text: “sermons in stone.” While Jonathan Gil Harris notes the “palimpsest-like matter’ of Arden,<sup>59</sup> Vin Nardizzi points out that early modern theatres provided an “outlay for evergreen fantasies. Inside them, England’s trees – replanted as the theatre – were virtually brought back to life whenever a character entered the woods.”<sup>60</sup> Current ecological studies, such as Robert Watson’s excellent “As You Liken It,” point to humanity’s (notably Duke Senior’s) anthropomorphic – and anthropocentric – proclivity to impose definitions on the natural world by means of ‘likening’ whereby “efforts to bridge, through simile, the gap between ourselves and nature, and between our minds and reality... only confirms that there is really no way back.”<sup>61</sup> No doubt, there is no possible way to return to the scene of origin, but the very gap that enables difference as well as ‘likening’ affectively embodies our link to human and more than human nature. As a proponent of vital materialism, Jane Bennett points out that unlike anthropocentrism, a “touch of anthropomorphism” catalyzes resemblances that invoke a deeper responsiveness to nature, even when using language to describe something ‘other’ than linguistic.<sup>62</sup> Although anthropomorphism can surely take on a sentimental guise that elides the presence of otherness while shoring up the self, current theories of embodied cognition and environmental studies tell us that language is grounded in physical experience: our connection with our environment is embedded within the neural, sensorimotor, kinesthetic systems of our bodies that evolutionary link us with other animals and forms of life.

Chronologically *As You Like It* appears to have been written and performed before *Hamlet*. Although the play was ‘staied’ in the Stationers Record around 1600, unlike Shakespeare’s earlier successes, *As You Like It* has no mention until its publication in the 1623 Folio, leaving open its performance date as uncertain and arguable for critics. Frank Kermode comments quite likely it was one of the first plays performed at the Globe, written for a new type of audience different from the nearby Rose Theatre, which catered to a more boisterous repertoire. Juliet Dusinberre believes that the play was written for the Shrovetide performance at Richmond on February 20, 1599 and proposes that an epilogue found by Stephen May in a commonplace book owned by Henry Stanford followed this performance of Shakespeare’s *As You Like It*.<sup>63</sup> James Shapiro places its writing in the summer of

1599, most notably after an unauthorized version of Shakespeare's Sonnet 138, "When my love swears that she is made of truth," was first published in *The Passionate Pilgrim*. Shakespeare's revision of the sonnet in his authorized publication of 1609 reflects minor changes that reveal a shift from a "self-protective" and "isolated" speaker (such as Orlando?) to the rhythmic reciprocity of a loving relationship between self and other (Rosalind and Orlando as coequals). Trans-positioning "I know" to "she knows" in line 6 of the 1609 version, Shakespeare introduces "a shared understanding and subjectivity," whereby "simple truths "are mutually "suppressed" so that the poem reflects the dizzying complexities of love, an active choral reciprocity in the last couplet: "She...me...we...be."<sup>64</sup>

Notably, the sensory (and maternal) world of Arden similarly plays upon the resonance of sound in the multiple songs that permeate Shakespeare's forest: "Under the greenwood tree (Amiens, 2.5), "Blow, blow, thou winter wind (Amiens, 2.7), "What shall he have that killed the deer (Lords 4.2) "It was a lover and his lass" (Two Pages 5.3), and Hymen's wedding song, "Wedding is great Juno's crown" (5.4). Unlike his other plays, Shakespeare wrote five songs for *As You Like It*, using an unprecedented number of six boy actors rather than the usual four. Shapiro points out that "thinking of the play as an embryonic musical" helps consider the newness of Shakespeare's relatively 'plotless' structure in anticipation of modern musical theatre.<sup>65</sup> While the rhythms of the forest world are reconfigured in Amien's singing, musical instruments – like the human voice – are receptacles of sound that call forth corporeal elements of language. In *The passions of the minde* (1601), Thomas Wright refers to a "correspondence, or proportion between sound and music" whose effect on the material body opens the self to an affinity with others whereby the responsiveness of sound is likened to "an artificial shaking, crispling, or tickling of the air...which passeth through the ears, and by them into the heart."<sup>66</sup> Interestingly, more than two centuries later, the young Nietzsche correlated music with the mother tongue," professing an "immediate kinship with music" and with those "who find in music their maternal bosom, so to speak"<sup>67</sup>

Sounding also applies to an opening of the self, the depth of emotion that Rosalind expresses to Celia "O coz, coz, coz, my pretty little coz, that thou didst know how many fathom deep I am in love! But it cannot be *sounded*; my affect hath an unknown bottom, like the bay of Portugal" (4.1.175-178, italics mine). Wes Folkerth points out Shakespeare uses 'sound' as a verb, sometimes as an adjective, but rarely as a noun.<sup>68</sup> 'Sounding' as an

ocean-like immensity and fluid depth touches on the textural palpability and reverberations of emotion while activating pauses and elastic stretches of time that a lover feels upon awaiting word from the beloved. When Celia ‘delays’ in telling Rosalind that it is in fact Orlando who carves loving verses in the forest, Rosalind invokes spatial as well as corporeal metaphors that link the impatience of discovery with child-like understandings of the literal yet polymorphous body, the interpenetration of eroticism and thought.

One inch of delay more is a South Sea of discovery. I prithee tell me who is it quickly, and speak apace.

I would thou couldst stammer, that thou might pour this concealed man out of thy mouth as wine comes out of a narrow-mouthed bottle—either too much at once, or none at all. I prithee, take the cork out of thy mouth, that I may drink thy tidings. (3.2.179-185)

Such ‘sounding’ and polymorphous mixtures call forth maternal echolalias of playful humor as well as their disruptions with Arden’s ‘golden world.’ Rather than eliciting the idealization of a chivalric knight, Celia finds Orlando like a “dropped acorn’ under a tree...” there lay he stretched along like a wounded knight” (3.2. 213; 218). Similarly, Touchstone (a criterion used to test the virtue of gold or silver) ‘touches’ on the alchemy of simple truths offering a window into the disposition of characters by which they (and the audience) test the nature of things or come to realize themselves. Orlando’s excessive poetic verse, ‘love songs’ carved into trees, align with Duke Senior’s opening aria to Arden “tongues in trees” whereby the expressive diversity of Arden, its flora and fauna, invoke the doubleness of the ‘hunt,’ to ‘kill/woo’ a ‘hart/heart’ or ‘deer/dear.’ Similarly In 3.2 Touchstone’s punning upon ‘hart’ and ‘heart’ – “If a hart do lack a hind/Let him seek out Rosalind” (88-89) – reflect pleasure in similitudes of sound that embody laughter while echoing darker shadows enacted in pursuit.<sup>69</sup> In 3.3 Touchstone tells Audrey: “No truly; for the truest poetry is the most feigning, and lovers are given to poetry; and what they swear is poetry it may be said, as lovers, they do feign” (15-17) – whereby Audrey replies in her own alchemic mixture of honesty and chastity – “I am not a slut, though I thank the gods I am foul” (30). Aubrey’s use of the “foul,” meaning homely as well as distasteful or unclean, doubles word and thing, both *this* and *that*, as it points to a truth more humorous than judgmental, ironically light-hearted but also shaming.

**So...Where Are the Mothers? Primary Thirdness and Theatrical Space**

To once again invoke Mary Beth Rose's question "Where are the mothers in Shakespeare?" is to highlight a persistent absence that paradoxically enlivens an occluded yet recurrent maternal presence in Shakespeare's plays. Rather than the enclosure of a command, a question calls attention to an ambiguity, something missing or not visible within traditional structures of representation. Although Rose's essay addresses important contributions by actual mothers in the early modern period, her hope for Shakespeare to have incorporated such representations within his plays is most often met with disappointment. Shakespeare has been admired for his presentation of young women (Rosalind, Viola, or Juliet) whose spirited beauty is contrasted with the excess of the maternal threat; however, it is possible to argue Shakespeare's rendering of the imaginary manifests an affective space for underlying forms of creativity that enable ethical care and responsibility, disrupting binaries yet valuing difference. As Jean Feerick notes: "In these layered images of attachment – earth bound together with human bound together with element — Shakespeare's play reveals what it means for the human to be 'inside nature,' and for nonhuman/nature to be inside the social."<sup>70</sup> Even though these plays are placed within a masculine world whereby the everyday experience of women and the real work of mothers are not represented,<sup>71</sup> such female presences are given potency and power, whether dangerous, threatening or emitting a mysterious eloquence, such as Lady Mortimer's beguiling Welsh, or the voices abundant in nature's forests. Caliban tells us, "Be not afeard; the isle is full of noises, / Sounds and sweet airs, that give delight and hurt not" (*Temp.* 3.2.130-3)

In such ways, Shakespeare's *Arden* resonates with Kristeva's adaption of Plato's *chora*, not simply as a womb-like receptacle that passively awaits the inscription of the paternal imprimatur but as third *genus* of the "errant feminine," an ethical space of play and 'psychic unrest' where boundaries of identities or 'things' become intra-actions of difference rather than divisions, networks of 'otherness' rather than replicas of sameness.<sup>72</sup> Such an exchange of elements within the earth's globe as well as Shakespeare's Globe (or 'Wooden O') represents intersecting networks within an ecological and theatrical whole. In her study, "Engendering the Narrative Act," Mary Ellen Lamb explores the oral tradition of story-telling as well as the garrulous speech of midwives and 'grandams' who are "originary to their art."<sup>73</sup> Helen Hackett points out that Shakespeare's later romances depend less on the "presence or absence of maternal characters," but "within the plays, maternal metaphors are used for narrative itself" where the "word 'issue' is insistently repeated signifying both children and narrative outcome."<sup>74</sup>

Such tales dramatize the child's relationship to fiction as well as an ambiguity that partakes of the in-between, the intermediary exchange between stage and world, the spinning (and *mattering*) of stories. "Fantasy," Kristeva states, "returns to our psychic life, but no longer as cause for complaint or source of dogma. Now it provides the energy for a kind of artifice, for the art of living.... This is the realm of imagination, play, and possibility, where even calculation becomes renewal and creation."<sup>75</sup> Shakespeare shows us that such a passage enriches our lives when regulations of the law are not simply imploded from without, but when passions and pathways of the body participate in creativity from within. As offspring of the imaginary, Rosalind – and her audiences – will inherit this space. Because it welcomes otherness, such a space is transformative and ethical.

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> Mary Beth Rose, "Where Are the Mothers in Shakespeare?" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42.3 (1991), 291-314; see also Mary Beth Rose, *Plotting Motherhood in Medieval, Early Modern, and Modern Literature* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017).

<sup>2</sup> For the early moderns *Pneuma* or *spirit* as life-giving breath was considered a third term between soul and body, a thin material substance or an incorporeal body. Aristotle's tripartite soul (vegetable, animal, rational) connects the human and the non-human world as much as it distinguishes each from the other. While current references to *psyche*, soul, or spirit are often used interchangeably, such meanings were more distinct in the early modern period especially in response to Galenic theories of medicine. Bruce Smith points out that the Latin *anima* "catches the double sense of 'soul' as 'spirit'; both a physical substance (particles of air) and a psychological concept (something a subject feels)." *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England* (Chicago and London, University of Chicago, 1999), 99.

<sup>3</sup> Sigmund Freud, *The Ego and the Id. The Standard Edition*, trans. James Strachey (New York: W.W. Norton, 1990), 26. Freud states "primal identification" with the "father of individual prehistory" is "direct and immediate," prior to all object relations or "definite knowledge of sexual difference." For Freud and Kristeva, the preoedipal father is an archaic presence associated with orality and the incorporation of matter, a drive-laden activity on the psychosomatic border of a preliminary and prescient 'other.' In this way, the prehistorical father-mother intimate a metaphorical interaction (like, yet not like) that takes on attributes of "both parents," the taking in and separation of matter, excess and loss. Such a chiasmus or 'turning' within primary identification imbues the transference phenomenon of analysis (and, for this study, the theatre) with empathic attraction to the intuition of otherness. As Kristeva tells us, in "his journey through the land of love Freud reaches Narcissus.... Amatory experience rests upon narcissism" (*Tales* 257), which for Kristeva is "unthinkable and unlivable without the other."<sup>3</sup> See Pleshette DeArmitt, *The Right to Narcissism: A Case for an Im-possible Self-Love.*, New York: Fordham UP, 14. The third term within the imaginary dimension of primary narcissism enables a creative laboring and motility, corporeal separation as well as attraction to otherness, an affective gap through which the subject emerges.

<sup>4</sup> Although cognitive critics such as Blakely Vermeule tell us the "new unconscious is aggressively anti-psychoanalytical," Kristeva creates an alternative 'narrative' to more traditional theories espoused by Freud and Lacan, who rely on Oedipal/Hegelian thirdness to structure the psychoanalytic subject as well as his/her position in language. Kristeva's psychoanalytic/social/literary approaches posit a connection between biology and culture evocative of early modern humoral theory. Similar to Hélène Cixous, who coined the term *écriture féminine*, Kristeva and Luce Irigaray, albeit in varying ways, approach the musicality in women's voices as a means to disrupt binaries within patriarchal narratives. While Irigaray is often cited by ecofeminist or post-humanist studies for her noteworthy contributions, this paper connects biological and societal

---

*archaic* parental functions or processes as they apply to Shakespeare's theatrical fictions, notably environmental, gender, and cultural issues regarding the ethics of responsibility, hospitality, and care of the other.

<sup>5</sup> Kristeva's elaboration of primary narcissism challenges traditional readings that posit narcissism as a dualistic enclosure that replicates the maternal dyad. Kristeva credits Freud with binding "the state of loving to narcissism" whereby primary narcissism is an organizational structure rather than a symptom. Within the preoedipal dimension, primal processes of maternal abjection (rejection/separation) and idealized attraction (transference/connection) interact as double-movements inaugurating the space through which the child comes into being, not through the specular reflection of the eye but initially through the mouth, the ear, the texture of touch, assimilating not only the *echolalias* and nourishment of the maternal body but also auditory reflections/soundings from a loving third, a transference figure outside material need via the *aporía* of maternal desire, an immediate, empathic identification.

<sup>6</sup> Francisco J. Varela, Evan Thompson, and Eleanor Rosch, *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991), 174. Karen Barad promotes a notion of agential realism whereby "individuals do not preexist as such but rather materialize in *intra-action*." For Barad, a "specific intra-action enacts an 'agential cut' (in contrast to the Cartesian cut—an inherent distinction—between subject and object), effecting a separation between 'subject' and 'object' within the phenomenon." As such, "it is not that there are no separations or differentiations, but that they only exist within relations": See Adam Kleinman, "An Interview with Karen Barad: 'Intra-actions,'" *Mousse* 34, 79.

<sup>7</sup> Mary Beth Rose, *Plotting Motherhood*, 77.

<sup>8</sup> Rose, "Where Are the Mothers," 291. Rose herself states that "her essay focuses on the relation between Renaissance sexual ideologies and dramatic genres: in particular, on the ways in which motherhood is represented (or pointedly not represented) in the various forms of Shakespeare's drama."

<sup>9</sup> See Tobias Menley, *The Animal Claim: Sensibility and the Creaturely Voice* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2015), 13-15. Menley explores eighteenth-century writers of sensibility in relation to an ethical response to the creaturely voice. As he notes, Walter Benjamin is "attentive to the persistence of something residual" within the human body that he calls "the voice of nature" within a cultural domain. Eric L. Santner maintains what enables humans to be "more creaturely than other creatures" is our ability to challenge socio-symbolic law. "The new ethics of neighbor love...locates our responsibility to elaborate forms of solidarity with this creaturely expressivity that [similar to Freud's uncanny or Kristeva's 'stranger in ourselves'] makes the other strange not only to me but also to him or herself." *On Creaturely Life* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2006), xiii. Similarly, for Kristeva, "maternity is the place where the self becomes alien, where the alterity within selfhood is manifested as an issue for ethics" (Emanuela Bianci, "Receptacle/*Chora*: Figuring the Errant Feminine in Plato's *Timaeus* in *Hypatia* vol. 21, no. 4, Fall 2006: 139).

<sup>10</sup> It is important to note that alignments between female corporeality and maternal nature have long been precarious for feminists, raising the threat of essentialism, the 'ghost of biology,' that has led to the oppression of women while excluding them from representation as participants in the 'grand narrative' of patriarchy. While crediting postmodern feminists who advocated for women's representation in language, Alaimo comments that Simone de Beauvoir, Gayle Rubin and Monique Wittig, have "pursued a 'flight from nature,' relentlessly disentangling 'woman' from the supposed ground of essentialism, reductionism, and stasis. The problem with this approach, however, is that the more feminist theories distance themselves from "nature," the more that very "nature" is implicitly or explicitly reconfirmed as the treacherous quicksand of misogyny." Stacy Alaimo and Susan Hekman, *Material Feminisms* (Bloomington and Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2008), 4. Notably there are significant interconnections between feminist, ecofeminist, ecocritical studies as well as psychoanalytic, phenomenological, and poststructuralist approaches. While material feminists work toward eroding power structures whereby gender, class, and sexuality are interlinked with the oppression of N/nature historically designated as 'female,' as Alaimo notes it is important not to move from one side of the binary to the other. As a means to disrupt the material/discursive dichotomy, Catrina Sandilands puts forth a project that makes "space for nature in politics" not as a "positive, human-constructed presence, but as an enigmatic, active Other." Catrina Sandilands, *The Good Natured Feminist: Ecofeminism and the Quest for Democracy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 181.

<sup>11</sup> Michael Witmore, *Shakespearean Metaphysics* (London and New York: Continuum, 2008), p. 13.

<sup>12</sup> Adrian Cavarero, *For More Than One Voice*, trans. Paul A. Kortman (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005), 169-180, esp. 169; 180. Both Marjorie Garber and William West comment that Arden as setting and myth, place and space, takes on the presence of a character. Alison Findlay notes that "Drama is, like the *chora*, an incubator in which new worldly forms,

---

new places and identities for women can be engendered.” While the “crucible of drama could often be dangerous, it could also transform the dull metal of one’s given place into the golden possibilities of space” (*Playing Spaces in Early Modern Women’s Drama*, Cambridge, 2006: 21; 225).

<sup>13</sup> Kristeva brings the maternal body back into language to deconstruct binaries. Critics such as Judith Butler maintain that to identify the semiotic *chora* with the mother’s body essentializes the maternal, reducing women to private enclosures, to mother nature (cyclical rather than heroic linear time), to reproductive processes controlled by patriarchal law. Critics such as Fanny Söderbäck, however, argue that Kristeva “by no means reduces women to the function of motherhood” but rather offers a return to the maternal body to undo such a reduction. “By bringing the woman out of the shadows, she provides women with a past (a genealogy of their own, a community of women, a history [her-story] hitherto repressed and simultaneously with a future (in the sense of liberating them from predefined roles and positions)” (“Motherhood According to Kristeva” in *PhiloSophia* 1.1, 2011: 65.) Similarly, rather than “strengthening the paternal function to the detriment of the maternal,” Kristeva’s recontextualization of Freud’s father of individual prehistory offers a means of deconstructing the maternal-paternal binary. See Kelly Oliver, *Reading Kristeva: Unravelling the Double-bind* (Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1993): 69.

<sup>14</sup> As noted, Arden presents an archaic inscription of fatherhood within the material/maternal disposition of the greenwood that destabilizes power relations within court and courtship through the internalization of psychic space: Rosalind is nourished by semiotic gestures and eclogue-like debates of both pasture and woodland, while her traversal of presymbolic space is supported by the affectionate yet distancing presence of Duke Senior’s fleeting yet idealizing eye. Rosalind embraces the ‘thirdness’ inherent in Kristeva’s “Father-Mother in personal prehistory” that disrupts categories of family and nation, gender and power, culture and environment. As such, Arden – like Shakespeare’s Globe – offers a domain of polymorphous pleasure and form-giving play, dramatizing maternal and paternal functions (and borders) not yet fixed in symbolic positions of gender, cultural or linguistic order. The correlation of primary process activity in formation of the psychic life of an individual (the subject-in-process) and the shaping of an aesthetic text (a literary-work-in-process) resonates with Shakespeare’s presentation of the imaginary and his use of theatrical space.

<sup>15</sup> Although psychic space is a difficult term to define – even Freud maintained the space of the psyche can only be read metaphorically – the roots of the psyche are deeply embedded in biological soil. For Kristeva, textures, rhythms, sound, precede symbolic sight and continually inform the split as well as the connection between self and other; as such, the embodied voice and the listening ear enrich the *energeia* and spirit of the theatrical event as a living event that puts assumptions at risk and offers an ethical encounter with the ‘other.’ For Levinas, ethics is a sensible rather than rational event prior to any conceptual understanding, an empathic experience of otherness rather than mastery. As a threshold figure who straddles psychological, embodied and cultural perspectives, the imaginary father offers a nexus from which to consider intertextual and critical approaches as diverse as Homi Bhabha’s “third space” and Raymond William’s “sources of dissidence,” not to mention recent concerns of presentism and ecological criticism, which address the interconnections between past and present, between human and nonhuman borders. Unlike the father of prohibition and the law, the ‘imaginary’ third is a figure of psychic and social renewal.

<sup>16</sup> Kristeva borrows the term *chora* from Plato’s *Timaeus*, which she posits as fluid receptacle without position or thesis yet marked by pulsions and scissions of matter that inform language, the articulation of primary processes and drives: “all discourse “moves with and against the *chora* in the sense that it simultaneously depends on and refuses it.” For Kristeva, semiotic drives are always checked by biological and social constraints, already imprinted by culture. *Revolution in Poetic Language* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 26-28. Like Plato, Kristeva associates the *chora* with the maternal (Plato’s ‘wet-nurse,’ a third genus,’ ‘bastard reasoning’). Diane Ackerman notes that within the *chora*, “mother and baby are united by an umbilical cord of sound.” *A Natural History of the Senses* (New York: Vintage Press, 1991), 179. Levinas refers to the connection between hospitality and the feminine, calling femininity “the very welcome of the dwelling.” *Totality and Infinity*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh, Penn.: Duquesne University Press. 1969), 158.

<sup>17</sup> Stacy Alaimo, *Bodily Natures* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010), 2.

<sup>18</sup> Not only do the wounded deer and the mirror evoke the Ovidian myths of Actaeon and Narcissus as the desiring as yet self-enclosed eye/I, Shakespeare, in turn, dramatizes the irony of a reflection that Orlando cannot yet apply to his own self-involvement. As Petrarchan poet-lover, Orlando is inclined to be more *expressive* of himself than the love he bears for Rosalind, “the *unexpressive* she” of his verse [italics mine].

---

<sup>19</sup> Ingo Gildenhard and Andrew Zissos, "Ovid's Narcissus: Echoes of Oedipus," *The American Journal of Philology*, 121.1 (Spring 2000), 132. The term 'flickering materiality' is cited from Todd Borlik, *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 94. Unlike the father of law, Kristeva regards Narcissus as "the obliged creator of the world" (*Tales*, 135). Echo's vocalic, aural reflections have often been elided, notably in psychoanalytic narratives such as Freud and Lacan. Echo as a figure of alterity repeats words but with intonations of difference. In correlation with the pastoral, pre-narrative-like landscape of Arden, Brain W Breed refers to Echo as "a figure both intimately associated with pastoral and wide-ranging in its suggestiveness, whether as metaphor for intertextuality, a symbol of the difficulty of distinguishing between self and other, or a manifestation of language that simply repeats and redoubles itself. Philip Hardie has recently focused on echo as the epitome of pastoral 'plenitude' the marker of a landscape full of human presence." *Pastoral Inscriptions: Reading and Writing Virgil's Eclogues* (London, 2006), 74.

<sup>20</sup> Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. Colin Smith (London: Routledge, 2011), xi. "When I begin to reflect, my reflection bears upon an unreflective experience, moreover my reflection cannot be unaware of itself as an event, and so it appears to itself in the light of a truly creative act." Walter Benjamin suggests resonance with a woodland as he relates it to translation: "Unlike a work of literature, translation does not find itself in the centre of the language forest but on the outside facing the wood ridge; it calls into it without entering, aiming at the single spot where the echo is able to give, in its own language, the reverberation of the work in an alien one." *Illuminations* (New York, 1968), 76.

<sup>21</sup> Gina Bloom, *Voice in Motion: Staging Gender and Sound in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 148. Also see Sarah Kathleen Kaczo, "The Ovidian Soundscape: The Poetics of Noise in the *Metamorphosis*," Dissertation, Columbia University, 2019, 104.

<sup>22</sup> During a period of poor harvests, food shortages, and economic dearth, commoners and squatters resisted enclosure; Robin Hood as an outlaw legend was especially popular with the people but not the Tudor monarchy. See Richard Wilson, "Like the Old Robin Hood": "*As You Like It*" and the Enclosure Riots," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43.3 (1992): 1-19, esp. 10-11.

<sup>23</sup> Kristeva's triadic imaginary correlates with the transference phenomenon of theatrical, creative, and psychic space. Unlike Freud or Lacan, whose symbolic father is a father of judgement and law, Kristeva's imaginary 'father/mother' is father of creativity and affection, simultaneously figural and corporeal. While semiotics usually refers to the science of signs, for Kristeva, semiotic refers to the rhythms, intonations, and "non-sense" of language that resist logic and representation. Semiotic gestures or intonations that are present in the vocalizations of young infants later appear (in the symbolic) as the rhythms, articulations, and music that permeate poetic language. Similarly discourses of analysands (and literary narratives) are permeated with symptoms, laughter, tears, and untold anxieties that "split into an irreducible heterogeneity."<sup>23</sup> For Kristeva, semiotic energy is never completely repressed by the symbolic, but continues to erupt in moments of crisis whereby the subject experiences a radical displacement or a confusion in meaning that is at once a loss and an opportunity for renewal. It is important to note the imaginary 'father' can be a 'mother,' a caretaker, or an 'elsewhere' of desire other than the child, for example art, literature, a human or nonhuman presence. In terms of her valuation of psychotherapy, Kristeva views the analyst as a 'presence' situated on a threshold between 'maternal' (nourishing) and 'paternal' (distancing) functions. Although access to the imaginary is retrospective and imperfect, such access enables more flexible borders that open to 'thirdness.' In psychoanalytic practice, patients who suffer from archaic wounds of primary narcissism would not be treated within Freudian or Lacanian psychology, since for these analysts, such a *wound* correlates with psychosis, disabling the transference proper necessary for treatment. For Kristeva, the imaginary site, at once nourishing and holding, distancing and temporary, offers a 'position' in psychoanalysis to treat seriously disturbed or borderline patients before transition to the symbolic. Since the imaginary 'father' – like the analyst – is loving yet *fleeting*, ephemeral yet affective, such a presence can be compared to the phenomenon of the theatrical event, the multiple and drive affected crossings between body, stage, and world. Such an imaginary site is prior to representation and the law, avoiding the absolutism of the symbolic (Freud's fear of mob hysteria and the tyranny of the Führer), whereby sites of renovation like the theatre enable a retrospective return and recovery of imaginary/psychic space.

<sup>24</sup> Pleshette DeArmitt, *The Right to Narcissism: A Case for an Im-possible Self-Love* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014) 50.

<sup>25</sup> Steve Mentz, "Tongues in the Storm: Shakespeare, Ecological Crisis, and the Resources of Genre," eds. Lynne Bruckner and Dan Brayton, *Ecocritical Shakespeare* (Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 155-71, esp. 164.

<sup>26</sup> See Bruce Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 136. "In their androgyny... figures like Leander, Adonis, and Hermaphroditus [also Ganymede] embody, quite literally, the ambiguities of sexual desire in English Renaissance culture. Jonatha Bates adds that "this inclusiveness, extending even to the sexualization

---

of the landscape, is one of Ovid's prime gifts to late Elizabethan culture" in *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 5.

<sup>27</sup> Barton, "Introduction," 400.

<sup>28</sup> Ruth Nero, "Existence in Eden," in *As You Like It: Modern Critical Interpretations*, ed. Harold Bloom. (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 2004), 21-37.

<sup>29</sup> Diamond, *Women in Woods*, 35.

<sup>30</sup> Martin, *Shakespeare & Ecology*, 19-20.

<sup>31</sup> Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 161. William Kerrigan. "Female Friends/Fraternal Enemies," eds. Valerie Finucci and Regina Schwartz, *Desire in the Renaissance: Psychoanalysis and Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 186.

<sup>32</sup> Michael Shapiro, *Gender in Play on the Shakespearean Stage* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 126.

<sup>33</sup> Peter Sallibrass, "Patriarchal Territories: The Body Enclosed" in *Rewriting the Renaissance* 123-42, eds. Margaret, Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy Vickers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

<sup>34</sup> William N. West, "Female Friends/Fraternal Enemies." *As If: Essays in As You Like It* (Punctum Books, 2016), p. 41.

<sup>35</sup> See Mark Turner and Gilles Fauconnier, *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities* (New York: Basic Books, 2003), Reprint edition.

<sup>36</sup> See Stephen Orgel, "Nobody's Perfect: Or, Why did the English Stage Take Boys for Women?" *South Atlantic Quarterly* 88.1 (Winter 1989), 22.

<sup>37</sup> See Wilson, "Like the Old Robin Hood," 10-11.

<sup>38</sup> Joel Fineman, *The Subjectivity Effect in Western Literary Tradition* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1991), 228. See also Sallibrass, "Patriarchal Territories" in Ferguson, Quilligan, and Vickers, 29, 130. "Elizabeth functioned both as national 'integrity' and as embarrassing contradiction": in the Ditchley portrait, she is represented as standing on the map of England, while in a 1598 Dutch engraving, "Elizabeth's body encloses all Europe." Not only does Elizabeth embody a 'thirdness' that informs Shakespeare's *As You Like It*, her paternal authority and maternal sympathy became a 'dialogized' site of the early modern imaginary. Spenser's *The Shepheard's Calender*, Sidney's *Arcadia*, Marlowe's "Passionate Shepherd to his Lady," and Thomas Lodge's *Rosalynde or Euphues' Golden Legacy* represent various romance conventions that attest to shepherds and love while bordering on political and social critiques of power. Pastoral conventions not only invoke a world of leisure and shepherds, but also the golden age of expansion and newly discovered territories that are portrayed in various representations of the Queen's body. Given the rise in cartography in such a period of expansion, chorography [chora-graph], rather than simply representing the land, attempts as Helgerson notes, "to make the land speak."

<sup>39</sup> Shakespeare's shifting views between male and female, high and low find expression in the *limen* or middle, an in-between site energized by attraction to prelinguistic 'third.' Shakespeare plays upon the interactions between *locus* and *platea*, attraction and dislocation, whereby positions inside and outside illusion reveal dispositions of character, actor, and audience. Shakespeare evokes such primary and presymbolic 'positions' as internal/external movements within character and setting, material/maternal (Arden) as well as symbolic.

<sup>40</sup> Valerie Traub, *Desire and Anxiety: Circulations of Sexuality in Shakespearean Drama* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 137.

<sup>41</sup> Phillip Stubbs, *Anatomie of Abuses* (1583), qtd. in Jean Howard, *The Stage and Social Struggle in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 1994), 34.

<sup>42</sup> Howard, *Stage*, 94.

---

<sup>43</sup> Such guidelines presented an “official systematization of nature and society...summarized in the *Exhortation concerning Good Ordre and obedience to Rulers and Magsistrates*, an homily to be read in Elizabethan churches.” Louis Montrose, *The Purpose of Playing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 20-21.

<sup>44</sup> Sara Gorman, Sara Gorman. “The Theatricality of Transformation: cross-dressing, sexual misdemeanour and gender/sexuality spectra on the Elizabethan stage, Bridewell Hospital Court Records, and the Repertories of the Court of the Aldermen, 1574-1607”. *Early Modern Literary Studies* 13.3 (January 2008) 3.1-3. <<http://purl.oclc.org/emls/13-3/teatran.htm> >

<sup>45</sup> Ambroise Pare, *On Monsters and Marvels*, trans. Janice Pallister (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 32-33.

<sup>46</sup> See Juliet Dusinberre “Introduction,” *As You Like It* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006), 1-142, esp. 50. Also see *Poly-Olbion* <http://poly-olbion.exeter.ac.uk/the-text/full-text/song-13/>.

<sup>47</sup> Mark Eccles is quoted in A. Stuart Daley, “Where Are the Woods in *As You Like It*?” in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 34.2 (Summer 1983): 172-180; 175.

<sup>48</sup> Shapiro, *1599*, 242.

<sup>49</sup> Rosalind’s creatively reconfigures such debates. Martin notes Rosalind “practices two kinds of convertible husbandry; environmental, on the degraded sheep farm she buys from Corin’s master; and romantic, on Orlando’s culturally encoded Petrarchism,” 19.

<sup>50</sup> Cavarero, *More Than One Voice*, 133-34.

<sup>51</sup> Pastoral romances such as Virgil’s *Eclogues*, Sidney’s *Arcadia*, Spenser’s *Shepheard’s Calendar* as well as Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso* and the medieval *Chanson de Roland*. Interestingly, Walter Benjamin seems to correlate a resonance in the woods with the motility of translation: “Unlike a work of literature, translation does not find itself in the centre of the language forest but on the outside facing the wood ridge; it calls into it without entering, aiming at the single spot where the echo is able to give, in its own language, the reverberation of the work in an alien one.” (*Illuminations*, New York, 1968, p. 76).

<sup>52</sup> Martin, 56-57. See also Jean Feerick, “Economies of Nature in Shakespeare.” *Shakespeare Studies*, eds. Susan Zimmerman and Garrett Sullivan (Madison and Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2011), 32-42, esp. 36.

<sup>53</sup> Daley, “Where Are the Woods,” 175.

<sup>54</sup> William Camden, translated by Philemon Holland (London 1610) cited by A. Stuart Daley, “Where Are the Woods,” 175.

<sup>55</sup> Although differing ‘forms’ of mapping, cartography and chorography (*chora*-graphy) overlapped in the early modern period, chorographers resisted imperialist ambitions in favor of a more familiar, historical association of land and homeland, an endeavor to ‘make the land speak.’ As the oldest Greek word for place, Mimi Yiu notes that *chora* appears the more preferred terms in expressing ‘emotional statements about space while *topos* often indexes an imperialistic an empirically precise location” (145). Similarly, *topos* corresponds to Robert Weimann’s *locus* as the site of illusion while *chora* correlates more fully with *platea*, the space-place where the actor/character affectively connects with the audience and illusion is disrupted. Although eco-critics such as Robert Watson challenge the practice of anthropomorphosis whereby humans impose their own likeness on the landscape, literature, while not offering a direct encounter with nature, enables a deeper, more affective response to the nonhuman world. Borlik references Richard Helgerson (“The Land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography, and Sub-version in Renaissance England”), stating that epics such as *Poly-Olbion* resist the mapping of “royal centrism” but instead provide a “coronation of the land itself. *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature*, 69; 99.

<sup>56</sup> Randall Martin, *Shakespeare & Ecology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 60.

<sup>57</sup> Frank Kermode. *Shakespeare’s Language* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 2000), 77-8.

<sup>58</sup> Julia Kristeva, “From Symbols to Flesh: the polymorphous destiny of narration” in *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 2000, p. 86.

---

<sup>59</sup> Jonathan Gil Harris, *Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 31. Building materials and wooden pillars, taken from James Burbage's The Theatre built in 1576 and used to reconstruct the Globe, were rich in resonance (timber/timbre) as well allusion to an earlier setting now transformed. In addition, the immediacy of theatre's woodland settings called forth 'untimely matter.'

<sup>60</sup> Vin Nardizzi, *Wooden O's: Shakespeare's Theatre and England's Trees* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 5.

<sup>61</sup> Robert Watson, *Back to Nature: The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 77-78.

<sup>62</sup> Jane Bennett, *Vibrant Matter* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), xvi.

<sup>63</sup> Frank Kermode, *Shakespeare and Language* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 2000), 78. For a thorough consideration for the date of the play's performance, see Juliet Dusinberre, "Pancakes and A Date for As You Like It" in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54.4 (1993): 371-405, 379. Playing before Queen Elizabeth at Richmond Palace, the following lines as Epilogue were spoken at Shrovetide 1599, assuring the "queen of the loyalty of both players and courtly audience, and of the courtiers of the future (who are still at the present moment children).

As the diall hand tells ore / ye same howers yt had before  
still beginning in ye ending / circuler accompt still lending  
So most mightie Q. we pray / like ye Dyall day by day  
you may lead ye seasons on / making new when old are gon  
that the babe wch now is yong / & hathe yet no vse of tongue  
many a Shrovetide here may bow / to ye Empresse I doe now  
that the children of these lordes / sitting at your Counsell Bourdes  
may be graue & aeged scene / of her yt was ther father Quene  
(Cambridge M S Dd.5.75, fol. 46).

<sup>64</sup> James Shapiro, *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare: 1599* (New York: HarperCollins, 2006), 201-02.

<sup>65</sup> Shapiro, *1599*, 224-225.

<sup>66</sup> Smith, *Acoustical*, 61.

<sup>67</sup> Cited in Cavarero, *More Than One Voice*, 131.

<sup>68</sup> Wes Folkerth, *The Sound of Shakespeare* (London: Routledge2002), 24.

<sup>69</sup> In the play, Shakespeare puns on the notion of pursuit. Life and death are inscribed in the doubleness of the word 'hunt,' to 'kill/woo' a 'hart/heart' or 'deer/dear.

<sup>70</sup> Jean E. Feerick "Economies of Nature in Shakespeare" in *Shakespeare Studies*, eds. Susan Zimmerman and Garrett Sullivan, Volume XXXIX (Madison, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2011), 32-42, esp. 42. Similarly in his history plays and romances, Shakespeare portrays a corporeal sounding as well as a vernacular consciousness with the material earth. In his opening speech in *1 Henry IV*, King Henry, worn with the care of civil wars, states: "No more the thirsty entrance of this soil / Shall daub her lips with her own children's blood. / No more shall trenching war channel her fields, / Nor bruise her flow'rets..." (1.1.5-8). Feerick adds, "Moments like this, where a man's flesh blends together with earth – typically gendered female as a dame, grandma, or mother – may suggest the indistinction that obtains between human and earth scrambles the coordinates of gender in compelling ways, perhaps subordinating gender identity to a more fundamental earthly identity."

<sup>71</sup> Mary Beth Rose's article has spawned important studies that have addressed the subject of mothers, notably her own *Plotting Motherhood in Medieval, Early Modern, and Modern Literature*, Janet Adelman's *Suffocating Mothers*, Katherine M. Moncrief and Kathryn R. McPherson's *Performing Maternity in Early Modern England* as well as *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England*. In addition to Rose's work, critics such as Natasha Korda, Valerie Traub, Patricia Crawford, Phillipa Berry have addressed the important contributions of women to the family and to society. See also Helen Berry and Elizabeth Foyster *The Family in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) and Phyllis Rackin *Shakespeare & Women* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 20. While Rackin's *Shakespeare and Women* does not focus on mothers exclusively, she

---

amplifies critical interpretations of women's oppression to explore many instances whereby "women's power and authority extended beyond the limits of the household" as a means to point out the articulate (and heroic) presence of women as models for today. "We need to interrogate that history...not because it is necessarily incorrect but because it is incomplete."

<sup>72</sup> See also Bianci, "Receptacle/Chora," 138-39.

<sup>73</sup> Mary Ellen Lamb, Mary Ellen. "Engendering the Narrative Act: Old Wives' Tales in *The Winter's Tale*, *Macbeth*, and *The Tempest*," *Criticism* 50.4 (Fall 1998), 529.

<sup>74</sup> Helen Hackett, "Gracious Be the Issue" in *Shakespeare's Late Plays*, eds. Jennifer Richards and James Knowles (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999), 25-39; 29.

<sup>75</sup> Kristeva, *In the Beginning Was Love* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 9.